

**Golden Gate National Recreation Area**  
California

National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior



**PUBLIC COMMENTS**  
**ON THE**  
**DRAFT DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN /**  
**SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**  
**STATEMENT**

**FEBRUARY 2014**

NOTE: When correspondence are submitted by mail, copies of each correspondence are scanned into the National Park Service's Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) website. While a review was done to ensure completeness some typos, including spelling, punctuation, and spacing may occur due to the scanning software.

**Correspondence ID:** 1    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,06,2013 10:46:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There is far too much area where dogs are allowed off leash. Off leash dogs should only be allowed in areas that are fenced in in order to keep them away from people who do not wish to encounter off leash dogs and to keep them from destroyed our natural habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,06,2013 12:11:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Are you really going to close so many dog friendly beaches and off-leash areas The San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin counties after many many years? Loyal residents that obviously love and use these beaches and parks daily and clean-up after themselves. Please do not change the SF BAY AREA's GGNRA areas into a closed-quarters area for humans only.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,06,2013 12:20:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing with regard to the elimination of virtually all off leash dog walking areas in the draft plan. As a long time resident and dog owner who regularly visits Ocean Beach, Lands End, Fort Funston, and other GGNRA areas I find it outrageous that the plan makes the claims that this will increase usage of these areas. At least half the year these areas are blanketed with fog and literally the only people there are walking their dogs (aside from the occasional fisherman). Eliminating areas where dogs (under voice control) are able to run freely with make those few parks in San Francisco with off leash areas more crowded than they already are. It will negatively impact the health and welfare of dogs and their owners. It will increase pollution by forcing people to drive further to reach an off leash area.

If there are problems with out of control dogs (I have seen very few the past five years, and none that resulted in any injury or damage) then step up enforcement of existing regulations. It's frequently reported that there are more dogs than children in San Francisco. Removing the ability for these animals to get adequate exercise in a city of renters and apartments is absurd when we have huge amounts of open space all around us. I believe the existing regulations allow off leash dogs in less than 1% o GGNRA lands - taking it down to almost zero is not going to improve community relations, safety, or the environment.

---

Drop this nonsense now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,06,2013 12:59:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs and Horses cannot safely co exist together on Thorton Beach if dogs are not required to be on a leash. It has been one dangerous incident after another with off leash dogs attacking horses all the time.  
Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,06,2013 13:39:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to start off by saying that everyone needs to compromise a little: there are some who want no dogs at all; and there are those who want unfettered access for their dogs. If either side gets their way entirely then we will create resentment and conflict in our community. Fortunately the park is big enough to accommodate both desires, as long as we are willing to compromise.

I would like to voice my support for Crissy Field maps 10f and 10c. These two maps achieve two important objectives: 1. It leaves a large area where dogs can run around off leash (ROLA) on both the field AND a long stretch of beach. Dog walkers should be able to enjoy sizable areas of the beach and field as ROLA. 2. It preserves East Beach for a place for young children and families free of dogs. East Beach is the most used area of Crissy field. My own daughter was run over and left with a bloody nose by a dog chasing a ball. Her twin sister had stepped in dog feces that same trip. The fact is that part of the beach is too heavily impacted as it is. Removing the dogs and creating a safe stretch of beach free of dogs is a fair thing to do for families.

Maps 10f and 10c reach a nice compromise between no dogs, dogs on leash, and ROLA on both the beach and the field. Compromise!

For Upper Fort Mason I support map 9c. It's also a great compromise balancing different interest.

Remember, compromise!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,06,2013 13:47:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I have quickly reviewed your draft proposal for a "Dog Management Plan". It seems like a policy designed to cover up your own mismanagement and perhaps incompetence. That's because you already don't enforce the CURRENT plan that you already have. At Ocean Beach, where I live, huge numbers of dogs run off leash in the on leash areas on a daily basis. Today (Friday) is a sunny day at the beach, and I can guarantee you that there will be DOZENS of dogs down there - - and their owners - - who will be violating the CURRENT regulations. The dogs crap all over the beach (and owners don't scoop), chase birds (including threatened species), jump up on people that want nothing to do with them (and have destroyed my headset for my iphone on one occasion when a dog jumped up and clawed my chest), and generally create havoc. Many dog owners are responsible with their pets, but many are not. When I have (courteously) informed some dog owners that their dog was off leash in an on leash area, I have been physically threatened, verbally abused and harassed.

All of this is going on RIGHT NOW, with rules being violated according to the CURRENT PLAN. When I have told your officers as well as supervisors about these violations, they have been ignored. On one occasion, two of your officers were sitting in their vehicle in the parking lot of Ocean Beach, and I informed them that there were five dogs just over the sand dunes that were off leash in an on leash area. They basically ignored me, and when I asked them if they were going to do their job, one of your officers threatened me with being cited for some bogus violation.

In a conversation I had with one of your supervisors, I was told that "it's a resource problem, we don't have the officers to patrol the beach for dog violations." Yet you have tons of officers to harass local people who are having fires at night, enjoying the beach and minding their own business. Your priorities are off, in my view.

In this draft proposal for a new "dog management plan", I don't see any provision for adding "more resources" i.e. more officers to enforce your regulations. Did I miss it somewhere? Without that, how will you be able to enforce a new plan any better than you been able to enforce the current plan?

Frankly, at this point you guys at the GGNRA have very little credibility. It looks to me like you are "shifting the deck chairs," nothing more. You are creating the perception of "action" to mask your current inaction. There is nothing about the CURRENT plan that couldn't be made to work if you guys were to actually prioritize your resources in a better way, and have some officers down there to enforce your current regulations.

Sincerely,  
Steven Hill

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	7	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2013 15:51:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** First, Thank you for maintaining and controlling the beach space in our neighborhood. San Francisco gave the national park service this land with the understanding that the park service would consider the rights of the population. With the knowledge that, in reality, if anyone has the right to use the land for recreation it would be San Franciscans. This is our backyard.

I am writing in reference to the new proposed dog walking mandates for the area from stairwell 21 to Sloat blvd. I understand the need to protect the snowy plover, but I implore your team to consider the



families that live in the area. You must understand that people move to this area of one of the most densely populated cities in the world because of the ability to enjoy the ocean with our whole family, including our pets. How many meetings, functions, rallies do I have to go to before the message is received? Why is it every year the mandates are put on hold because of community disapproval, and then the following year stricter mandates are proposed.

Please understand that the limitations you are looking to impose are on the edge of an immense city, not a rural area. Leaching dogs in this area is understandable and acceptable. A total ban on the family enjoyment of this land is completely unacceptable.

Currently there is a leash requirement, yet there are off leash dogs running free in that area all of the time. If your team isn't able to enforce the leash laws, how do you expect to enforce the ban - especially with hundreds of angry protesters showing up with their dogs just to show you we won't let you take our beach from us. This is San Francisco you are dealing with, and we don't sit back quietly and let our rights be taken away!

Alternative E, where you would set up the off leash area and allow families to enjoy the areas south of Stairwell 21 with their pets on a leash is the only acceptable option here.

I am willing to go to jail for this, are you willing to arrest me for the first time in my life because I want to walk my dog in front of my house? I will never, EVER pay any fine for doing it, and I will continue to do it no matter what mandates you pass. When you take a moment to consider that I am one of hundreds of dog owners that feels this way, perhaps you will do the right thing and allow us the use of our beaches.

As an aside, I've lived in this neighborhood 14 years, and I've never seen a dog catch a Snowy Plover - not even come close.

Regards,

Tom Jagger

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	8	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2013 19:54:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My comment is on dog use plans for Mori Point.				

Your current preferred draft plan (E/F) is unrealistic and potentially impedes use and comfort of visitors with limited mobility who do not have dogs. Here is why:

Mori Point has only one path that is accessible to human pedestrians with limited mobility and has any area defined for human comfort (i.e. benches to sit on). That is Old Mori trail and the pedestrian boardwalk by the ponds and protected habitat. The "limited mobility" group would include the elderly, parents of infants and toddlers transported in strollers, and anyone with a physical disability affecting their ability to walk up hills. It might also include many cyclists, as the hiking trails at Mori point are not suitable for cycling.

Some park users with limited mobility have dogs, but many do not. The only way for a dog walker to bypass Old Mori trail and/or the pedestrian boardwalk (where human users might rest to enjoy the natural scenery) is via Lishumasha trail and Upper Mori trail. The only plan that depicts that trail as being open to leashed dogs is Map 17-A (current usage) - - therefore, of the plans you have presented, that is the only one that will protect the interests of all current users.

If all dog owners were walking docile pets, then perhaps this would not be important. However, some dogs are excitable and may behave in ways that are upsetting or frightening to human users, particularly cyclists or those with small children. Most dog owners will self-police, and choose the higher-ground bypass trails if they know their dogs tend to bark at children or lunge at other dogs or cyclists.

There are other possibilities that could further protect and preserve use for everyone. For example, there is no need for dogs to be allowed on Bootleggers Steps (dogs don't need stairs) - - but you don't have any proposed maps that appear to differentiate between areas designed for the comfort of humans and areas likely to be popular among dog walkers.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	9	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hercules, CA 94547 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2013 20:52:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The preferred alternative is far too restrictive. There are already lots of places that don't allow dogs, there should be plenty of places that DO allow dogs as well, so there is a GOOD choices for everyone. More unnecessary laws also require unnecessary enforcement and the potential for more conflict.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	10	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Greenbrae, CA 94904 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2013 21:59:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off leash dogs dominate areas where they're permitted. They disturb and chase runners, hikers and brds alike. Muir beach is no longer used by residents without dogs because of the dogs roaming, sniffing, digging and pooping and their irresponsible owners inconsiderate behavior. Public properties that are allowed to become off leash areas become only suitable for dogs.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	11	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Ross, CA 94957 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2013 23:32:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	1) The revised plan still does not seem to recognize that dogs are biologically engineered to retrieve balls and sticks, preferably from the water. No dog can retrieve a stick while on a leash, is that so hard to understand? This "plan" is nothing more than a veiled invitation to euthanize our				

---

dogs, and it is therefore despicable.

2) In addition to being utterly morally bankrupt as per 1) above, the plan is also a stunning waste of taxpayer dollars. This plan is designed to be litigated from here to forever, and, before this is all over, many millions of our hard earned cash will have been vaporized. Children still go to bed hungry in this country every day, but apparently it's ok for the Park Service to flush money down the toilet?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,07,2013 01:34:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am completely against any of the options for Fort Funston except Alternative A. This is the only area we can run free and not impact any other users. The area is used by a wide cross section of beach goers, hang gliders, model airplane pilots, joggers, dog lovers, sight seeers, equestrians, and history buffs among others.

The proposed leash only or ROLA areas would ruin this unique site and relegate the area to no more than a common "dog park" like we have on 3rd ave in San Mateo. We drive to Fort Funston regularly and stop for lunch and/or diner in the surrounding area on a regular basis due to the unique nature of Fort Funston.

The draconian "alternatives" you have laid out are simply unacceptable, unwarranted, unwanted, and wasteful. Enforceent would be futile and expensive leading to misgivings between the patrons and the Park service. This semi remote area is unique and precious the way it is - don't attempt to ruin it and cause un-necessary stress on the Park service and the population it is supposed to serve.

Thank you very much  
Bart Beeman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,07,2013 07:58:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I like exploring with my dogs. Please make these lands open to dogs and off leash if possible.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 14    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** daly city, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,07,2013 08:33:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Unless the NPS enforces the dog rules, many of the dog owners allow their pets to spoil the experience for the visitors, environment, and wildlife.

36 CFR Â§ 2.15 - The sections of the NPS pet regulation that prohibit:

â€¢Failing to dispose of pet excrement \*nice word for raw sewage left on our park jewels\*

36 CFR Â§ 2.1 - The regulation to preserve natural, cultural and archeological resources which prohibits possessing, destroying, injuring, defacing, removing, digging or disturbing wildlife, fish, plants or cultural or archeological resources.

36 CFR Â§ 2.2 - The regulation to protect wildlife that prohibits the feeding, touching, teasing, frightening or intentional disturbing of wildlife nesting, breeding or other activities.

36 CFR Â§ 2.34(a)(4) - The regulation regarding disorderly conduct which prohibits creating hazardous or physically offensive conditions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	15	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,07,2013 09:14:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I applaud the continued reasonable restrictions place on dog walking etc in our national parks/recreation areas. As a resident of San Francisco, I see daily problems with dog owners at Ocean Beach allowing their ( illegally) off leash dogs to chase sea birds for hundreds of yards and to urinate all over areas where other users ( children, surfers, etc) then lie on the sand. These area are national parks NOT DOG parks and someone needs to speak for the wildlife and other users aside from dog owners. Thank you				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	16	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,07,2013 09:18:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a 32 year resident of the Sunset District of SF and a dog owner who has used Fort Funston as a uniquely wonderful site to walk my dog for years, I must register my extreme disappointment at the proposals put forth by the NPS.				

---

Walking a dog off leash is one of the pinnacles of the dog ownership experience. It allows the dog to "be a dog". It allows the owner to get outdoors and walk in a pleasant environment with the companionship of their pet and to experience the pleasure of seeing their pet happy, free, socializing with other dogs, and getting real, unfettered exercise. Walking a dog on a leash is a mere shadow of the experience of walking a dog off leash and leashed walking should in no way be seen as an equivalent to off leash walking.

Fort Funston evolved into a uniquely wonderful resource for dog owners by historical accident. It is one of the only areas I know of immediately adjacent to a major urban center where a large plot of land in a beautiful setting has allowed near unrestricted off leash dog walking. It is obvious by the heavy usage of

---

the facility that MANY residents see it as an invaluable resource for them and their pets and the primary reason that it has been as popular as it has been is because of the off leash option. It isn't too hyperbolic to refer to Fort Funston as the "Sistine Chapel" of off leash dog walking sites.

It should be clear to the NPS that people are voting with their feet (and paws). They want Fort Funston to remain as is. Restricting off leash areas to small parts of the facility would radically degrade the value of the site as a place to walk a dog. I would stop going there. I imagine many others would as well. And the unfortunate reality is that I won't have anywhere else to take my dog for a similar experience. Lose-lose.

Every option in the proposal other than A (status quo) is unacceptable to me.

I understand that the NPS is uncomfortable dealing with sites that aren't operated according to their standard policies. Fort Funston doesn't fit into the NPS portfolio very well. It is too messy. Too anarchic. Too many exceptions to standard NPS land use policies. I get it. You want to bring order to chaos and provide a better "multi-user" experience. But the fact of the matter is that 95% of the "users" of Fort Funston are people who want to walk their dog off leash and almost all of them want the NPS to allow the status quo to continue.

If the NPS is incapable of accepting Fort Funston as is, with all of its warts and bumps, and is unwilling or unable to leave it alone to thrive as it has for many years, I would suggest that the NPS consider transferring ownership of the land to another public entity that is willing to do so.

To summarize: Option A or give/sell the land to the City/County of SF or some other local public entity that will manage the land in a manner better suited to local needs and less constrained by bureaucratic consistency. Anything else will break my heart and will represent a triumph of mindless bureaucracy over pragmatism.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	17	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Menlo Park, CA 94025 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,07,2013 09:35:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for continuing to work with all the community input you've received. In the face of recent news coverage of the dog owner's groups & spokespeople, I felt compelled to comment. We only use the parks sparingly, but have contributed to their improvements out of love for the area and your overall mission.:				

This hugely successful and beautiful system was not developed for the selfish gain of a few outspoken dog lovers whose idea of a gently & loving "fido" does not extend beyond their close group of friends & fellow dog lovers. Not everyone is excited by the site of an unleashed dog or an over friendly one either. Nobody wants to sit where dogs have had their run of things, and small children are especially at risk to all the vulnerabilities that unrestricted access brings. Anything can happen at any time; not everyone enjoys the uninvited canine experience that these groups are asking for.

Please maintain the controls that you are proposing. They are more than adequate and frankly more than these groups should reasonably expect. National parks are not open/unrestricted dog runs. Thank you again for your continued efforts to serve the whole community and outside visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 18    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,07,2013 10:05:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't take away Fort Funston from our puppies. It is the only safe place to take our dog and let them run off leash. It is very important to our family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 19    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,07,2013 10:48:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off leash under voice control for Baker Beach, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach & all parts of Crissy Field that currently have the same.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 20    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,07,2013 11:38:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner and I am furious with this recommendation. We have been walking our dogs (who are well behaved and under voice control) for nearly 20 years (2 sets of dogs) on the East end of Crissy Field - off leash. There is a precedent here and that needs to be taken into consideration. Plus, the East End of the beach will disturb wildlife LESS than the middle section. . .it's next to a parking lot, for heaven's sake. This park is not a wilderness, nor should it ever be. It is an urban park and as such needs to serve the needs of all taxpaying residents, not just a few. There are more dogs now in San Francisco than kids, but we don't see you disallowing children on the beach - and they do alot more to disturb wildlife than the dogs do. If you don't change this policy, we will disobey it and take you to court. Dogs have rights, too - they just don't have a vote. We will support the dogs.

Ultimately, you need to have off leash areas all over Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston and Fort Mason. Dogs need their exercise and we all are getting along - it's the federal government that is the problem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 21    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,07,2013 11:44:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** The expansive proposed restrictions to dogs on Ocean Beach seem excessive. I would advocate enforcement of existing leash requirements much more strictly (violations are extremely common) before limiting access so significantly. Thsnk you for considering my perspective.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 22    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,07,2013 12:57:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for all the diligent work in attempting to balance the desires of dog owners (and local agencies and politicians) with broader environmental and public policy objectives. As a Marina District resident who spends some part of nearly every day in the GGNRA but does not have a pet, I want to strongly request that the NPS please stand firm on the more-than-fair concessions it has made to the aforementioned special interests and implement this document as-is. It is the right thing to do for everyone who wants to enjoy the space (and our use of tax dollars on it) as something more than a dog park and who wants to see the continued revitalization of the natural environment and ecosystem in the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 23    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,07,2013 16:17:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm wondering how GGNRA will enforce the voice command requirements. Lots of dog owners think that if a dog saunters over after they holler it's name 8 times, they think that counts as voice control. I support leashed dog walking areas, but, many dog owners have their pets on very long leashes that block the trails and still allow the dogs to jump on passing walkers. Perhaps there should be some guidance on how to use the leash or how to control the dog? It should be prohibited to allow a dog to jump on a stranger, whether the dog is on or off a leash. It should be prohibited for a dog to harass wildlife or go off trail, whether it's on or off a leash.

Please do aggressively enforce any rules. I live in an area where no one enforces the dog leash laws, and it just seems over run with unruly dog owners and their well-meaning but untrained pets.

Thanks for pay attention to this important matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 24    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,07,2013 19:42:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Overall, I support the new preferred alternative. However, the areas open to dogs is unreasonably large. But I think this is better than the way things are now. Also the length of leashes allowed are too long.

I do support the limit of dogs off leash to maximum of 3 dogs (commercial or personal). I hope that dog owners will be better able to control their dogs with a limit on the number. I do believe there should be

heavy fines for exceeding this number for any reason. I also support the requirement of dogs to have the dog owner's name and number on the dog in any off leash area. I feel that this will help avoid conflicts between dogs owners and other park visitors. Currently dog owners feel that can be rude and mean to other visitors and that there will be no consequences as they are relatively anonymous. I hope there will be an easy way for people to report those dog walkers who do not obey the rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 25    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,07,2013 20:54:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is long overdue and almost not strict enough. Too long have I seen owners allow their dogs to degrade the parks. I endorse this proposal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 26    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** new orleans, LA 70114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,07,2013 21:50:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In referenced to unleashed areas in federal parks- Any area that allows dogs to be unleashed should not be patrolled by mounted park police officers. It is an accident waiting to happen to allow horses in parks designated for unleashed dogs AND dogs to be under voice control. For everyones safety,including dogs,people,mounted officers & horses,KEEP horses OUT of the parks where you allow off leashed dogs.  
What happened to David Gizzarelli & his dog ,Charlie is still an injustice. His case was treated differently than other similar cases in the same park. (Crissy Field) Another case,a therapy dog bit a mounted park horse. The owner was given a small fine & requested the dog be kept on a leash in public. Also a owner 'sicked' his dog on a park officer & owner recv'd the same small fine & on leash request.

At first David Gizzarelli was given Charlie back, with a request to keep Charlie leashed. David was told Charlie is a good dog,just scared.Ten days later, that same officer,deemed Charlie vicious & dangerous & impounded Charlie,committing him to death.

Something is suspicious about the way SFACC and the park police handled this case. Charlie & David G were in someones cross hairs. The slander & hatefilled FB page created to trash David G is proof of that.

If the park had clear rules to keep horses out of areas designated for dogs,these accidents would have not happened.

I suggest you place natural boundries, fences hidden by hedges,plants & barriers,to keep dogs in a safe area. Keep park horses out of dog areas. Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 27    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,07,2013 22:28:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** I use the GGNRA regularly with my dog. It is one very important to me to be able to continue using it. I primarily use the area in Marin County. I urge you to adopt the following alternatives for dog use in Marin County GGNRA:

Muir Beach - Map 5-A  
Rodeo Beach - Map 6-A  
Marin Headlands - Map 7-A  
Fort Baker - Map 8-A

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

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	28	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,08,2013 09:08:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Alternative D; it provides the most protection for the resource and keeps the dogs out as much as possible. Dogs cause problems for wildlife and for other users. I am tired of being approached by out of control dogs in the GGNRA; they are not in control and should at least be on lease.				

Alan Carlton

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	29	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,08,2013 09:21:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	RE: Dog park near Farallone Elementary School. PLEASE NO.				

Please see below my letter to the Farallone View Elementary and San Mateo County Sheriff. It will only make the current issues of crime on campus worse. Use the precautionary principle and leave the off-leash dog group to find an area far away from children.

I have lived on the mid-coast 51 of my 54 years. Thank you, Brenda  
Donald.....

dardenellej@cabrillo.k12.ca.us

lgibbons@smcgov.org

Joy Dardenelle  
Principal, Farallone View Elementary School

Dear Joy Dardenelle:

Subject: Dogs on Campus - Signage, Incident Prevention and Stewardship

I am emailing to express concern about the pervasive problem of large hunting and/or fighting breed dogs off leash on Farallone View Campus during off-hours and to request additional, more visible No Dogs on Campus signage.

I currently have a first grader in Annie Blair's class. We visit the playground during off-hours with many other families.

After the recent attack on two young teens originating at FVE I have become less accepting of the lack of citizenship shown to this campus and students by after-hours and weekend adult visitors.

With dog access regulations pending at GGNRA I am concerned that dog walkers may use the campus as an alternative dog park.

I called the sheriff's office to find out what could be done about an adult visitor to the campus bringing large pit bull near the western jungle gym. A male officer whose name I did not jot down indicated this was a district issue, and any future signage for picking up after dogs or leashing dogs may imply consent to bring dogs on campus.

Aside from the liability for the District, feces left on the field, the urine on play equipment, the unpredictable behavior of dogs with unfamiliar kids, the adult with the hunting dog who exercises it by chasing killdeer on the field, the adult owner of a St. Bernard who closes the gate to the K-playground to toss a ball to his dog undisturbed by kids; all this behavior is a terrible example of adults putting their wants above the agreed upon rules of the School District and the County in front of the students. This example is at odds with the citizenship and stewardship education FVE and the parent volunteers have worked so hard and spent so much to provide.

The late great Superintendant of the GGNRA, Brian O'Neil once told me "Brenda, I just can't win with the dog thing". The FVE situation is not a slippery slope but a clear policy. That stated I am requesting the district put up additional NO Dogs on Campus signs visible from the playgrounds and playfields that a parent can point to if necessary. Locking the new gate at the NE corner of the campus might be advisable as well.

If you need funding for the signage, please let me know.

Thank you,

Brenda Donald  
P.O. Box 14  
El Granada, CA 94018 (mail)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	30	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Sep,08,2013 09:39:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a San Francisco resident and have had many bad experiences with dogs and dog walkers. Dogs are often out of control in San Francisco and on "voice control," dogs run up to me and disturb my park experience. I have witnessed dogs destroying plants and scaring wildlife as well as scaring children. For this reason (safety and environmental concerns), I support decreasing the amount of area that is open to dogs.

Overall, I support alternative F. However, I would like to the additional changes. For the off leash are on crispy field, I would like to see this area marked off with fence. Ideally, one would have a permit to enter this area. With this permit would come either a key to enter, an access code or a badge that would allow entrance.

I strongly support leash only on baker beach as this is an area where I have noticed a number of conflict between dogs and wildlife or dog owners and other park visitors. I believe if this area were enforced as leash only this would significantly decrease the tension between dog walkers and other park visitors.

I also support making lands ends leash only. Because this area is overrun with off leash dogs, I have not been able to go to this area for over 10 years. It will be nice to be able to share this area with on leash dogs and dog walkers.

I am not happy about the area suggested to be off leash at ocean beach. There should not be only off leash area here. If there will be an off leash area then again it would be important to create some type of physical boundary to make it clear which area is on leash, off leash and no dogs allowed.

I have never been to fort funston since it is overrun with dogs so I don't have enough knowledge of the area to comment on this area. I would only say that if there were some areas that became on leash or no dogs, I would be very excited to visit.

I hope that with these changes, dog owners will start to be respectful of others and learn to share our beautiful city and park lands.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	31	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94609 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,08,2013 09:51:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir or Madam:				

I am writing to comment on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Dog Management for the GGNRA and to voice my support for this document. The restrictions that are proposed on dog owners seem reasonable and appropriate to me. As a national park, you have a mandate to protect wildlife and natural resources. While you are placing some restrictions on dog access in areas that have previously not had any, this make sense given the increasing population of California and increasing use of the parks by humans.

I'm sure that this must be a challenging process and appreciate your work on it.

Mark Friedman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 32    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Lawrence, KS 66049-2029  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,08,2013 15:29:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is my opinion that the NPS Preferred Alternative F is the best alternative for the Draft Dog Management Plan. I would like to know that the natural, cultural, and wildlife aspects of all of the areas described are protected for future generations. I believe visitors to these areas have the right to be safe from unruly dogs and/or their owners. I know that most dog owners are responsible and considerate of their dogs, as well as other people. I feel that dogs and their owners could benefit greatly from visiting all the areas discussed in this management plan, but there must be clear rules about when and where it is appropriate for dogs to be on- or off-leash. Of greatest concern to me are the needs of the wildlife that depend on beach areas for nesting, feeding, mating, and etc. As long as Alternative F is effective in providing such protection, I would accept it as the best alternative. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Dog Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 33    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Woodside, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,08,2013 16:04:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dog-walking opportunities are already excessively restricted. Given the expected population increase in the Bay Area as a whole, it is essential to adopt the least restrictive dog-walking rules possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 34    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,08,2013 16:38:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have reviewed the various proposals, A through F, with particular attention to the Marin County maps as I live and hike mostly in Marin County. I prefer to see plan A implemented. It has a reasonable balance of voice and leash control areas, respects the wishes of hikers and dog owners. I also note, I often notice dog owners picking up residual trash ( as well as their dogs' waste) on Rodeo Beach. On busy days, the sand is full of cigarette butts, straws, plastics, candy & food wrappers - -thank you all for picking it up.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 35    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,08,2013 16:46:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

I commented on the previous Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (comment ID: 457979-38106/85) and as requested will focus on the changes made between then and the current draft.

My chief concern with the previous draft was the provision that allowed the NPS to degrade off-leash 'ROLA' areas to on-leash or banning dogs entirely without further public consultation. The latest draft has removed this language, but the new 'Monitoring-Based Management Strategy' doesn't strike me as a material improvement.

The compliance section of this strategy begins with focused enforcement of regulations and education. It should stop there. Instead it goes on to mention buffer zones, time and use restrictions, and SUP restrictions and then goes on to short-term closures that are typically one-year or less.

While the previous draft was worse, the prospect of losing access to the limited off-leash areas that will remain after the implementation of this plan for a year or possibly more isn't a material improvement.

I live in San Francisco and frequently visit the GGNRA with my family, which includes a toddler and well behaved dog. I completely support a reasonable allocation of the available space between visitors who want to bring their dog and visitors who would prefer a dog-free experience.

Given the tone of the plan and the history of the NPS seeking to ban off-leash dog access altogether I cannot help but fear that any provision in the plan to curtail dog access will end up being used.

Please remove the language around further regulating, restricting, permitting and closing the ROLA areas. Focus on enforcement and use your limited resources to handle the minority of irresponsible dog owners rather than closing down access for everyone.

Sincerely,

Robert Ellison

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

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	36	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,08,2013 17:11:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I like that dogs will be required to be on leash. It is frightening to young children and small adults for dogs to come running up to them as they often do because they are friendly and enthusiastic. Dog parks are where dogs can run freely. And, by the way, I don't have a dog now but I did and I appreciated when other dogs were on a leash.				

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	37	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** san rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,08,2013 22:10:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** When me and my 5 year old daughter are walking, and an off-leash dog comes running towards us, we have no way to determine what its intentions are.

Will it stop, will it bite . . . or what will it do?

And if it only ends up jumping on my daughter to try to lick her, the dog usually knocks her down in the process.

In any event, we are both fearful in this scenario.

While some dogs are responsive to verbal commands, most seem to be undependable to control their natural inclinations unless on a leash.

What not use a long leash and reel your dog in when approaching other people?

The public then has the option of coming over to pet your dog, or let it jump on them if they so desire.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 38    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,08,2013 22:13:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** When I first saw the maps, I thought it was pretty good news! All that pink area all over the place seemed even better than it does now in some places. But then I started looking at Alternatives that weren't just Alternative A. NOT good. To prevent dogs from ever even going on most of Ocean Beach, for instance, is a joke and a travesty. Are you kidding? Are we turning into LA County here?

One of the reasons we live in San Francisco is because it's so dog friendly. One of the reasons we live near Ocean Beach is because dogs were allowed leash free when we moved here. Now we deal with the leash law most of the year, and while not as good for our dog, it's tolerable, because we still have Ft. Funston down the road. But if you ban dogs from there and severely restrict them from being allowed at Ocean Beach and GGNRA properties, you're going to see SF city parks overrun by dogs, many more cases of dog aggression, lots of unhappy dogs, and owners who might head to the hills.

There is no reason for dogs to be banned from Ocean Beach. We're not talkin' the French Riviera here, or even Malibu. We're talking a beach that has very little traffic in a very large area. It's foggy and cool the majority of days. It's not going to be a regular bikini magnet until global warming takes hold in a big way, and that's not happening in near future.

If you ban dogs from Ocean Beach and some of these other areas, all you're going to do is decrease traffic significantly, and have far less voter support for GGNRA/National Parks. It could become a real downward spiral for funding and lead to really unfortunate consequences for the parks' futures. Dogs on leash don't chase plovers. Most dogs off leash don't, either. But all the homeless encampments up there don't do a whole lot of good. And those sandmovers aren't helping them.

Thank you,  
Maria

Please

---

**Correspondence ID:** 39    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,09,2013 01:13:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Crissy Field should remain as Map 10-A. The only acceptable compromise would be a hybrid of 10-A and 10-C. By this I mean the Central and East Beaches north of the Promenade should be ROLA and so should Crissy Airfield.

I am especially concerned that the East Beach north of the Promenade is OFF-LIMITS or LEASH REQUIRED on all of the maps except 10-A. Is this really your goal? This is a horrible betrayal of generations of native San Franciscans who have played fetch the ball with their dogs on these beaches since before all of us were born (you included).

It is difficult enough for senior citizens to walk the sand, let alone with a leashed dog which thinks it's going to run and chase balls.

If you must reduce dog traffic along the Crissy beaches why don't you extend the concept of ROLA to include all dogs? You could then limit access to dogs that are truly under voice control with a simple obedience test. People who only think their dogs are under voice control because they (sometimes) come when called would have to go elsewhere. People (with their dogs) who cause problems including dog waste would lose their permits.

Incidentally, why is the tidal inlet to the Tidal Marsh off-limits to dogs on all of the maps except 10-A? Is it going to be off-limits to people too?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 40    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,09,2013 08:54:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am so appreciative of the efforts of the GGNRA to create a multi-use park for all to enjoy, not just a park dogs and dog walkers. While I would personally like to see all of the GGNRA be completely dog free (no dogs allowed not even on leash), I support the current preferred alternative. As it is now, my children do not have enough space to play without interference by some off leash dog and the risk of dog bites. I would like to see strict enforcement of the new rules to protect my children and other visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 41    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Sep,09,2013 11:10:38**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the proposed dog plan, especially restricting dogs from being off-leash at East Beach. There are many children and toddlers who use that beach because of the easy access to parking - - a necessity with kids that age - - and running dogs (and what they leave behind) and small children don't mix well. I myself have had to defend my children from dogs running wild in that area, and my children were terrified.

Dogs can run on the airfield - - toddlers and babies cannot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 42    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Sep,09,2013 11:55:19**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am responding to the policy to close the Oakwood Valley Trail to dogs under voice control and to require them to be on-leash. I am a steward of Oakwood Valley and I have walked my dog on the trail for the 37 years I have lived in Tam Valley. Problems have been extremely rare with dogs under voice control. There is no habitat damage when owners keep their dogs on the trails. Fragile habitat areas, such as that of the mission blue butterfly, are not on the valley floor where the fire road and trail are. Where habitat restoration and fragile areas do exist, fence and signage should take care of the problem.

The same principles can be applied to voice-control of dogs at Muir Beach. Keeping dogs away from the stream and lagoon is a good idea - keeping them out of the ocean and off the shore is ridiculous.

Teaching people to use our trails and beaches properly is much more effective than prohibition. It's also a less expensive proposition.

Respectfully yours,  
Laurie Cohen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 43    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Sep,09,2013 18:29:07**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:**

I can't make sense of the documents, so I will respond to a claim that I have heard, in that GGNRA is proposing to ban dogs from all or part of Ocean Beach. I am a rabid environmentalist and liberal, but I absolutely oppose this, and if it becomes law, I will lobby with every ounce of my strength to defund GGNRA and remove its authority on my city parks. You people are out of control.

Dogs present no more threat to the Snowy Plover than do children, adults, and all the pollution that is allowed to be spilled on that beach. I spent two days last week at Ocean Beach, watching kids and joggers run through the crowds of snowy plovers, scattering them and making them fly- - far more than the dogs



do. If the purported aim is to stop harrassing the birds, then you should start with banning children!

Moreover, everyone knows that the beach is black from oil waste dumped at sea by ships before they enter the Bay and have to submit to Bay Area dumping regulations. The pollution threatens the snowy plovers every time they stick their beaks into the sand, far more than dogs chasing them!

Dogs outnumber people in this ridiculously expensive town, and they need space to run and play. I don't have a dog, or kids, but watching the dogs play offleash gives me sheer joy. Why are you non-natives trying to kill our last sources of freedom and joy?

It is time for the national parks to stop threatening our use of the parks, and for environmentalists to stop trying to turn all of the state and nation's parks into no-touch crystal palaces. Stick your beak somewhere else!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	44	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,09,2013 19:18:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am concerned about the resource degradation associated with the dogs in Chrissy field, especially on East Beach and Central Beach.				

Why is our national park just a dog walking area, when there are so many other animals, like shorebirds, migrating birds, and other birds, as well as humans, that should benefit from this resource? If you walk on the Central beach during the week, there are often 40 dogs at one time walking the beach with dog walkers. It is a travesty that the dogs are allowed to overrun the beach, destroying the atmosphere for the people there.

My husband dislikes the experience of going to this beach because of all the dogs, and so he will no longer accompany me to the beach.

Thank you for the opportunity to make a comment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	45	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,09,2013 21:01:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I for one am tired of all the dog feces on strewn on Ocean Beach. By and large most owners are responsible, but you can't get all the waste, and frankly who wants that job? It's unsightly, and detracts from the enjoyment of walking on a clean beach. Yesterday my wife and I watched as a pit bull chased a flock of small white shorebirds back and forth, harassing the endangered species. The owner did nothing and ignored us when we mentioned that he needs to control his animal. I have never seen any rangers or enforcement ever present in all the years I've lived here and enjoyed the beach. Rangers ignore the stretch near Daly City south if funston. I love dogs but the place is overrun now, and it shows.				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 46    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,09,2013 21:17:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am strongly supportive of Alternative A. Reducing the amount of off-leash dog parks would cause our city parks to become flooded with dogs and people, creating unsafe environments for all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 47    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,10,2013 10:59:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs should always be leashed where allowed in the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 48    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,10,2013 11:40:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While people line up to complain about policies that they feel will undermine their dogs' happiness and livability in the city, where is the outrage about policies, or a lack of policies, that make the city livable for women and families? With housing unaffordable for most, childcare unavailable and prohibitively expensive, schools un navigable, and public transit unreliable and inefficient, it seems that arguments about the availability of dogs' open space is perhaps a bit out of place. I do realize and respect that some people choose to have pets over children; however, it seems misguided to create and maintain a city that is more livable for dogs than it is for families. Especially when there are so many irresponsible dog owners who refuse to abide by leash laws in any case. I've limited my walking on Land's End, in Golden Gate park, in Sutro park, and in other places because there are so many people who refuse to leash their dogs, even though there are signs that clearly say dogs must be on leashes. And don't even get me started on how many oblivious dog owners now feel it's OK to bring their dogs into grocery stores and other shops.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 49    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Millbrae, CA 94030  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,10,2013 12:27:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I listened to the thoughtful discussion of the Dog Management Plan this morning, September 10th, 2013 on the public radio station KQED.

---

As a dog owner and nature lover I am hugely disappointed by the efforts to further limit access to land for me, my dog and my family.

Please, at leave things as they were rather than locking us out.

thanks,

Brett

---

**Correspondence ID:** 50    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Woodside, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,10,2013 15:35:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA Parks are truly special and access to them to be protected for everyone, including dogs. There are so many places in the Bay Area where dog access is restricted or outright banned. Please, please, leave these rare sites, where dogs can run free, for us to continue enjoying.

I frequently walk my dog off-leash at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field. It is such a valuable asset to have places where my dog can run free, chase balls, swim in the ocean, and play with other dogs as she is unable to in her day-to-day environment. Dogs simply cannot get the same amount of exercise and movement when restricted to a leash and a weekend trip to these places tires her out more and makes her happier than anything else can. Yes, dog walking is inherently ripe for conflict, both with other dogs and people, but that is exactly why it is absolutely necessary to have wide, unrestricted, off-leash park areas. Overcrowding and restriction of dogs via leash actually increases their territoriality and increases conflict. The GGNRA sites are one of the very few places where space is abundant and the rate of conflict is probably relatively low compared to standard, fenced-in dog parks. As use of the parks goes up, increasing restrictions will only increase conflict and the necessity for park staff to enforce rules and intervene in conflicts.

Furthermore, given by what I've witnessed at these parks, negative environmental impact to birds and the surrounding dunes at Fort Funston is caused just as much by kids sliding down the hills and general park visitors hiking and hanging out off-trail, as is by dogs. I fail to see evidence that dogs are the sole cause of environmental impact. If there are areas that need to be protected, restrict access to everyone, but please, don't take away off-leash walking privileges; leave the beach free for everyone, including dogs, to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 51    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,10,2013 18:55:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the preferred alternative: F.

I hope that the all off leash areas in this alternative will be fenced off.

I would also suggest permits (\$1000 a year per dog) to be able to use the off leash areas. Many dog owners who prefer off leash areas see their dogs as children and \$1000 a year is reasonable as it is a lot

---

less expensive than pre-school or day care or after school activities. They should pay this minimal fee to essentially enjoy exclusive use of those designated off leash areas. Right now they are getting it for free while the rest of don't get to enjoy those areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 52    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,10,2013 19:47:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to urge you not to ban dogs on Ocean Beach in San Francisco, on any portion including the portion between Sloat and the Beach Chalet.

I am a homeowner, living in sight and smell of the beach here. Our beach-park is unlike most in the state in that it is not warm, and it is nearly always windy. Consequently, the value in our beach is rarely to lie in the sun and be still. Our beach is a walking beach. Our best and usual enjoyment of this great natural resource is to walk by the water. It's several mile length also make it unusual, in that we can walk for long distances without climbing over mountains or walking on rocks, yet we are on the shoreline. Thousands of residents in the outer-Sunset, such as myself and my husband, bought our property here specifically because of its access to the beach, and it's dog friendly policy. Of the neighbors who I see every day walk by my window in the evenings after work, most who are headed to the beach are with dogs (unless they are carrying surfboards, that is). The Sunset is a much bigger residential neighborhood than the Richmond (which is north of the Beach Chalet). To allow dog walking only north of the Beach Chalet would unfairly burden the Sunset residents, as we would have to drive our dogs in order to walk them on the beach, despite our own homes being right next to the beach.

If you ban dogs on the beach in the Sunset, you will, in short: (1) cause a parking problem by forcing the Sunset residents to park by the beach or in the Richmond neighborhood in order to walk dogs, (2) cause a dog congestion problem due to the large number of dogs who are usually spread out over almost 3 miles of beach being confined to only about 1 mile of beach, and greatly diminish the property values of homes in the Outer Sunset (39th Ave to the Great Highway, Lincoln to Sloat), because the value of our (tiny) houses here is most significantly our location to our great beach.

In closing, please note, we don't even own a dog. We have dogs stay with us frequently when our friends go out of town, and we like dogs, but we are non-dog owners and we feel strongly in favor of needing dog-access here.

Sincerely,  
Cindy Brightly  
1583 47th Ave, San Francisco, CA 94122  
cabrightly@gmail.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 53    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,10,2013 20:01:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** (With apologizes, this is a re-submission, edited for clarity.)

I am writing to urge you not to ban dogs on Ocean Beach in San Francisco, on any portion including the portion between Sloat and the Beach Chalet.

I am a homeowner, living in sight and smell of the beach here. Our beach-park is unlike most in the state in that it is not warm, and it is nearly always windy. Consequently, the value in our beach is rarely to lie in the sun and be still. Our beach is a walking beach. Our best and usual enjoyment of this great natural resource is to walk by the water. Its several-mile length also makes it unusual, in that we can walk for long distances without climbing over mountains or walking on rocks, yet we are on the shoreline. Thousands of residents in the outer-Sunset, such as myself and my husband, bought our property here specifically because of its access to the beach, and its dog friendly policy. Of the neighbors who I see every day walk by my window in the evenings after work, most are heading to the beach with their dogs. The dog walkers outnumber the surfers. Also, the Sunset is a much bigger residential neighborhood than the Richmond (which is north of the Beach Chalet, where dogs will still be allowed). To allow dog walking only north of the Beach Chalet would unfairly burden the Sunset residents, as we would have to drive our dogs in order to walk them on the beach, despite our own homes being right next to the beach.

If you ban dogs on the beach in the Sunset, you will, in short:

- (1) cause a parking problem by forcing the Sunset residents to park by the beach or in the Richmond neighborhood in order to walk dogs,
- (2) cause a dog congestion problem due to the large number of dogs who are usually spread out over almost 3 miles of beach being confined to only about 1 mile of beach, and
- (3) greatly diminish the property values of homes in the Outer Sunset (39th Ave to the Great Highway, Lincoln to Sloat), because the value of our (tiny) houses here is based primarily to our proximity to our great beach.

In closing, please note, we don't even own a dog. We have dogs stay with us frequently when our friends go out of town, and we like dogs, but we are non-dog owners and we feel strongly in favor of needing dog-access here.

Sincerely,  
Cindy Brightly  
1583 47th Ave, San Francisco, CA 94122  
cabrightly@gmail.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	54	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,10,2013 21:09:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS,				

Thank you for the latest draft maps "F" detailing the areas that should be Leashed-Required. I believe these latest drafts, especially for Baker Beach and Chrissy Field will preserve the land and is more than a generous compromise for many dog owners and dog walkers. I live walking distance to Baker Beach and frequent it often with my young children. There's never a visit where I do not see dog feces on the beach. When I started visiting Chrissy Field Beach East with my young children, there were dog incidents in the last 4 of 5 visits I had at that beach. I am very hesitant to return to chrissy Field Beach again with my

children until leash laws are implemented. Unfortunately, my children love Chrissy Field beach because the waves are often not as rough as Baker Beach.

The statistics on dog incidents are grossly underrepresented. I have not formally reported these incidents - but just in the last 2 months, there were 4 dog related incidents at Chrissy Field Beach East involving my children and strongly, negatively impacting our experience and deterring us from future visits.

The first incident involved a woman whose dog defecated 3 feet from my children building sandcastles and another parent's child. When we asked her to pick up her dog feces and that doggy bags were available in the parking lot - the dog owner just shrugged it off and just covered the feces over with sand. The second incident involved a large dog running over my 4 year old son while chasing a ball thrown from a ball launcher. My son was terrified and traumatized - and the dog owner was too busy chatting with others to notice. The 3rd incident involved a dog walker with at least 6 large dogs that surrounded our picnic blanket and my children. My son was already scared and when I tried to protect them and shoo the dogs away, one of the large dogs growled at me and was about to bite me. The dog walker did not proceed to control his dogs. When I told them his dogs should be leashed as there were too many out of control, he angrily said "this is a dog park" and took no responsibility for his dogs' behaviors. His dogs were running everywhere. The 4th incident on another visit involved a large dog that jumped on my son and scratched his legs while he was on our beach blanket. I tried to console my crying son and hold the dog back. The owner apologized after I asked him to "please control your dog."

Map F of the designated lands for leash dog regulation is fair and safe for all visitors. Even your representative survey research shows that an overwhelming majority would prefer dogs to be leashed; even dog owners. When I frequent beaches in France - they do not allow any dogs whatsoever, because dog feces would be everywhere and they have such a problem enforcing dog laws. I think this latest draft is more than generous to dog owners who want to have their dogs unleashed. I was a former dog owner - and though I love dogs; it just is not safe for young children. A large dog can run 15-40 mph chasing after a ball launcher. That's a large impact on a child, scratching them, running over them and hurting them. My children are now afraid of dogs; and they shouldnt be. The sanitation is also a large issue. When you have many dogs, how in the world will you be able to keep track of all the dog feces if your 6-8 dogs are running in every direction.

These beautiful park and beach lands belong to everyone. And everyone should be allowed to experience these lands in a way that creates a positive experience for everyone. America is unique that we treat dogs like people - because we are wealthy and can afford to do so. But lesser income groups - and in many different countries, dogs are dogs, not people. The majority of park and beach lands should not be reserved specifically for their unwarranted and unregulated use.

Thank you for your thorough report. I read a lot of it. I'm a market researcher myself - so surveys and statistics are my profession. Policy has to be made for the benefits of the majority, not the minority.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	55	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,10,2013 21:29:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	For San Francisco I would like to see Alternative C for the Upper Ft Mason, Alternative A for Crissy Field, Alternative A for Baker's Beach, Alternative A for Lands End, Alternative A for Ocean Beach and Alternative A for Fort Funston.				

---

I enjoy walking with my well-behaved, under voice control dog. The exercise at our own paces and the mental freedom of both of us walking without being tethered to each other gives both of us great joy. I am happy that at least in San Francisco, that activity is allowed somewhat. I find the plan for GGNRA lands in San Mateo County despicable. There is so much open space there and all you can find is one tiny square near the back of Montara for off-leash dogs! This is shameful. There is plenty of space for walkers, horseback riders, bikers, flora and fauna and NO SPACE for off-leash dog hiking. I do not go anywhere where I cannot walk with my off leash dog. I think there are many of us who feel that way. If you are trying to keep people out of the parks that is a good way to do it. I rarely see people walking without an off leash dog. You will have some barren parks. Please reconsider this for San Mateo County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 56    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,11,2013 14:20:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** While I would like to see a much stricter dog restriction policy in the GGNRA, I believe the NPS's most recent proposal is thorough and balanced. It should be implemented without change. As much as we as a society love dogs, there are some places they simply do not belong.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 57    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 95122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,11,2013 19:11:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Thank you for a fair and balanced plan. Thank you for your continued efforts to protect the beaches, parks and wildlife from the wear and tear caused by too many dogs. I strongly urge you to stay resolute in the face of such selfish and emotional objections from entitled dog owners.

WILDLIFE HAVE RIGHTS TOO!

Much appreciated, many thanks

D. Boshier 30 year resident of the Sunset

---

**Correspondence ID:** 58    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,11,2013 20:53:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This plan is completely ridiculous. Under no circumstances should dogs be allowed in the ggnra. And especially not off leash. That is just pure crazy.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 59    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,12,2013 14:58:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** People are attracted to walk their dogs here from all parts of the bay area that in turn help boost the city's economy. They don't need to be punished for doing so and it detracts from the city's appeal. Our supervisor's can't think of enough ways to make the city more appealing so why would the park department try and pull a stunt like this? The entire city should be up-in-arms about such a imposition.

The Crissy Field dog group is a well-meaning and reasonably behaved group, however you may not hear from the "not-so-nice" crowd until restrictions are in place and you are scrambling to find resources to control the backlash. No one is going to take any restrictions lightly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 60    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,12,2013 15:20:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Three years ago I would have been totally against tightening the leash laws but now seeing how there are so many dogs on the trails I am in total agreement with the NPS I think owners are overly confident on their voice control abilities or plain do not care that requiring leashes in some of crowded areas is the way to go. It is a good compromise in Marin that Oakwood Trail will require leashes and Oakwood Fire Road will be voice control/leash option. Thank you NPS for getting it right. And I am a three dog guardian.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 61    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,12,2013 16:11:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I visit East Beach at Crissy Field everyday with my dog, Luca. He's a 2 year old Rhodesian Ridgeback, who loves to run on the beach and play with his friends. We've been coming since he was 8 weeks old. It was the perfect place to socialize him and keep him safe before he was fully vaccinated because the majority of the dogs are very well behaved & good natured and the owners/dog walkers are responsible and aware of good dog play and social interactions. The dogs that visit Crissy Field and East Beach are well socialized and behave well around other dogs, adults and children.

He needs a lot of exercise both because of his breed and young age, and East Beach is the perfect place for him. There are always fun dogs to play with and plenty of space to run. I especially love it because of the beautiful setting and proximity to my apartment... we live 5 minutes away. One of my favorite parts of the day is to take Luca to East Beach, and both of us are happier and healthier after our daily visit.

---



I appreciate that the new plans will still provide an off-leash section for dogs, but I worry that it won't be large enough for the amount of dogs that visit the beach at any given time and will cause more problems than it solves. There are many dog walkers and owners both during the week and on the weekends, and a fenced in area wouldn't be sufficient to hold everyone. While we do have off leash areas all over the city, we need them because very few apartments have yards for dogs. And even if we did, dogs who live in cities have a greater need to be socialized so that they interact well with all kinds of people and dogs while they're walking down the street.

I also respect that we need to share the beach with picnicking families and visiting tourists. But during my daily visits over the past two years, I've seen very few bad interactions between those people and dogs. Dog owners and walkers are at East Beach every day, no matter if it's raining, foggy, windy, or on the rare day, sunny. Rarely are there families or tourists on those poorer weather days. We visit and enjoy the beach no matter what the climate.

In terms of keeping the beach clean, I find that dog owners are as responsible as the other visitors. I've found food remains, trash, dirty diapers, and other unmentionable items at the beach left by picnickers and tourists. So I think everyone could be more responsible about cleaning up after themselves and their dogs.

With regard to protecting the wildlife around East Beach, I've seen very few dogs interfere with the birds in the protected areas. But even those interferences could be prevented with better fencing and signage around the protected parts.

Luca and I would be devastated if these plans go through. We really hope that a compromise can be reached that will more fairly consider dog owners and dogs who frequent East Beach.

Thank you!  
Menden

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	62	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,13,2013 09:38:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I moved from Arizona to San Francisco over two years ago with Charlie my King Charles Cavalier. Walking on the beach is our daily activity and I would not give that up for the world. Living here has been a hardship financially but the freedom of the beach walk more than makes up for that. I will not give that freedom up without a fight.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	63	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94124 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,13,2013 10:17:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There is no hope of ever reasoning with dog fanatics. Being part of a dog group is like being in a cult. Please don't drink the koolaid! Don't let them ruin the park for the rest of us. I support alternative F.				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 64    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,13,2013 10:58:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern;

I am writing in regards to the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan, in particular Maps 4-A, 4-B, 4-C, 4-D, 4-E, and 4-F, which all concern the Oakwood Valley / Alta Trail.

I have been walking these trails every day with my golden retriever for the last twelve years. I know the trails well, and the people who walk there, some with dogs, some without.

In twelve years, I have NEVER encountered a problem with a dog, off-leash or on. These include single dogs with owners as well as dog-walking groups, all of whom are well-mannered and respectful of others.

I have encountered numerous problems with cross-country bicyclists; on one occasion being knocked down by a cyclist coming around a blind corner too fast, and on another occasion watching helplessly as a bicycle ran over an aquatic garter snake that my dog had calmly stepped around only moments before. In both cases, I was on a trail that was supposedly off-limits to any sort of bicycles.

Therefore, it surprises me that not one of the possible Dog Plan options is for keeping these trails entirely "Voice Control." It is even more dismal that several of the plans might make certain trails off-limits to dogs altogether. I can only conclude that the writers of these options have not walked these trails as I have, and do not understand that the off-leash dogs on them are not a problem.

In brief, I request that the Alta Trail, the Oakwood Valley Fire Road, and the Oakwood Valley Trail remain "Voice Control" trails, and that the park do more to enforce bicycle rules.

Thanks you very much, Laurel Bunce-Polarek

---

**Correspondence ID:** 65    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,13,2013 11:55:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been walking my dog, Archer, for 10 years in the San Francisco Bay Area. We take 2-4 walks a day and our walk routine includes Lands End trail, Golden Gate Park, Ocean Beach, Ft. Funston, and other common dog areas.

In the last 10 years, I have not witnessed any of the issues related to dogs offending people listed in your report.

Further, your report lists 2,775 dog-related incidents over a 4 year period. This is about 2 incidents per day across the tens of thousands of visitors per day. How does this compare to other incidents for other

---

reasons? How many people fall down or otherwise hurt themselves each day and require park personnel assistance?

There will be people who complain about everything. Taking individual complaints as a representative sample of all the visitors seems more like the staff is looking for a reason to ban/significantly restrict dogs from the GGNRA.

Also, how many quotes do you have from people who have met Archer? We meet dozens of tourists each week on our Lands End and Ocean Beach walks and Archer serves as an ambassador of San Francisco values of friendliness and acceptance. He's always got a tail wag for a new person and this leads to excellent conversations between me and tourists, thus enhancing the overall GGNRA experience.

The discussion of the value of dog socialization is scant in the report. There are assertions that a ROLA rules would allow dog socialization. This is not correct. A key aspect of dog socialization is exposing puppies (dogs not yet under voice control) to a large group of well socialized and well behaved dogs (dogs that respond to voice control). By denying puppies exposure to large and varied groups of well behaved dogs (this happens at Ft. Funston, on Crissy Field, and periodically on Ocean Beach, for example on Saturday morning at 10:30 when there is an organized "small dog" walk), the population of dogs that qualify for ROLA will be reduced and the puppy owners will seek other places to socialize their dogs, and the ultimate result would be a radical reduction of the number of dogs in the GGNRA.

The report and response to comments seems very skewed towards a policy of deprecating dogs in the GGNRA. As a dog owner, I think this is a terrible policy. As a San Francisco resident and parent of elementary school students, I think this is sad as dogs, big and small, are a part of the San Francisco landscape just as "purse dogs" are associated with Paris. Excluding/deprecating dogs from the GGNRA will not serve any valuable social goals, but will remove some of the unique character from the GGNRA and homogenize the GGNRA experience... making it more like Disneyland or Mall of America, than a unique piece of America.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	66	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,14,2013 13:13:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I read that..."The purpose of GGNRA is to offer national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population while preserving and interpreting its outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values."

Effective enforcement of the GGNRA's proposed changes will dramatically reduce utilization of the resources by the urban population.

San Francisco has 340K households and between 110K and 160K dogs. So one-third to one-half of the households have a dog. Many more than have a child. And if members of those households take the trouble to visit one of the locations GGNRA administers, they would prefer to bring their dog. Dogs need exercise every day. The locations regulated by GGNRA represent the primary destinations for recreation in the city. People who have a dog and a normally busy life probably only get one chance a day to experience these locations, often coinciding with the time in the day when they would logically walk their dog. So if they are truly deterred by rangers preventing them from walking their dogs, or restricted to tiny

areas, or to lease only access on paved paths, then they will simply walk their dogs somewhere else and not come to GGNRA lands. There will be more pressure on local parks much less well suited to the purpose.

You are proposing to exclude a significant portion of the urban population you purport to serve from using the resources that make San Francisco an attractive place to live.

Retain large voice-control areas in several of the parks. Most prominently, I recommend keeping Fort Funston the way it is. No one goes there except to walk their dogs. The de facto designation of that space as dog heaven functions as an effective way to handle the demand for a place to let a dog and their owner get what both need.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	67	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,14,2013 14:14:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Want to encourage GGNRA to limit canine access. Dogs don't belong in national parks, even when said parks are in urban areas. I support the areas currently proposed for off-leash and on-leash use. Please don't let the shouting deter you. Keep up the good work of preserving un-built land for hikers, with a little for bikers and bow-wow people, our local version of off-road motorized minorities whose choice of recreational options can so efficiently ruin the park experience for the vast majority of users.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	68	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,14,2013 18:05:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the preferred alternative. I strongly believe that to protect our native species, we need to have only very limited areas where dogs can be off leash. I have witnessed dogs harassing wildlife in GGNRA areas while owners either futilely call after them, or sometimes encourage them, to chase birds and other animals.				

There are more off leash dog parks in San Francisco than several other major cities combined. There are many options for people who want to have their dogs off leash, but there are not many options for the endangered species which we must protect and preserve for future generations.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	69	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,14,2013 21:47:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I support the new preferred alternative.  
I want a dog free experience and I vote! And I pay taxes and deserve a dog free park experience.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 70    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,15,2013 15:30:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am commenting on the dog management plan for Rancho Corral de Tierra, which is in the neighborhood where I live. I strongly support Alternative F and I am thrilled to see that it is NPS's preferred alternative in this park. It allows dog walking on leash but also provides area where hikers can enjoy the property without fear of running into aggressive dogs. Well done!

I very strongly oppose Alternative C. Frankly, I am shocked to see that an "off-leash" dog park is being proposed for the area between Tamarind and Le Conte streets. As noted in the plan, this area is right across the street from an elementary school!!! It would be quite dangerous for small school children to encounter off-leash dogs just across the street from their play ground! As voice control is ineffective for most dogs, there would be a high risk of injury to children. In addition, there are homes along Tamarind Street that would now have an "off-leash" dog park, literally in their front yard!! Again, this seems untenable in terms of potential dog attacks to the people who live on this street. (I live on this street!). Also, it seems highly likely that off-leash dogs would easily run into and damage the yards of these homes and the grounds of the Farallone View Elementary School. Is the NPS going to be responsible for the property damage that will inevitably occur to these homeowners' yards? I support an area in Rancho for off-leash dogs, but certainly NOT across the street from an elementary school and residential homes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 71    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,16,2013 19:30:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed changes to open areas for local dogs to run, socialize and play is TERRIBLE! The GGNRA was given the land at ocean beach many years ago with the intent to keep it as a use area for the inhabitants of this great city. Restricting the area to dogs is in no way allowing us residents to enjoy the beach. I live across from ocean beach and take my dog to walk and run daily. I pay taxes. I am a SF firefighter, so have pledged myself to protecting the life and property of residents of San Francisco. With the proposed changes you are telling me I can not walk my dog in my neighborhood after a long 24 hour shift at work. This open space at the edge of a major city is not comparable to a remote park in the mountains....it must be kept open to the residents of SF to enjoy and use....and that includes our dogs. Last I checked there were more dogs then children in this city! Do not allow these changes to take place.

Thank You. Heather Buren

---

**Correspondence ID:** 72    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Sep,16,2013 20:29:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support the preferred alternative. We desperately need to decrease the areas for off leash dog walking for a number of reasons. Firstly, we must preserve our national parks. Off leash dogs create damage to the area and ruin our parks for everyone else.

Certain dog owners are irrational and need to start taking personal responsibility for their dogs instead of expecting that the rest of the world should provide the ideal and off leash experience for their dog.

Many other dog owners do get it and understand the importance of the changes to dog walking in the GGNRA. Many other dog walkers also support the preferred alternative. I see this as a fair compromise and again fully support the new preferred alternative.

Thanks for helping to ensure that many generations to come can enjoy the wonders of the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 73    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,16,2013 22:58:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 74    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,17,2013 08:13:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please consider approving Plan A for Rancho Corral de Tierra.

When considering all the GGNRA for dog walking options, my suggestion is to provide Loop options for dog walkers.

Spreading out trails users in this fashion will reduce user interactions immensely,

Thanx!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 75    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,17,2013 09:53:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** A review of the proposed plan seems vet anti-dog, blaming canines for everything from soil erosion and bringing in invasive non native species of plants to criminal activity within the GGNRA. This is not correct. I read no evaluation of the damage mountain bike riders do to paths and surrounding areas when they ride off trail. Try walking some on those trails in winter when bike tire ruts

make them almost impassible due to the mud pits they create.

Your own crime statistics show that crimes or offenses committed by dog owners are not the major problem within GGNRA, yet dogs seem to be the main target of Ranger scrutiny. I walk Mori Point trails daily and vandalism to signs and paths is a big problem. So is the consumption of alcohol and the broken bottles that are left by the drinkers.

As for invasive plants, I believe birds and other wildlife are far more likely to be the source of these problems, feeding on plants from surrounding residential gardens.

As for dogs chasing birds and wildlife, I see more children chasing birds on the beach, or poking bugs and snakes with sticks, than dogs chasing wildlife, yet there would never be a plan to ban or restrain children within the GGNRA.

The preferred plan for Mori Point is very unfair to dog owners. Taking away the trails that go to the top of the Point reduces the area available to walk and prevents people walking their dogs from hiking through the GGNRA area to Rockaway Beach area. I walk Bootlegger's Steps daily with my dog and the cardio benefit for both of us is important. I believe Plan A is the best for Mori Point, leaving all areas open to dogs on leash. Plan A is also the most cost efficient and your stated projected cost for the preferred plan should disqualify that plan in an age of budget cuts and sequestration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	76	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,17,2013 10:57:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the proposed dog plan. It is a sound approach to managing increasing park use while protecting fragile ecosystems and ensuring fairness. I encourage NPS to implement the proposed plan and pair implementation with strong enforcement.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	77	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,17,2013 16:52:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I STRONGLY OPPOSE GGNRA's preferred alternative 'D' (banning dogs in Rancho Corral de Tierra). The preferred alternative should be 'E'.				

I hike Rancho Corral de Tierra daily with my dog. I have been walking the trails as long as I have lived in Montara and have never had any dog problems! Most of the people that I see on the trails have dogs themselves and everyone I have met likes dogs.

Why would you propose a plan that would shut out the largest users of the land?

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	78	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,17,2013 20:34:23				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The county should start a program where dogs can pass a special test for voice control, socialization, and manners. For a fee, which would go to the parks, these owners could then get a special license and tag which would allow the dogs to be off leash. Revenue could be generated for the park.

Regarding the maps, I prefer Rancho Coral Plan A, Pedro Point Plan E, Sweeney Ridge Plan A, Milagra Ridge Plan E.

Please don't limit dogs any further

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	79	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94119 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,19,2013 10:03:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

Thank you very much for your continued openness to receiving public comments regarding the Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. I am writing to you in my dual capacities as both a dog guardian and as a resident of the Pedro Point neighborhood in Pacifica whose property is adjacent to the Pedro Point Headlands open space.

I currently walk our dog in the Pedro Point Headlands an average of three to four times per week for 20 to 45 minutes per walk, accessing the Headlands on foot. I therefore strongly support proposed Alternative E for the Pedro Point Headlands. If any other alternative is adopted, I would have to get in my car and drive our dog to another open space area or park in which to walk our dog.

My wife and I also occasionally take our dog to Milagra Ridge and to Sweeney Ridge. We have benefitted greatly from the current on-leash policies at those sites and I therefore support proposed Option A, the status quo, for those two sites. The other proposed alternatives impose restrictions that, given the size and temperament of our dog, would render those locations unsuitable for walking our dog. We would instead have to take her for walks elsewhere, most likely at Pacifica State Beach or Montara State Beach.

Our dog is a 55 LB mixed breed rescue from the shelter who does not get along well with other dogs or people. We have found that we need multiple trail options in order to be able to move our dog to an alternative trail when another dog approaches on the main trail we are using. We have watched other dog walkers with troubled dogs perform this same maneuver, most especially at Milagra Ridge, which, with its expansive vistas and clearly visible trails, supplies an ideal environment for watchful and responsible dog guardians to ensure that their dogs do not get close enough to other dogs or humans to start a fracas. I cannot impress upon you more urgently the need for open space areas with multiple, interconnected trails that permit on-leash dog walking. The number of troubled dogs we have observed being walked in such areas is considerable. These dogs can be walked safely and in ways that do not disrupt the environment, as long as there are multiple, connected trails available, as is the case currently at Milagra Ridge and in the Pedro Point Headlands. My wife has observed that the vast majority of dog walkers at Milagra Ridge have been very careful to keep their dogs on the trails and off the clearly marked protected habitat zones.

I therefore urge you to retain Alternative A for Sweeney and Milagra Ridges and urge you with equally



high enthusiasm to adopt Alternative E for the Pedro Point Headlands.

Thank you again for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Tor Neilands  
P.O. Box 191643  
San Francisco, CA 94105

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	80	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Libertarian Party of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,19,2013 20:22:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I do not own a dog, but I do believe in freedom and individual responsibility.				

Therefore I support rules that do not restrict off-leash dogs, but rather hold \*individual dog owners\* accountable for damage or harm caused by their dogs as a result of owner negligence.

There should be no general ban on dogs, off-leash or otherwise, from any significant portion of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. As the name implies, this is primarily a \*recreation area\*, not a wilderness area. It is in proximity to a large city. It is not realistic to try to maintain this area in some sort of pristine state of nature.

Putting certain small, limited areas off-bounds should be limited to the protection of specific endangered individual plants, or replanting/reforesting/dune restoration type projects of limited duration. Such sensitive environmental areas should have friendly signage designating them as such, along with aesthetically pleasing fencing or other barriers physically marking them off limits for dogs.

GGNRA rules should also provide penalties for overzealous enforcement by park rangers or other government employees who may be tempted to engage in petty power trips when dealing with members of the public. These penalties should be \*heavier\* than any imposed on dog owners for violations of the rules, since government employees are entrusted by the public with special authorities and responsibilities and therefore must be held to higher standards.

When someone files a complaint regarding a particular employee, there should be an investigation into the behavior described in the complaint, and the person who filed the complaint should be informed as to how that investigation was conducted, what penalties were imposed or corrective actions taken if any, and how to further appeal the issue if desired.

Too many individuals in positions of authority think that wearing a uniform or having a shiny badge gives them carte blanche to order people around, take on an arrogant attitude, or refuse to answer legitimate questions. Public servants should act like public \*servants\*, and if they are unable to do their jobs with an appropriately humble and service-oriented attitude, then they should be sent to remedial sensitivity training or removed from their positions.

Complaint procedures should also be clear, simple, and transparent to media and members of the public. Complaint forms should be available on-site, and should also be public. No one should have to rely on

simply taking the word of a government employee when asking questions such as what opinions have been voiced by members of the public with regard to a specific policy <redacted> they should be given free access to view, copy, listen to, etc., the original documents, emails, voicemail messages, etc.

I hereby authorize and request this letter including my contact information to be made available to members of the press and members of the public. In general, government operations, including communications with government agencies and officials, should be subject to transparency and sunshine.

Sincerely,

Starchild  
Outreach Director, Libertarian Party of San Francisco  
(415) 625-FREE

---

**Correspondence ID:** 81    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,20,2013 00:09:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the suggested more restrictive dog rules in park areas in San Francisco. Many areas, for example Crissy Field, are currently dominated by free-roaming dogs, some of which cannot be voice controlled. As someone who is scared of dogs, I find myself avoiding these areas and feel limited in my access to open space. In addition to the problem of off-leash dogs, I am also concerned about the remnants of dog feces, even after owners picking them up. It is impossible to completely clean up after a dog, particularly urine, which leaves off-leash grassland unusable for people (although some people don't seem to mind). The plan seems to reduce these impacts, as well as impacts on wildlife. One remaining concern will be the enforcement of the new rules. Even now with many more off-leash areas available, many dog owners ignore on-leash rules where they exist and I have never observed any enforcement. The plan should include policies and measures to ensure enforcement in restricted areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 82    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,20,2013 09:43:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to urge you to do everything you can to stop the Golden Gate National Recreation Area from implementing its new dog management plan. This plan will cut where people can walk off- and on-leash by 90% compared with where people can walk with dogs now. It is going to create a huge impact on the Bay Area, which we simply cant afford.

I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.

The GGNRA was created in 1972 for the maintenance of needed recreational open space, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. That's why

it's designated as a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. With the new dog management plan, the GGNRA is renegeing on its promises to preserve and protect recreational access to the GGNRA.

There is no credible reason why people with dogs are not allowed to have adequate and reasonable space to walk their dogs in the vast 80,000 acres that comprise the GGNRA. Please take action to stop the GGNRA from imposing this radical plan on the San Francisco Bay Area.

Thank you,

Bill Cole

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	83	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,20,2013 12:10:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am in favor of the proposed new dog management plan.				

If I had my way, Dogs would be prohibited in the entire GGNRA, just like all other National Parks.

The Dog people constantly mention a one percent area they have access to, that is the same one percent that all other user groups use too. The rest of the GGNRA is mostly not accessible.

The dog people and dog groups have failed miserably to self police themselves, and know the GGNRA needs to do it for them, just like any other rule or law that was implemented for the common good of society.

I want to see enforcement of the existing rules/law and enforcement of the New Dog management plan. The Dog owners are irrational and threaten people when called out for there Dogs bad behavior, They let there dogs pee, poop, bite, kill wildlife, dig up native vegetation, steal food from pick nicks, damage personal property, etc.

So much unpicked up poop that some areas are health hazards.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	84	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Brisbane, CA 94005 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,21,2013 09:17:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS,				

I support your Preferred Alternative F.

---

Alternative F will protect the safety and enhance the experience of park visitors.

Thank you for your work on the dog management plan.

Regards,

Steve Rodrigues

---

**Correspondence ID:** 85    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Gilroy, CA 95020  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Fellow Feathers Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Sep,21,2013 11:42:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs lose in our set-up and landing areas is unsafe both for direct danger and distractions that can cause accidents.

Our pilot community has many dog owners with trained well Behaved dogs. It is the people (dog walkers to many dogs) who with careless owners cause our true risk. It is unfortunate If pilots would have to leash their dogs?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 86    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,21,2013 11:56:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ocean Beach is a CITY Park, not an environmental protection zone.

City residents need places for recreation, so to, do their dogs. Many of us have taken on the responsibility of owning, and often rescuing dogs knowing that we have access to open spaces at Ocean Beach and Ft. Funsten for these dogs to run and exercise both on and off leash. Simply removing this access with a stroke of a pen, through your over bearing plan is both unfair to those of us who have taken on the responsibility of these animals, but also unfair to the animals too.

I fail to understand and comprehend any valid justification for your plan which is severely restrictive to dogs and to their owners. There simply is no good reason other than an overall strategy of the Park Service to implement programs which effectively eliminate the enjoyment of parks by the masses, and restrict parks to the use of the environmental elite.

This program is a massive waste of money, with little or no benefit to your main constituents, HUMAN BEINGS.

Please stop this madness.

Dump the plan, focus on removing the graffiti from the sea walls.

Tom Lloyd-Butler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 87    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** easy Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Sep,21,2013 14:52:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** "Dear NPS,

I support your Preferred Alternative F.

Alternative F will protect the safety and enhance the experience of park visitors.

Thank you for your work on the dog management plan.

larry carpenter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 88    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,21,2013 15:07:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave as many areas open to dogs as possible. Responsible dog owners follow the rules and control their animals and need as much room to run them as possible. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 89    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94063  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,21,2013 16:13:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS ,  
thank you for allowing my input concerning this important planning issue for Fort Funston ,  
i support preferred option F as the best compromise for the user groups out at the Fort ,

Sincerely  
Charles Nelson  
redwood city ,ca

yes on F

---

**Correspondence ID:** 90    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Menlo Park, CA 94025  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** CA, USA tax-paying citizen Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Sep,21,2013 23:55:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs are an important part of the family. The National Guard acknowledges this, which is why they implemented a "No Pet Left Behind" policy for their rescue effort in CO. Your proposed dog policies for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area may be appropriate for national parks like Yosemite or Yellowstone but they are inappropriate for a recreational area located within and adjacent to large cities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 91    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco-San Mateo County, CA 94014-1119  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,22,2013 13:19:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sunday Afternoon, September 22, 2013

First I want to oppose any changes to the rules for dogs in the GGNRA, so my choice is description A of the proposed dog management plan. leave everything else the same.

The only thing I would entertain, is the addition of a fee based permit system to off set the costs of Park Maintenance at the different parks that allow dogs to walk off leash.

I would now like to talk about Ft. Funston and Our Experience:

Fort Funston over the years has become a dog walkers paradise. With this in mind if there was not a place like Ft Funston where dogs are under voice control can burn off energy and be a Dog. There is no other area with acres of open land close to San Francisco -San Mateo borders.

Fort Funston has been a dog park, a park for hang gliders and horses and other visitors, This experience for dogs has evolved over the years and these dogs cannot be brought to large parks like San Bruno Mt, or Muir Woods , Angel Island. This is because the experience at these other parks has been defined to leave dogs restricted, to the point, there will be a class with no place to let there dogs run free. The bottom line dogs also need Open Space and deserve a place like Ft Funston since the population density has taken away open space with building growth.

It is a proven fact that dogs that either not given this freedom to run free in an open space become unruly and tear things up in there home out of frustration and eventually owners cannot deal with them and they end up in the Animal Shelters

These Shelters end up killing 90% o the Pets, dogs and cats because they cannot be placed, to new homes. We rescued our dog 2 1/2 years ago.

Our dog Goldie waits every evening for her time at Ft Funston and she has become a more peaceful and serene dog through the daily socialization, she gets by interacting with other dogs, along with the Daily Bonus of an hour or more of fresh air and a brisk walk that my Family Doctor encourages me to do because of my heart condition,

If we had not taken Goldie in when we did, her plight as a Stafford Shire Terrier/American Pit bull at 7 years old estimated by our vet was in question. She would have become another dog being put down because of having no home. and it was then we found the perfect place for Goldie and me to get our daily exercise at Fort Funston.

Thousands of others have their own stories, weather it be from a professional Dog Walker or a private citizens who's love of a park with open space for dogs to run free under voice command.

Their was also concerns over one specie of plant and a cliff dwelling bird in Ft. Funston first the dogs don't go on the cliffs and the park service needs to identify and locate these plants and put a fence to stop dogs from going to the cliffs edge.

In closing I noticed graphs in section G in the New Dog Management Plan and for Fort Funston in 2011 there was a total of 139 incidents where a Park Ranger responded and out of that, there was only 25 percent or 35 dog incidents in the whole year at Fort Funston. This is a really low number of incidents considering there are thousands of dogs that visit this park every day. This is only because most dog walkers police themselves and their Dog.

My last thought is that the GGNRA could issue fee based permits for dogs who visit Ft Funston and other parks that allow dogs.

Thank you, for your attention to this matter that effects so many dogs and their families along with all dog walkers.

Thomas Roop

315 Irvington St.

Daly City CA 94014

415-583-4357

---

**Correspondence ID:** 92    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,22,2013 15:49:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support alternative f.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 93    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,23,2013 17:01:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a long time San Francisco resident, frequent user of the Chrissy field beach areas, and a dog owner ... I strongly urge you to adopt Alternative A for Chrissy Field (allowing voice control off leash access to dogs on the beach sections OTHER THAN the areas where bird / wildlife protection is needed and in force. This is a unique and wonderful place for people and their dogs to recreate.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 94    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,23,2013 20:35:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

I support your Preferred Alternative F.

Alternative F provides the best balance of safety, access, and use for all park visitors.

Thank you for efforts on creating the dog management plan.

Regards,

Christopher Carrillo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 95    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965-1036  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,23,2013 23:52:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having experienced multiple encounters with so-called "professional dog walkers" and their packs of dogs, usually off leash and often not interested in obeying voice commands, count me among those who welcome the prospect of some regulation of these inconsiderate people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 96    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,24,2013 18:27:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I fully support the draft dog management plan. I appreciate the Park Service's efforts to safeguard natural areas and wildlife as well as to balance the needs of various constituencies in order to provide safe and equitable access to areas loved by hikers, walkers, birders, and dog-owners<redacted>the young and old, those who are able-bodied, and those with disabilities. The process has been fair and thorough. The Park Service has been charged with protecting our resources and must do so. Thanks for your vigilance.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 97    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,24,2013 19:28:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The 2013 dog management plan is terrible. Please don't implement it! You basically ignored public comment on the 2011 version. Shame on you. That's how government works - IN EGYPT. This is America and our government is supposed to listen to the people. And here in San Francisco, many people want more off leash dog areas, not less. To summarize, here are the changes you should make:

- MORE off leash dog play areas, because after all there are MORE dogs now than ever and we need a lot more space for them.

- BETTER dog play areas, because as you mention there are conflicts with birds and people so we need better signage, more trash bins for the poop, more bags and bag exchange areas, and a roped-in areas would be nice too (to 'rope out' people who do not want to be bothered by dogs). You definitely want to keep your horses away too - they shouldn't be allowed anywhere near the dog areas! Dogs were hear first of course....

- PROTECT the environment and those poor defenseless endangered birds, by banning the Blue Angels, the Americas Cup, massive construction on Doyle Drive, low flying coast guard helicopters, and all new construction in this 'park' area. Once you have done all of that, the birds will be much better off and you won't have to blame the dogs for all the world's problems.

- HAND OVER the GGNRA to local officials (the board of supervisors, mayor, rec and park) who

---

actually listen to and care about local people. I think it's time for Washington bureaucrats to just leave. You've strayed far from your mandate which was ordained by congress, to promote recreation, not conservation or whatever it is you think you mandate should be. This isn't Yosemite.

- start saving up for the litigation phase of this plan. You will no doubt get sued, class action style, for a variety of reasons by a variety of groups. It's going to be a very long and expensive process for us all. Remember that many dog owners are lawyers who have lots of time to work on pro bono "pet projects" like this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 98    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Ross, CA 94957  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,24,2013 21:14:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't let a vocal special interest group determine the future of this lovely and sensitive national treasure. I don't enjoy visiting this park's open space very much - - and don't do so - - as I feel like I am going to a dog park, not a 'people' park. From dealing with dog feces and urine all over the field (ugh - who would want to sit down there?) to being approached by off-leash animals or almost sliced in half by folks' so-called long 'leashes,' neither I nor my children come here any more.

Sadly, asking folks to keep their dog on a leash, even when told by frequent signage that it is to protect wildlife or the watershed appears to have NO impact, whether it is here, at Ocean Beach, in Golden Gate Park, or at any of the Marin Municipal Watershed areas. So I'd like to see one or two areas that are clearly 'dog parks,' since clearly we won't be able to NOT provide that, and have most of the rest of the areas be DOG-free and people/children-friendly. This park is a treasure not just for SF area residents, but also for our human visitors and animal denizens.

I'd also like to see ALOT more ticketing and enforcement of dog-related violations at ALL of our parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 99    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,24,2013 21:40:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I wish there were more restrictions for dogs, but please at least implement this. It infuriates me how dog owners, even if it's only a few, are irresponsible and continue to allow their dogs to run all over without having any control. Every time I go to crissy field, there is at least one dog who's owner has decided that it's cute to allow his dog to run and splash and then run over our blanket. This is a dense part of the city and shouldn't be controlled by a few vocal dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 100    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,24,2013 22:00:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner living in San Francisco. I disagree with an am saddened by the restrictions and loss of on leash an off leash dog walking opportunities in this new proposal. I have seen little or no evidence in the proposal or underlying documentation noting conflicts or problems with off leash dogs and other users of the park.

Encourage responsible dog owners to use and enjoy the park. Do not take these drastic measures to limit our on our dogs' ability to continue on and off leash activities in the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 101 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,24,2013 22:20:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the National Park Service in restricting several new spots in Golden Gate Park to dog use. Our precious common parks are not home to just wealthy dog walkers, but to quiet citizens who do not wish to be bothered by annoying and potentially dangerous dogs (or their owners); not to mention the many other living organisms that make up that ecosystem and without which no one would want to visit GGP in the first place. Domesticated invasive animals pose a threat to the natural atmosphere, and the flora and fauna that have been manicured and have naturally sprung up out of Golden Gate Park since its inception. It is a common area, that should be reserved for many activities, but not all activities everywhere. Such indiscriminate use would foul the park and degrade its experience for users, let alone the land. I urge the National Park Service to go ahead with restricting dogs from being off-leash in designated areas, and to disallow dogs altogether in ecologically sensitive territories.

Thank you,

Hale

---

**Correspondence ID:** 102 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,24,2013 22:48:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First, I have to children who have lived in the city since they were born. I have at least 20 times had run ins with dog owners who think their little dog that is yapping/snarling at my kids, and is off leach is just precious. If my toddler would just calm down all would be alright. Luckily, I have not hit any of them, but it has been close. If my kid gets bit, someone will get sued.

I also run in the Presidio, and am constantly tangling with dogs. Off leash they are a menace, and on leash they obstruct the trails.

Given these perspective, and wanting to be able to use a national park as it is intended (not as an open bathroom for people's domestic animals):

(1) I object to all maps in 9 series except 9A and 9B, these are the only open free range spaces for children to play in the area, covering them with dog shit, is not a good idea. The areas, if opened to off leash dogs will become unusable by others.

(2) I find it hard to believe that the park service would even consider allowing free ranging dogs off lease on the Promenade and bike path in map 10A do you want to get sued? Have you considered the liability? Free ranging dogs will be attracted like flies to shit to the bikers and runners on both. Both will become unsafe for anyone other than dogs. These are major paths, that Dogs would be allowed on them, or near then is beyond crazy. Someone will get killed, there will be a major lawsuit, and the park service will pay dearly if dogs are let anywhere near either of these heavily used paths.

(3) similarly, there is no way with 10C-F that the dogs will not invade the promenade and bike path. They will be unusable for people who are not dog fanatics. If there is one area that dogs should not be allowed at all, its the maps in the ten series.

(4) map 12A and 12E are crazy. Is the goal to cover the beach with dog shit? No way dogs stay off the beach.

(5) I run regularly on 13A, letting this area be off leash will allow kids, hikers, and runner to be injured. Want to be sued? The trail is very narrow, and all but 13D allow dogs on much used, heavily impacted and fragile trails used by runners. And that is too much. Dogs should actually be kept off the entire lands end trail other than from the parking lot to the stairs, where the trail is wider.

(6) 15A, C-F are you really going to let dogs crap all over Ocean beach?

(7) 16A, E,F you are being very very bad stewards of the land to let dogs destroy Fort Funston.

I have no idea why this much dog use is being proposed, but not my objection to even as much use as these maps suggest in highly impacted areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	103	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Half Moon Bay, CO 94019 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Exweb Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,24,2013 22:49:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am highly opposed to the new proposal. It's an unconstitutional way of interfere with our freedom to use our public land. The vast majority of people we meet walking our dog in the Golden Gate park smile and appreciate to have animals close by.				

National Park service lack an understanding on how to live with nature.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	104	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Palo Alto, CA 94301 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,24,2013 22:51:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe the with the exception of option A, the options for Fort Funston are far too restrictive. Fort Funston is a very unique place, which, because of its relative isolation from other parts of the city, allows dog owners a destination which is both safe for dogs, and less traveled by other park				

---

users.

It's an incredibly unique place which, as a dog owner I appreciate (as there is no place like it anywhere else in the Bay Area) and that I have heard from non-dog owners that they appreciate for the same reason. I strongly support option A, which preserves the gem that is Fort Funston.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 105    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,24,2013 23:06:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After having an off-leash dog, chasing a frisbee, crash into me on the Crissy field beach, knocking me down and leaving my leg bloodied (and permanently scarred four years later) from impact with its teeth, with never even an apology from the frisbee-throwing owner, I strongly believe that off-leash dogs need to be severely limited on, or better yet completely barred from, the beaches in the GGNRA.

Separately, after having a roving, out of control, off-leash dog urinate on a sand castle my young child was building at the Crissy Field beach while she was building it, I also feel it very important to what are often obviously poorly trained or untrained dogs on-leash on the beach and well away from children; that is, if dogs are allowed at all.

The appropriate solution is to have permitted off-leash dog runs somewhere in the GGNRA well separated from other visitors and especially from small children.

I am withholding my name and address (Union Street near Broderick in San Francisco) due to privacy concerns. Thanks very much.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 106    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,24,2013 23:45:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to oppose the restrictions placed on off leash dog walking in the draft dog management plan for GGNRA. The revised plan still provides too few areas for off leash dog walking at Fort Funston and Chrissy Field. Both of these areas have been off leash areas for dogs to enjoy with their human companions for years and are a vital part of public access to GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 107    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,24,2013 23:49:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** If you read the public comments to the 2011 plan, you will see that the majority of comments were opposed to any further restrictions on dogs. The new draft under consideration now in 2013 must incorporate that earlier public input. That's how the process works, you know, democracy, due process, responsive government. The lip service of just taking comments is not sufficient; you have to actually incorporate the comments into the subsequent revision. Otherwise, the dog-owning lawyers will come forward armed with the claim that public input was not appropriately considered. They are already taking notes, planning strategy, and drafting letters. The entire 2013 draft and any subsequent rules will be thrown out in court, and we will have to start this entire process over all together. Actually, I think that already played out once before about 5 years ago when the park rangers started suddenly giving out tickets for off-leash dogs without taking any public comment. A federal judge threw out the tickets and the entire new policy due to lack of public input, and that is what started the whole process of creating these draft plans. It seems that we are going to repeat that all over again.

So the best option today is to retract the 2013 draft, then review the comments to the 2011 plan, and come up with a new and better draft which fully incorporates public comments. Based on the 2011 public comments, it seems that dogs will need to have the same if not more space allowed off-leash, and other people who do not want to be around dogs deserve to have signs to tell them where those areas already exist which ban dogs (the vast majority of the GGNRA and the Bay Area).

In the mean time, the park service can take other actions to improve safety and environmental conservation in the GGNRA, like enforcing existing rules against fireworks and bon fires, litter, people in the protected sand dunes, removing rangers' motorcycles and horses which are incompatible with the environment, and slowing down the commercialization with all the new museums, cafes, restaurants, and roads being build now in the GGNRA - how to the little birds feel about all that?

Really at this point I should point out that the Park Service has failed to effectively administer a public comment process. It's not that complicated. But it has taken them many years to get this far, only to get thrown back to square one. Probably they are just doing all of this to keep busy and protect their budget, in this era of federal budget cuts. Either way, it is just a great example of government waste.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	108	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94705 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,24,2013 23:58:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear friends at the NPS, Many years ago, I used to go regularly to Rodeo Beach. It was my favorite place of relaxation and recreation.				

At a certain point the number of dogs present increased dramatically. On one occasion, I arrived in the area near the cliffs on the southern end of the main section of beach, to find that the entire beach smelled like dog feces, something I had never noticed prior to this. I lay down where I usually did to relax in the sun. About 10 minutes later a large brown dog came running at high speed directly into me. One of the dogs sharp nails went into my leg, causing a wound which bled for minutes. The owner of the dog was a young man nearby who saw what happened and was very apologetic. In retrospect it made no difference whether the owner was nice or not - the over enthusiasm of a dog of this sort cannot be controlled. The bad smell and injury caused me to leave. I went to the ranger's office and spoke with a ranger, complaining that dogs were ruining the beach and that I had been injured. He said large numbers of dog owners brought their dogs there because it was one of the few beaches where they were allowed to do so,

and he suggested I send a comment to the managers.

I have never returned to Rodeo Beach, and as long as dogs are allowed there with their attendant dangers and stink, I will not return. I have recommended to others that they not go there - the place smells polluted with feces and the dogs are dangerous. THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM in these negotiations is that EVERYBODY, including dog owners, knows there is no way to have an arrangement of any type which is safe and sanitary for human visitors, as long as dogs and humans are allowed to be in the same place at the same time.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	109	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Half Moon Bay, CA 94019 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Pythom Inc Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,25,2013 00:28:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Studies have shown that owning a dog can add 5-7 years to human lifespan. In our sedentary and obese society dog ownership must be strongly encouraged and enabled. Faithful companions to humans dogs have animal rights. Confining them to short walks on tight leashes, in crowded dog parks or crammed backyards is un-natural, stressful, dangerous and cruel.

Every beach, every trail, every campground are increasingly shut down to us and our best friends. A dad with two children trying to walk their black lab outside a no-dogs campground in the middle of a forest were forced onto a busy country road and almost run over by trucks passing them by. Wanting to take a walk in the sunset with my dog who had just had been diagnosed with a tumor just yesterday I drove pass miles after miles of empty beaches where not a soul could be found but the two of us were not allowed.

We demand open space to exist and run. Wilderness and nature belong to all humans and animals. Dog-fearing park officials are not suitable for their job and should be removed.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	110	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	None Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,25,2013 09:10:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I did not bother reading the document. I have been following the issue in the newspapers for years.

Since I have lived in the 94121 zip code since 1987, I have spent enough time at all the high traffic areas along the waterfronts where the public with dogs and the public without dogs interact.

I have seen good dog owners and bad dog owners. By and large what I have seen is that most owners do not keep their dogs on a leash. When no one else is around that is not a big deal. However, dog owners do not keep vigilant and when the numbers of people start to go up, they do not call their dog to them and leash them up.

I have seen senior citizens who have had dogs intimidate them and jump on them. It is not the dogs fault. What I have to ask, and you should as well, if what happens if a elderly citizen is knocked down by a dog? A broken hip on an 75 year old can be a death sentence to that individual. Is a shortened life an

acceptable exchange for allowing dog owners to continue with their behavior of not keeping a dog on a fixed leash?

I would like to see more areas allowed for people to walk their dogs, not doubt more areas than what you have proposed. But, only with a very strong enforcement to go along with it. I suspect that the shrinking areas you are proposing has to do with the real world costs and problems of enforcement.

In the end, if you do not have the person power to properly enforce whatever you do, then shrink the areas to match the person power you have to vigorously enforce your rules.

JD.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	111	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,25,2013 11:03:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express strong support for your proposed rules, particularly those within the city of San Francisco. These public spaces are for the enjoyment and use by all citizens and not just those who own dogs. I want to iterate that I strongly believe that off leash areas need to be provided at all locations and as a resident of SF, I notice that large areas will be dedicated at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field for this use. Most of my dog owning friends seem to think that this is a very reasonable compromise and good balance of these shared resources.

A few key facts to keep in mind as there seems to be a lot of misinformation coming from certain dog lobbies.

1. Off leash dogs would NOT be banned from Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, or Fort Funston. In all locations, large areas are being dedicated to off leash dogs. The rules address the current situation where off leash dogs are everywhere and enforcement has been hampered by a court injunction.
2. There is a claim that only 1% o the current GGNRA is available for off leash dog walking. Please keep in mind that the vast majority of the area in the GGNRA is off trail in the Marin Headlands and not available to anyone. In almost 100% o the areas available to people in the SF portion of the GGNRA, there are currently off leash dogs.
3. If you read through the comments of the previous EIR, you will notice a lot of different viewpoints. Though the dog lobby often yells the loudest, there are others that want to use and enjoy these resources as well. They have made very logical and compelling arguments for some sort of balance between different users.
4. People who support these rules are not dog haters. I often enjoy the company and energy of dogs but not all the time. Dedicating locations for off leash, on leash, and dog free zones gives us the opportunity to experience the park on our terms and not the terms of just one group of people. Again, I reiterate, you need to provide off leash areas for these folks.

I hope that this long sordid story is coming to a close, the 1979 Pet Policy was conceived at a very different time where the intensity of use by these spaces was a lot less. Times changes and we all now



share these spaces. In particular, the East Beach of Crissy Field is social gathering space for many of us. If there were one or two dogs on the beach like 1979, then maybe these rules wouldn't be necessary but there are often 40-50 dogs on that beach making the use of that beach by non-dog owners marginal at best. Even when there are no dogs, the smell of urine is simply overwhelming. Asking dog owners to walk 2 minutes from the parking lot to the proposed off leash area to the west of the lagoon outlet hardly seems onerous to me.

Thank you for all your hard work on this very sensitive subject.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	112	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	BERKELEY, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,25,2013 11:27:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing in favor of stronger rules requiring that dogs be kept on leash and stricter enforcement of those rules.				

The draft rules have a concept called "voice control" which, in my experience, is a wishful fantasy.

At Ocean Beach, I have been bitten by a dog running off leash. It approached me aggressively while I was jogging. I asked the owner, who was nearby, to get it under control, at which point it leapt at me and bit my arm. I still have a scar. The owner expressed zero regret and took zero responsibility.

At Muir Beach, when I go there seeking peace and quiet, on a blanket off to one side, a steady parade of off-leash dogs bounds up, with no respect for the boundary of a blanket, sticking its snout in my face and/or food. Owners sometimes say "no" and the dogs sometimes respond, but there's another dog behaving like this every 5-10 minutes on weekends, making peaceful enjoyment of the beach impossible.

An owner calling a dog off after the fact does not constitute voice control, any more than saying "sorry" after a car accident constitutes safe driving. Voice control, as presently practiced by too many dog owners in SF, is a sham.

I want dogs to be required to be kept on leash throughout the GGNRA.

Thank you.

know most comments will favor less rules and less

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	113	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,25,2013 13:56:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** My wife and I have been walking and hiking in the GGNRA for many years and now walk fearfully each time. It's such a shame and really outrageous that we have to be on constant guard for uncontrolled dogs and their defiant and disrespectful owners. We now make sure to have heavy sticks to protect ourselves (in one case we had to protect ourselves from both the dog AND the owner!). We support the plan insofar as it designates specific areas for dogs (fenced areas would be best), a strong leash rule, that dogs must be "under control" and that there actually will be enforcement.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	114	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94705 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,25,2013 15:52:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern,				

I am writing to urge you maintain the off-leash dog status in areas of GGNRA where dogs are currently allowed. I understand and agree that balance is important in these public areas- for people and for wildlife. I am myself a wildlife biologist and believe that the protection of sensitive habitat and wildlife should be primary. That said, there should be areas where people and their pets can recreate as well. Most public places are off limits to dogs, so these few places in the GGNRA are super special to us.

I am sure you understand that for many people, their pets are their family, and for us, that is certainly the case. Enjoying our beautiful Bay Area, outdoors with our dog, is our favorite thing to do. Crissy Field, and Baker Beach are our absolute favorite places to be, and we make the trip over the bridge early in the morning to enjoy the beauty and freedom that being there provides. It is truly our favorite thing about living here.

Please consider us when you make a decision on the future of GGNRA dog regulations.

Sincerely,  
Sarah Flaherty

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	115	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,25,2013 19:18:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** PLEASE DO NOT RESTRICT OFF LEASH AREAS!!!!!! i walk my dog everyday and have rarely seen any issues with off leash dogs. In fact, the only issues I have seen are with leashed dogs trying to go after each other! When dogs are under voice control, they all get along! Having people walk or run with their dogs off leash in the parks is a great thing for San Francisco. It keeps our parks safe because there are people there and less crime. One of the best things about San Francisco is being able to have dogs and owners enjoying the same parks and having dogs off leash does not infringe on anyones right to enjoy the parks!!!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	116	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,25,2013 19:20:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE DO NOT RESTRICT OFF LEASH AREAS!!!!!! i run with my dog everyday and have rarely seen any issues with off leash dogs. In fact, the only issues I have seen are with leashed dogs trying to go after each other. The parks are for EVERYONE to enjoy and requiring dogs to be leashed means the i cannot enjoy the parks! That is NOT fair!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 117    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,25,2013 19:30:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am totally AGAINST restricting off leash areas in the Parks!!! The tradition in San Francisco having off leash dogs is a long and valued tradition! For years owners and dogs have been enjoying the parks together- please dont change that!! I do not even have a dog but I enjoy being in the parks with many owners and seeing the dogs have fun. If you restrict off leash, those dog owners will just walk on the street and the parks will be deserted!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 118    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,25,2013 21:41:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've been through the San Francisco proposals and generally I'm most interested in restricting off leash dog walking at Chrissy Field and Ocean Beach. Whatever the current regulations are, dogs are off leash ALL over these areas currently, even where they are clear signs. Many owners either do not control their dogs to keep them away from people who don't want dogs jumping on them, dumping sand on them or grabbing their beach toys or are simply not paying attention. I'm in favor of very clear areas that are limited in such a way that people wanting to enjoy the coast without unleashed dogs have an easier time of it.

The other place I would wish to visit more is Fort Funston but unless off leash walking is limited there, I will avoid it. Its overrun by professional walkers caring for groups of dogs. The natural landscape is a mess and its intimating to go for my family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 119    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,25,2013 22:32:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** For the sake of birds, other wildlife, vegetation, and all those people who enjoy the beauty of the park in as natural a condition as possible, my family strongly supports the most dog-restrictive of the proposed alternatives. The San Francisco dog epidemic has already greatly diminished the presence of the shorebirds we have loved over the decades at Baker Beach, along Crissy Field, and in other parts of the park. Please strengthen protections within the park from the unnatural and entirely unwelcome disturbances of dogs, particularly those off-leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 120    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,26,2013 02:23:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Walking through the trees by Lobos Creek you will find an enormous amount of used dog waste bags left behind, on the ground in the runoff areas for Lobos Creek. 80% of the water that the residents of the Presidio Park comes from Lobos Creek. Many of these residents have small children. Even if these people's rent didn't fund a lot of the maintenance on the park, it is unethical and violates clean water laws to contaminate drinking water with dog feces. Many dog walkers - walking several dogs at a time - walk through the park and near Lobos Creek runoff areas. All medications and flea control that these animals receive are leaching into the water when people let the dogs use the area as a personal toilet. If people can't be respectful and behave ethically, then they should receive a fine and injunction, barring them from the park. Due to the difficulty of having park rangers be in all places at all times, the ultimate solution is to ban dogs from the park all together.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 121    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,26,2013 09:19:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I fully support the measures outlined in this document.

The heavy use of the GGNRA means that even a small proportion of dog walkers behaving irresponsibly (or simply having unavoidable accidents) will result in harm to the environment - no matter how responsible the majority of dog walkers are (or claim to be).

We all come at this issue as animal lovers. However, domestic animals have the advantages of readily available food and shelter that wild animals do not. If we respect all animals, we need to protect wild animals even if it is inconvenient to dog owners. This is NOT a civil liberties issue - no-one has a right to destroy ecosystems whether using a bulldozer or walking their dog. This is NOT an issue that can be resolved by increased personal responsibility. A system based on personal responsibility has resulted in the state of affairs we see currently - endangered animals harassed, fragile ecosystems endangered. Personal responsibility is not enough to protect our wild resources.

There is simply no way we can protect wild animals and ecosystems without requiring dog owners to be fully responsible for their animals. I support the GGNRA plan, and I FULLY SUPPORT INCREASED ENFORCEMENT OF ON-LEASH LAWS. I wish this plan went further and I wish you success in implementing it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 122    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,26,2013 13:53:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not support the plan to allow dogs off leash in any public area. The idea of dogs being under "voice control" is an illusion. Dogs cannot always be controlled by their owners at all times. Any dog that is seemingly under control can easily get out of control when another dog is near. Small children are also at risk from unleashed dogs. Even birds and squirrels tend to excite the unleashed dog.

I know that most pet owners believe that their dog is different, and that their dog would never get out of control. But reasonable people know that is not true. Voice control is not an acceptable alternative to leashing dogs in public areas. In my opinion, it is simply too dangerous to let dogs run free where young children are playing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 123    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,26,2013 16:13:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

I am very saddened to hear that you are considering restricting dog access within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I am a responsible dog owner that enjoys spending my weekends enjoying the beautiful parks and beaches that are dog-friendly in Marin County. I moved here from Seattle, WA, with one of the big factors in my decision being how dog-friendly the San Francisco Area would be for me and my Golden Retriever.

I respectfully request that you consider NOT restricting the current dog usage policies in the Bay Area/GGNRA. It will have a serious impact on my life of me and my dog.

Thank you,  
Elizabeth Loy  
Mill Valley, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 124    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,26,2013 21:59:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a former dog owner (RIP Rafter) I support the creation of a dedicated off-leash dog area at Crissy Field. The current situation with dogs at Crissy Field East Beach is a little too much of a good thing. Only the proverbial one in a hundred dogs/dog-owners is a problem, but we see more than a

---

hundred dogs every day.

The incidents have been rare, but over the years I've experienced off-leash dogs acting aggressively towards me, seen one snarl and chase a jogger into a bench, and observed another dog owner have to fend off unwanted attention towards his leashed dog. Creating some separation is a sensible, well thought out move. It will also be nice to enjoy the beach without having to scan for poo-bombs.

PS. I have not observed any problems with the professional dog walkers. In my experience the problems are caused by individual owners or non-alpha (from the dog's point of view) family members who do not understand that taking one's dog off-leash can make the dog more assertive, thinking that it is now in an alpha role.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	125	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123-5407 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	1550 Bay St Tenants Association Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,26,2013 22:13:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As an individual, & per our tenant membership @Marina Cove Apts, we agree, accept & support the Dog Management Plan, with huge thanks for Everyone's efforts.				

Our 240-unit apt bldg. no longer allows pets, but we do different things to get our "pet fix." Several of us dog sit; a few do volunteer work at SPCA & shelters, etc.

However, we have close proximity to Moscone Park, Ft. Mason, Marina Green, Crissy Field & beyond, so we observe a lot. We know that dog owners don't do what they claim. Your Plan is very inclusive, but we haven't commented before:

1. Dog owners don't ways pick up their dogs' poop, or they do if someone is watching, then toss the baggie somewhere. Is there any way to gauge how many gallons of urine is left in our parks? And am I sitting in it?
2. Dogs considered to be on "voice command" are not. They are not "obedience trained;" the dog responds if it feels like it.
3. Dog owners think that everyone likes/loves their pets sniffing, yapping, barking, drooling, etc, etc, but we don't. It's true that we shouldn't approach dogs with the assumption that they like strangers, but owners shouldn't encourage this. I've been almost knocked over & I've seen little kids on their backs before owner did anything.
4. Dog owners have an organized lobby & clubs, which the rest of us do not. We resent dog owners feeling of entitlement. When I was growing up, you kept your dog in your fenced yard. I commiserate with owners not having backyards in San Francisco, but it doesn't mean that all other open space is their domain.
5. As neighbors of the Crissy Field area & lagoon, we have watched what has been accomplished. As a "city girl," I've seen birds & fauna I've never seen before!
6. It was astounding to me to hear that there are more dogs than children in SF. Pets are wonderful companions & all that. But when there are SO many, they must be contained, especially aggressive breeds.

I appreciate your consideration of our comments & we hope that you don't back down on any of your provisions. Flora, fauna & people need to come before dogs!

Very, very truly yours, Jan Bulechek for 1550 Bay St. Tenant's Assn.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 126    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,27,2013 03:33:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This plan allows for too many areas for dogs. Dogs should be banned from the GGNRA. Dogs are destructive. There are too many dogs in the city which is a place that is not suitable for dogs. In part dogs are kept in tiny apartments because dog owners use the open space in the GGNRA as an excuse to this. They rationalize to themselves that walking their dog for 1 hour a day and the rest of the time keeping the dog in a tiny apartment is fair and healthy for their dog. It is not. Dogs are not meant to be in cities especially big dogs. By allowing dogs in the GGNRA you are supporting cruelty to animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 127    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-3144  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,27,2013 08:07:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA is unique in that it is an urban park, therefore it is subject to somewhat different use and demands than most other federally governed parks. This reality is reinforced by the fact that this land was donated by the city and people of San Francisco. I advocate for the more permissive dog rules that allow space for our city's dogs to run freely in most areas. I agree that all dogs should be under voice control. San Francisco is a dog friendly city and our parks system needs to reflect that reality. I am legally disabled and have a service dog that only gets limited exercise due to my disability. In the interest of humanity and kindness to animals, I need places, like Fort Funston, where I can let my dog run a bit. If the GGNRA insists on rigidly adhering to the regulations of rural federal parks, I suggest that these lands be re-gifted back to the city to which they and belong.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 128    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,27,2013 15:41:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a frequent jogger and hiker (3 times/week) at the sites I will comment on. In summary, I have experienced that only about 1/2 of the off-leash dogs I encounter are truly under voice control. Dogs often run after me and occasionally bite me. I am often forced to stop running and ask the owner to get the dog under control. Often they cannot.

These are my preferred preferred alternative plans for the sites I frequent:

Muir Beach: D

Rodeo Beach: D

---

Marin Headlands: D  
Fort Baker: D  
Crissy Field: D  
Lands End: D  
Ocean Beach (all): D  
Fort Funston (all): D

---

**Correspondence ID:** 129    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94609  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,27,2013 17:19:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose removing the few places dog owners have left in this densely populated urban area where we can exercise and socialize our dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 130    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,27,2013 17:49:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am strongly in favor of immediately and permanently banning all dogs. The reasons are exactly the same as banning all baby strollers so you can just substitute "dog" wherever you see "baby stroller" below:

- sometimes baby strollers charge at me and I'm not sure if they are going to attack. Oh sure their owners SAY theirs is a "friendly" stroller and it won't hurt me, but I don't know that! I'm scared!

- there are "conflicts" between visitors and baby strollers.

- the environment is degraded by baby strollers. Anything to protect the environment! Shame on the baby strollers. They're so selfish.

- studies have shown that baby strollers scare away birds. I don't have any of those studies. You just have to trust me. You can't argue with the studies if you don't have the studies yourself. And since nobody has the studies, case closed.

- once a police horse got spooked by a baby stroller. It must have been the stroller's fault, since horses are never skittish or unpredictable.

- there are enough other places where baby strollers are allowed. Do they have to be everywhere?

- my child is fearful of baby strollers. He's a woos but that's not the point.

- once I was injured by a baby stroller and now I am scared of ALL of them. I'm a woos too so the federal government should protect me. I pay taxes so the government should do anything for me me me! It's all about me, the tax payer.



- people with baby strollers think they own the place. Um, actually they do since it's taxpayer funded. But my point is they just ACT funny and I don't like that. The federal government should change the way they act, by banning baby strollers.

- while many people with baby strollers are responsible, some are not and they leave dirty diapers all over the place. It's so gross. Feces. See, isn't that gross? Feces. Ooo. Feces feces feces. If we just use the word "feces" enough it will get people to act. Feces.

- there are more visitors and baby strollers every year. So obviously the only way to manage this is to ban baby strollers. There's not other possible solution so let's not even consider alternatives.

- this is a recreation area (the "R" in GGNRA). But since it is managed by the National Park Service let's just gradually start to call it a "park" when nobody is paying attention. Then it makes perfect sense to ban baby strollers. Because after all, that's the only way to run a park. Do you see how logic and word games work?

- we've had plenty of draft policies and public comment on this issue. It doesn't matter what the comments are, just that there were comments of some sort. See? We followed a process! Now it's ok to implement the original plan without any changes.

- people have been using baby strollers in the GGNRA since 1979 or even earlier than that. There were votes and all that complicated democracy stuff back then. But nowadays the federal government just decides what is right. It's much faster. They do it in China and Egypt that way and things move much faster there. It's more efficient.

Please understand that I am not against all baby strollers, and certainly I'm not against babies. Most of them are very responsible. It's only the bad strollers which we must restrict, and since we don't know who is bad, or who might BECOME bad, let's just ban them all to be safe. At the very least we should limit the places and times when they are allowed, and they should all be leashed to their owners so that don't get away and scare someone. They should be licensed and pay fees. And wear arm bands with symbols that we can see from a distance to be sure they are following the rules. It's only fair.

And just forget about professional baby strollers - there's just no room for commercial activity in the GGNRA. Unless we're talking about cafes, restaurants, museums, office complexes, yacht races, blue angels, road construction, fitness centers, or bowling lanes. Then it's ok.

Actually I have a baby stroller myself. So it's all ok. You see, I'm not an anti-strollite. I only use my stroller on busy city streets where it is safer. It understands. And whenever I use it, it is chained to my wrist and the brakes are on so that nobody will get hurt or scared or offended. We are all better off this way. Especially the stroller.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	131	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Kenfield, CA 94904 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,27,2013 18:18:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I use many offleash areas in San Francisco particularly Chrissy Field . It is one of the great things about living with a dog in the Bay Area. I' am opposed to any change in policy regarding the current off leash areas. Most dog owners I encounter are responsible about their dogs. Let us remain that way in peace!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 132 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,27,2013 23:39:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My dog Mocha loves the presidio including Crissy field, inspiration POINT AND BAKER BEach. They are all part of what makes SF the best city on earth and unique relative to non dog friendly cities like NYC, Philly, Chicago, etc. Please Dont take this away from Us and turn SF into another soulless and lame east coast city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 133 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,28,2013 10:17:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having these outdoor areas for my dog to run freely is very important and part of what makes the bay area great! Please don't change anything.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 134 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Sep,28,2013 15:23:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our family is so disappointed with your plan. We have trusted you with our land and you responded by taking away much of its primary use - for families with dogs. Putting dogs together in enclosed spaces often triggers fighting that one never sees in off leash areas such as fort funston. With so many challenges for families living in the bay area from cost to poor public schools why on earth would you take away one of the attractions of living here. Surely you can protect breeding areas and such by making those off limit. Instead you are proposing that we don't enjoy nature hikes with our dogs a total loss for our family and a reason to consider leaving this city. So disappointing that you so ignored the biggest voice of response. I suppose we can look forward to beig tazored on the trails when we walk there anyway.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 135 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** not available, NJ 08822  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** american ciizen Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Sep,28,2013 16:34:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** i approve of dogs being leashed in most of park. they can still enjoy it even though leashed. i also thought it ironic that audubon is saying dogs bother wildlfie, when in nj audubon is working with hunters to kill wildlife. irony? lying? you bet!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 136    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,30,2013 15:40:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It occurs to me that this proposal is one-sided.

Currently there are areas designated where dogs may run off-leash, which are encroached upon by persons who are anti-dog.

Out of the thousands of miles of coastal areas available, "visitors" seem to need to use the very few areas where dog-owners can exercise their companions, then complain about it.

Perhaps it would help to put up signage to indicate an area is open to off-leash dogs so folks would at least know what to expect: dogs, running, jumping, playing, wet, and muddy who will shake-off water when they come out of the ocean and you might get splashed with some drops. Not unlike little children who play out on the beach and throw water and sand.

It is shameful to punish average citizens who want to enjoy even a small part of seashore for the benefit of persons who have miles and miles of areas to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 137    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Lafayette, CA 94549  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,30,2013 18:21:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to voice my frustration at the proposed new restrictions. I believe the NPS is simply going through the motions of soliciting public comment on dog policy. It is quite apparent that you intend nothing short of radically changing the areas where dogs are allowed off leash.

My personal concern is Ocean Beach, where I've been walking my dog off leash since 1980. People have been letting their dogs run on this beach since the Gold Rush. Let's examine the things you have ignored in trying to implement a more restrictive policy:

- Your own studies indicate an inverse relationship between off-leash dogs and protection of the snowy plover (the lowest populations were when dogs were completely banned, the highest when dogs were completely off leash)
- Initial public comment ran 3 to 1 in favor of leaving the policy alone
- Policing new policies will cost \$2.5 million dollars a year, a sum that seems a bit stupid given the budget issues and the fact that this would seem to run counter to general public wishes.

Your handling of this manner is frankly unsettling. One questions the democratic process if public input, scientific studies and fiscal responsibility are all ignored.

I would suggest that the zoning remain completely unchanged from current standards. None of the options presented seem to take a minimalist approach to new regulation.

But I think that's what you have in mind anyway, public comment be damned.

Sincerely,

John C. Weaver

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	138	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,17,2013 12:17:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I ask you to withhold my personally identifiable information from public review.				

I am shocked and dismayed at the GGNRA's proposed limits to off-leash dog walking in San Francisco. I will recruit other dog walkers and consider civil disobedience if we are further limited.

I support the following proposed maps that maximize off-leash areas from your PDF  
03\_GGNRA\_SEIS\_PEPC\_Fall\_2013\_maps\_9-16\_San\_Francisco:

9-C or 9-E (What is the difference? I support the maximum off-leash area.)

10-A

11-A,B,C (What are the differences? I support the maximum off-leash area.)

12-A

13-A

14-A

15-A

16-A

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	139	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94610 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,17,2013 12:44:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been to GGNRA many times, and dogs are always a problem. I go to walk and observe nature, but my experience is to try to get owners to get their dogs under control and away				

---

from me, so I can watch other dogs chase wildlife and/or destroy habitat.

- 1) Off-leash dogs are almost never controlled. Even if they are truly under voice control, I have no way to compel an owner to actually control their dogs.
- 2) I fear being knocked over by out-of-control dogs.
- 3) Off-leash dogs defecate "out of sight" of their handlers, and pollute the environment.
- 4) Dogs should not be allowed at all in most areas, such as Marin Headlands and Crissy Field. These should be the same as any National Park. People and nature, not dogs.
- 5) All parks in San Francisco are already de facto off-leash dog parks. If you must have more off-leash areas in SF, they must be fenced in order to be enforceable. Anything else is not effective.

Thank you for your concern.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 140    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,17,2013 23:20:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am an avid walker and naturalist, and believe that for the protection of wildlife, dogs and wildlife should be separated. I would like to see enclosed areas for dogs; otherwise, dogs strictly on leash, and no dogs at all in sensitive areas where there are ground-nesting birds. Personally, I find dogs intrusive in my appreciation of flowers, birds, and insects, so would like to have dog-free areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 141    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,17,2013 23:42:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't believe that the ggnra is responsible for having off leash dog areas. If the city is interested in off leash dogs then they need to provide these areas (not the federal government). Many dog fanatics have argued that the new ggnra dog walking proposed rules would have an impact on the city lands however this was far from true.  
During the government shutdown with park lands being not or less accessible, there were increases in problems in the SF city parks. There were still a lot of dogs but not there really was no appreciable change. I think the government shut down proved that the new ggnra rules (which would provide more dog areas than during the government shut down) would not adversely affect the city lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 142    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,18,2013 10:07:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner in San Francisco for the last several years (have lived in San Francisco for over 15 years).

I strongly believe that Fort Funston and the Presidio must be kept open for dogs - including significant

---

access to off leash areas. There are many areas along the coast - in Marin, along the peninsula, and in the city - where dog access is restricted. I see no reason why a couple of key areas can't remain open to unleashed dog use.

Fenced in dog runs are not sufficient for the number of dogs in San Francisco and they are not sufficient for providing the exercise that dogs need. The same is true for keeping dogs leashed - that does not provide sufficient exercise for dogs to remain healthy.

This I strongly believe.

Additionally, I think it is sad that such strong limits are placed on dogs across the national park system. I am a strong advocate for the National Park System and a supporter of Wilderness areas as well as other natural resource designations. But sadly because of the strong restrictions on dogs I am unable to consider them as vacation options. We end up spending more time in national forest land or BLM lands where the restrictions are less stringent. I wish there were a more balanced approach to accessibility for dogs - and I feel that The Presidio and Fort Funston are examples where we can achieve that balance - continue to restrict dog access in other areas in Marin, in San Francisco and along the peninsula and balance that with a couple of locations where dogs are less restricted.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	143	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94124
-----------------	-------------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Oct,18,2013 11:57:24
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog owner in San Francisco, i'm very concerned about the proposals to restrict so much of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area, prohibiting dogs altogether or dogs off-leash. In addition to the fact that my ability to take my dog to Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and Crissy Field is one of the few reasons i stay in San Francisco and put up with the high-cost of living, saturation and overcrowding, i am particularly concerned with not giving our dogs a space to run, exercise and socialize. In a city where dogs are everywhere, having under-exercised dogs poses a threat to everyone. Though leash walking is great and appropriate, so is giving dogs a chance to run free, play with each other and with their owners.
------------------------	---

Plus, if you want people to enjoy the "recreational" areas you are trying to protect with these restrictions, you will have a significant drop in users if you impose your over-reaching restrictions. I for one will not use any of these parks if i can't take my dog or have to leash her. In fact, before i got my pup, i never went to any of these locations. Getting to know the beautiful coast line in and around SF is one of the biggest gifts my dog has brought to my life. I don't want to live in an area where enjoying these areas is no longer feasible for me because my dog is prevented from joining me or because i have to restrict our mutual enjoyment. I already walk her on leash in plenty of other places, like Golden Gate Park or other parks.

Not having these beautiful places for off-leash play feels punitive and not consistent with encouraging people to enjoy our beautiful coastal areas. I understand preservation is critical, but you haven't struck a balance with your plan. you've prioritized,significantly and unfairly, one type of use of these "recreational areas" over others, leaving the thousands of dogs in this city, and their guardians, without a place to participate in what the city has to offer.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	144	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,18,2013 13:52:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs are presently only allowed off-leash on about one percent of GGNRA land and the current proposal wants to restrict where dogs can walk on about 90 percent of that one percent of land. This is unacceptable! Let's save Fort Funston and all the Bay Area's recreational areas! PLEASE DO NOT eliminate off-leash dog areas in the Bay Area at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and elsewhere in Marin and San Mateo.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 145    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,18,2013 14:25:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I recently read about a new plan to limit off-leash exercise for dogs in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and am very saddened by the news. My husband and I adopted a terrier mix from the SF SPCA last year and we have enjoyed many walks off leash with our dog all over the GGNRA. Our favorite place to take him is Fort Funston. He is a very energetic dog and without his daily walks off leash, he would not get the proper exercise he needs to be a well behaved dog member of society. There are many studies done that show that off-leash exercise is vital to canine health and I am saddened by the proposed plan to limit this kind of exercise. I understand that there needs to be a healthy human to canine to nature balance within the GGNRA, but with closing these areas off, the other areas of San Francisco and Marin counties that do allow off-leash dogs will become very overcrowded and could possibly be a threat to our dog community.

I urge you to listen to the community that uses these parks and please reconsider.

Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 146    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,18,2013 14:27:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please discard this plan. This is unreasonable and fails to serve the needs of any constituency.

This is simple.

1) San Francisco is one of the (maybe the) most dog-friendly cities in the country (by individual dog

guardianship).

2) The ENTIRE waterfront, and all dog play areas (notably ALL DOG BEACHES) are controlled by the GGNRA, not the City and County of San Francisco

3) The GGNRA would be closing ALL BEACHES/WATER ACCESS plus ALL LARGE DOG RUN AREAS without any regard to the jurisdiction in which it operates.

The only obvious conclusion is to ensure that ALL GGNRA areas are open to off-leash dog play. Reasonable policies and patrols can be enforced to ensure that people who are not dog-friendly can also share these areas without scaring or threatening the dogs (or their guardians).

In other words, please be reasonable and not reactionary.

Any closure at all of any GGNRA area explicitly denies federal services and access to all dog guardians and therefore to the majority of the constituency that the GGNRA serves.

There is no "other side" of this debate. All GGNRA areas are and will always be open to dogs off-leash, or the GGNRA has failed to serve its mission.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	147	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sunnyvale, CA 94087 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,18,2013 15:27:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My dog loves going to Fort Funston. There are very limited off-leash areas for dog owners already. Limiting further will be limiting an already limited arena. Please keep it open and off leash! Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	148	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,18,2013 16:02:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE do not further restrict off-leash exercise for our dogs! We take our dogs to Rodeo Beach regularly, and to Crissy Field, Baker Beach and other GGNRA locations intermittently. Our dogs need lots of exercise; one of them is not good in enclosed spaces with other dogs. It is vital to their well-being that they get some time to be out running around. Our dogs are both completely under voice control and well-behaved in open spaces. We always obey all rules to keep them away from wild life and we always clean up after them. There are SO few places in the Bay Area that they can run free. PLEASE don't take the little space they have away from them. Dog owners are citizens, too. Our voices should count.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	149	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---



**Affiliation:****Received:** Oct,18,2013 16:07:26**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I wholeheartedly oppose this plan which would further restrict dog access in GGNRA parks. Should this new plan be approved, I will join the fight in returning the land of Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and Crissy Field to the city of San Francisco thereby reversing the 1973 vote on Proposition F which originally transferred the land to the GGNRA "to hold only for so long as said real property is reserved and used for recreation and park purposes."

I have only been a dog owner since 2011, but have lived in San Francisco and utilized city and federal parks in the area for the last decade. In the years before I was a dog owner, I rarely if ever saw parks being disrespected in a way that would warrant such aggressive restrictions. Now that I am a dog owner, I take pride in respecting our parks, cleaning up after my pets, ensuring they behave in an acceptable manner. I see most if not all other dog owners and dog walkers doing the same. We love and respect our parks. This proposal seems to be a punishment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 150 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Palo Alto, CA 94306  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Oct,18,2013 16:10:10**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not limit the dogs off leads areas - these areas are vital for the health and happiness of dogs, many of whom have no outside space to play off lead. Dogs are increasingly as important to their owners as other family members and the happiness obtained by allowing dogs to run off lead is really important to their owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 151 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Oct,18,2013 17:14:07**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** San Francisco's off leash areas make my life with my dog possible. She is a typical high energy dog who keeps me active, healthy and happy. However, as a normal San Franciscan with a full and busy work life these off leash areas provide my dog with the necessary exercise to keep her likewise healthy on the days I don't have the ability to take her on full walks.

I would also like the parks department to take into account the sheer numbers. San Francisco is a place where people are forced to forgo having kids in order to afford living in their favorite city. It is because of this that dogs outnumber children. PLEASE don't take away one of our few opportunities to take in the city with our surrogate kids. I know it sounds like the words of a crazy pet lady, but this is the reality of SF.

If the parks decide to make the error of taking away off leash dog access in existing areas I strongly believe they should create a nearby alternative in the presidio. There is plenty of unused and unnatural space in the Presidio that would be perfect for a dog run or penned in play space. This low cost alternative may be much less desirable but could be equally functional.

**Correspondence ID:** 152    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,18,2013 18:11:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am overwhelmed by the size and technicality of the SEIS, and the best I can do is to give comments based on what I understand as a lay person, and on my experiences visiting the SF units of GGNRA frequently over the years.

I fully support the park's efforts to control and limit dogs in GGRA. As a birdwatcher and lover of wildlife, I am dismayed at the lack of space and protection the management now gives to birds and wildlife, and to the lack of commitment to preserve these creatures and their habitat for future generations. Chrissy Field is the worst. It is in effect an off-leash dog park. I no longer go there to birdwatch. But Ocean Beach, Sutro Heights and Lands End are also significant critical areas for wild creatures and plants, and dogs should not be in these areas on or off-leash (except in a fenced-in area).

People have a right to enjoy an urban park separate from dogs. SF has many parks, but even when dogs are required to be on-leash or are not allowed, the rules are not enforced and dogs are present off-leash. GGRA should not consider this problem separately. In reality, it offers the only opportunity for people to enjoy parks without dogs in SF.

Enforcement of dog restrictions should be consistent and robust. "Under voice control" doesn't work. I don't speak to dog owners anymore because some of them are rude and aggressive and I am afraid.

Please be bold and protect the defenseless- -the birds, wildlife, and the less vocal people who want to enjoy nature without dogs.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 153    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,18,2013 22:22:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Nothing makes my dog happier than running along the water at Ocean Beach, and for a disabled person like myself this is beneficial in more than one way. I cannot walk my dog on a leash because of a back problem I developed this summer. The ability to let him off the leash so he can sprint back and forth between Balboa and Lincoln allows him to get plenty of exercise without hurting my back. I get so much joy out of watching him and other dogs chase tennis balls or run in circles, and he gets good social skills and a chance to stretch his legs. He knows the second we hit the PCH where we are heading and his jowls turn upwards into a huge grin, his tail wags furiously, and he inhales the ocean air, which has been proven to be beneficial to mammals. Every time I take him out there, I meet new and interesting

---

people, most of whom I discuss our love of the beach and dogs with. The more time I spend at OB or Fort Funston, the more i get involved with community services like Surfrider or other beach activities. The idea of restricting him onto a leash while at the beach makes my heart sing as it would take the wind out of his sails and not allow me to bring him there anymore.

Please think of all of the wonderful interactions that the people and dogs of Ocean Beach have daily when considering the leash law. Many dogs are aggressive on leash, dogs that are normally passive and playful. After working in shelters and privately training dogs for years, I can tell you that dogs need a lot of exercise and socializing, and they are not able to do it well while restricted on a leash.

Thank you,  
Sarah Gherini

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	154	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94129 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Seth Green Canine Care Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,20,2013 10:08:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** NPS staffers and others: thank you for taking the time to read my comments. I know you guys are doing your best with limited resources, so I will try to be clear and concise. Rationalizations below: I support maintaining Alternative A (no action), as this most closely reflects the 1979 SF Pet Policy, as established as law.

I own a dog walking business in San Francisco. In order to efficiently and safely exercise my clients' dogs, I usually take them to land managed by GGNRA. We see your staff and volunteers every day: the horse-mounted NPS LE (I leash the dogs and usually give a wave); the grounds maintenance folks mowing the airfield at Crissy Field (including the inmate crew you have working there, who, it should be noted, do a GREAT job); the facilities people keeping our heavily used, much loved public land free of trash, etc.; the LE Officers patrolling Old Mason St. and taking care of those infernal "Go-Cars."

Although there are certainly some conflicts, and the occasional missed dog poop, the overwhelming majority of the time one would have no idea that there may be over one thousand dogs running on the beach at Crissy Field on a daily basis. Add to this the growing number of regular dog owners who bring their pets to the beach, and I suspect that the number might double, to over two thousand dogs, per day, at Crissy Field alone. I am not exaggerating.

Some reasons this number is important:

As it is well known, there are many dogs in and near San Francisco. One estimate I have heard is ~175,000 dogs in SF County alone. Further restricting where dog owners and commercial dog walking operations can (legally) take their dogs will promote further conflict in the few remaining off leash areas (your plan calls them ROLAs).

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

With regard to commercial dog walking operations (and the like), there are over 400 such businesses in San Francisco. Yelp.com currently lists 414. By simple extrapolation, that's a lot of dogs, and a good number of robust businesses that rely on public land, open space, and off leash areas in order to operate. Further restricting use of GGNRA managed lands will have a negative effect on local business. I fear that with further land use restriction and permit bureaucracy I may have to close my own business, because increasing rates unsustainably and limiting my group size to 6 will push me out of business.

It should be noted that most of the GGNRA continues to allow a variety of activities that might qualify as "special exceptions" to the the NPS's common rules and regulations. Bicycle access, hang-glider access, and other activities are but a few examples. It is my firm belief that the DOI and NPS do the public a disservice by isolating user groups from one another, restricting the behavior of some while allowing that of others. GGNRA is in a special place, blending between natural areas and a large urban metropolis, and in order to serve the public good must reflect the public's historical use of the land in question. This includes off-leash dog access. Ironically, in 1983 GGNRA's Superintendent requested a special exemption to allow for continued off-leash dog access to the areas in question; there was never a federal response.

Thus, for these reasons and other unstated, I am compelled to support Alternative A (no action), as this most closely reflects the 1979 Pet Policy, established in court as the law of the land.

Regards,  
Seth Green  
415.799.7057  
sethgreencaninecare@gmail.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	155	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san francisco , CA 94131 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Oct,20,2013 10:42:36
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	The elimination of major portions of National Park services for off leash dogs, particularly Crissy Field and Fort Funston, severely hampers my ability to keep fit as a senior citizen. Recreation is not about watching my dog run in a small enclosed area. I am 69 years old and walk vigorously at fort funston and crissy field along with my 22 lb schnauzer sally off leash. I can not put her on leash as it throws me off balance. I throw the ball for my dog and she retrieves it. i always pick up dog litter.
------------------------	---

Your new proposal virtually eliminates my ability to recreate and will make me go to local san francisco parks to get my workout. This is unfair to san francisco as we gave the land to you for fort funston and against my health interests as a senior citizen.

I support your attempt to regulate dog walkers and think that 4 and no more than 6 dogs is reasonable. ANd they should not drag their leashes. This is why the park is getting degraded, not by me and the other individual citizens who walk dogs.

Focus on the real problem and allow me to continue to improve my health by using the federal recreation facilities with my dog off leash.

**Correspondence ID:** 156    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Ashland, OR 97520

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Evogeneao Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Oct,20,2013 13:43:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We favor maximum restrictions on where dogs are allowed. There should be NO off leash areas. We visit SF and GGNRA, and find the presence of dogs, on- and off-leash and their waste a real drag on the experience. Their effect on wildlife and flora can't be positive.

Also, the ADA is being grossly abused by dog owners who claim their dog is a 'service dog' and get away with avoiding restrictions everyone else follows for the general good. NPS should clamp down on this abuse.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 157    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,20,2013 21:25:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very disappointed with the proposed plan to greatly restrict dogs within GGNRA. When your last proposal came out, I and many others wrote expressing our concerns about it. Unfortunately it appears that public input was largely ignored. This lengthy proposal seems to be based on a dislike of dogs, rather than facts. Please revise it keeping these considerations in mind:

1. As the name implies, this is a recreation area, not a wilderness.
2. Dog owners make up a significant percentage of the population in this dense urban area, and deserve access to a significant percentage of parkland.
3. It is not possible for most breeds of dog to get enough exercise on leash.
4. People get a lot of emotional and physical benefits to dog ownership and it would be humane to nurture this relationship.
5. Most dog owners take the time to train their dogs and clean up after them; they should not be punished for the behaviors of the minority. Irresponsible dog owners could be ticketed or banned from the GGNRA. This should certainly include owners who allow their dogs to chase or otherwise harass wildlife.
6. Single hikers, especially woman, are safer when they have a dog with them. You are limiting access to the outdoors if you further restrict their ability to walk with a dog.

I urge you to honor prior commitments and historical use of what is now GGNRA managed land and allow off-leash access to at least as many areas as are in current use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 158    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,20,2013 23:42:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a long time San Franciscan resident. I examined all of the San Francisco maps. Three considerations should be addressed:

---

1. Protection and preservation of wildlife.
2. The ability to enjoy the resources of the GGNRA without the impact of unleashed dogs (environmental degradation, safety issues, harassment).
3. The desire of dog owners to have an area for unleashed dogs.

The protection and preservation of wildlife must take the highest priority. This is in line with the GGNRA mission: to "preserve and enhance the natural, historic and scenic resources". This is what makes the GGNRA different from a City park.

With careful consideration, some areas may be open to unleashed dogs as long as it does not compromise the GGNRA mission. In addition, any area that is suitable for unleashed dogs must also leave space for those who prefer not to be around unleashed dogs.

The following maps seem to balance out the aforementioned 3 considerations:

Upper Fort Mason - Map D and F

Crissy Field - Map C, D and F (However, if Central Beach or West Bluff Picnic Area is determined to be important for wildlife protection, that would eliminate C and F).

Fort Point - Only trails not in sensitive habitat should be open to leashed dogs.

Baker Beach - Maps D,E or F

Land's End - Map D

Sutro Park - Maps B,C,E or F

Ocean Beach - Maps C or F

Fort Funston - Maps C or D

As it stands now, the requirement to leash dogs in SF City Parks is not enforced. Hopefully, the GGNRA will decide on a plan which is in line with its mission so as to provide a natural space for everyone.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	159	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Modern Hound Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,21,2013 08:34:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRA's off-leash areas are essential to what make this city a vibrant, exciting and humane place for humans and dogs. It is so important to keep this space open for off-leash dog play. Please consider the impact on thousands of San Franciscans and others in the bay area before taking away the rights for happy, healthy pets. Thank you! Sincerely, Shoshaunna Parks				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	160	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,21,2013 14:20:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't take away what makes San Francisco the most dog friendly city in the world, which is one of the biggest reasons that makes SF the best city in the world. I have often hear tourists and visitors say how impressed they are with how dog friendly this city is. It humanizes the City of San Francisco and emphasizes that we are an animal and nature loving city. PLEASE DON'T TAKE THIS AWAY!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 161 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** sanfrancisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,21,2013 16:18:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In view of the September fatal case of a boy killed by dogs in San Bernadino, I am extremely concerned about the safety of humans attacked by pets. I can understand pet owners love their dogs, and almost all human want safety.

Dog attacks can be considered as assault with a deadly weapon and the owner is ultimately responsible. Pets running around in public places including our National Parks posed a threat to human safety and to the fragile flora and fauna. Their waste invit flies which can spread diseases. Dogs on leash is the least dog owners can do and yet they are left roaming around freely.

36CFR2.15(a)(2) prohibits off leash dogs in National Parks and Lands End including but not limited to trails should not be an exception. In addition, SF Health and Safety Code bans off leash dogs in public. The Code should be strictly enforced.

PLEASE WITHHOLD MY PERSONAL INFO. FROM PUBLIC REVIEW. THANK YOU.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 162 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francico, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,22,2013 19:19:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam,

I am against this plan. Please reject the proposed Draft Dog Management Plan  
This plan is bad! Do not further restrict off leash dog walking in the GGNRA. There are already so many places that dog owners are restricted to go; this further restriction of dog owners is unfair and will limit the ability of dog owners to enjoy the GGNRA which belongs to all of us. Further restrictions at Fort Funston just seem mean-spirited and intended to punish dog owners, I can see see that part of Chrissy Field east beach could be made as on-leash only, but every other aspect of this plan seems punitive toward dog owners. The restriction of dogs from Muir Beach is completely unacceptable. There are plenty of other wonderful beaches that do not allow dogs access all up & down the CA coast, and losing

dog access to Muir Beach would be a tragic loss of one the few places that dog owners have in Marin to access the beach.

Sincerely,

Michael Willingham

Please reject the current proposal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 163    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Mrs. Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Oct,22,2013 19:28:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am concerned about the damage dogs do to wildlife and wildlife habits in the GGNRA. I witness many dog owners allowing their pets to run even in restricted snowy plover nesting areas. I am a dog lover and in fact have volunteered and donated to dog rescue and welfare charities for years, but wildlife matters, too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 164    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,22,2013 19:32:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow professional dog walkers at Fort Funston. Most are not able to supervise their charges, very difficult to watch them all. Most are off leash and do not respond to voice commands. Fine for a dog bite should be a min of a thousand dollars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 165    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hayward, CA 94544  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,22,2013 19:43:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Natural areas need protection from dogs. There are plenty of accessible parks in the area already; protecting our beaches for endangered species like the Western Snowy Plover are crucial. I support restricting all dogs from the GGNRA.

Thank you,  
Bob Toleno

---

**Correspondence ID:** 166    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---



**Received:** Oct,22,2013 20:30:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been tripped by dogs while I'm jogging. At 70 years old, tripping and falling is a serious matter! So I fully support the NPS leash plan and restrictions on roaming dogs. I am a dog lover, but we need greater responsibility from dog owners. Leashes are a reasonable restriction and protect us, the wildlife and even other small dogs from harm.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 167 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,22,2013 21:15:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for creating a plan to control dogs in GGNRA. I was walking through the Presidio a year and a half ago, with my son who was 4 at the time. A dog, which was about 50 pounds, bounded up to him from 100 feet away. I had to kick the dog away as it was about 3 feet from my son. The woman took offense to me stopping her dog, with the usual 'he's a nice dog' refrain. Some day a small child will not be so lucky, if people aren't taught that they must control their dogs and laws are in place to prevent incidents like this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 168 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,22,2013 21:37:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to see more on leash rules/areas and areas without dogs. I represent the majority in the bay area. Please don't let a very vocal minority ruin these wonderful park lands for the rest of us. I am with the majority in supporting the preferred alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 169 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,22,2013 21:44:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been following the print and television coverage of your policy, I want to lend my support to limit the dogs in the park and at the beaches. Fort Funston and Crissy Field has been off limits to our family for some time. Not everyone loves dogs, in particular, my daughter is deathly afraid. We have only been to Fort Funston once, but were soon surrounded by unleashed dogs and had difficulty even trying to leave. We faired no better at Crissy Field. We had to leave since dogs were barking, peeing and pooping as the kids tried to play. My daughter was so frightened and had to retreat to her chair as dogs ran around her. We haven't been back to the beach since. It is also unsanitary to have kids playing in the sand and water at the same time dogs are peeing and pooping in it. We had the same experience at Ocean Beach and Baker Beach so we don't go to these places. It's unfortunate and limits should be put in place and enforced so everyone can enjoy the parks.

We are hopeful that the situation will change and we can visit these the beaches again peacefully.

---

Thank you for your efforts.

The Anastas Family

---

**Correspondence ID:** 170    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,22,2013 22:12:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ah. It seems the Park Service wants to undo the traditional recreational use of dog-walking on the beach.

May I suggest the NPS return Ocean Beach to the city, since it is planning to violate the terms under which it received the beach. It will save so many lawsuits...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 171    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,23,2013 14:19:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like GGNRA to implement plan 12A for Baker Beach.

I have been walking there for ten years and my neighbors for far longer, some 40 years. Every day I pick up so much trash and so do my other dog owner friends. They took the trash cans away so we clean up first thing in the morning around 7 am. There are no snowy plovers. There are crows, seagulls and sandpipers.

The dog owners all police themselves, and the dogs are under voice control as a rule. We are disturbed that dogs are being singled out as a problem when I see cigarette butts, illegal fires, naked men, piles of beer cans and wine bottles. Humans seem to impose more on the beach than the dogs. It is sand...how can the dogs disturb sand? I even bring extra bags to put on the post at the bottom of the stairs at Baker at the 25th Ave entrance.

Please do not have restrictive dog policies for the GGNRA areas where humans and dogs happily RECREATE.

Our dog walking privileges should be grandfathered in with the NPS laws.

Thank you,  
Deborah Hatch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 172    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94710  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,23,2013 14:29:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to see plan 12A adopted. I am frequent visitor to Baker Beach. In my experience the dog owners are easily the most responsible visitors to the park. I have seen them picking up trash and keeping the beach neat. I have never seen dogs in the fenced off dune area, or chasing birds on the beach. I do not think restrictive leash laws are necessary to protect wild life or the comfort of others using the beach. There are hundreds of miles of wild coastal land in California. These areas in an urban setting, with a tradition of multiple use, should be open to all who use them responsibly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 173 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,23,2013 14:52:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was in the GGRNA for a walk of about 1.5 miles along Oakwood Valley Trail recently and saw no less than 10 piles, or bags of dog feces along the way back to Tennessee Valley Road. I do not think it is a good idea to allow dogs on trails, but fire roads could be limited to lease only access. I live within a mile of many of the GGRNA trails and find dog feces littering the streets in my neighborhood and on the trails. Irresponsible dog walkers frequently trespass on private and public land without regard to what the dog is doing. If dogs are allowed the same level of access to GGNRA land, it will continue to be a dumping ground where dogs are allowed to damage habitat and harm wildlife. Dog owners aren't taking responsibility to clean up after their animals in my neighborhood, what do expect them to do on park land where there is no enforcement of proposed rules?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 174 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,24,2013 10:45:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I understand that the dog management plan raises hackles for Bay area residents and canines on both sides of the issue. I've read (most) of the revised report and I have a couple thoughts I'd like to share.

1. I understand that the GGNRA area is separate from the city of San Francisco, Marin County etc. However, when talking about impact on residents you can't isolate the experience to just what happens on GGNRA land. Since I live in San Francisco I'll restrict my comments to just my experience in the city. As a qualifier I have lived here for six months. My dog and I moved from Chicago. The cities of San Francisco and Chicago are quite different in how the neighborhoods are set up. In Chicago there's grass between the sidewalk and the street that is public property. My dog didn't relieve himself on cement or anyone's yard. In San Francisco there's only cement (in most places). Chicago's districts each have gated dog parks and there are sectioned dog beaches where dogs are allowed to run freely. San Francisco only has these areas on GGNRA land. Restricting GGNRA access to dogs on leash only would completely

reduce if not highly eliminate where dog owners can exercise their pets. There's not an easy answer but any GGNRA proposal needs to be partnered with city official input.

2. I have a two year old rescue dog. He's a Jack Russell and Miniature Greyhound mix. He has a lot of energy and his favorite thing (besides chicken) is running. I run an 8 min mile and I've run him up to 10 miles on leash however it doesn't compare to the exercise he gets when he's allowed to run off leash. On leash, I can only go fast enough that he trots. Off leash, he runs like a greyhound complete with the greyhound smile. Eliminating areas where he can exercise properly will negatively affect his health no matter how much I exercise him on leash.

3. My dog has never been aggressive to another animal (human or canine). I believe this is because of how he is trained and because he is well exercised. Reducing the amount of healthy exercise dogs can get in the city will not help any aggression issue. (This is the dog whisperers biggest thing right?)

4. I think it'd be extremely helpful and necessary for you to include with the number of incidents reported how many canine and human visitors you have to the park throughout the study period. While I can understand that even one incident is one too many this must be analyzed on a percentage basis. 75 incidents out of say 100,000 visitors is not significant and just reporting 75 is misleading and fraudulent.

5. Please consider as an alternative looking at how other cities handle this issue. For example in Chicago dogs must be on leash except in the gated dog parks and beaches. GGNRA could fence off large swatches of land to accommodate the dogs in the city. As it stands by just reducing the land area that dogs are allowed to run free on won't solve any issues with non dog owners being scared or dogs reacting negatively to horses unless that is area that they are then restricted from as well.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. Having a larger space to let my dog run free has been the biggest positive change in my life from the move.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	175	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,24,2013 11:32:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I walk my 2 welsh terriers on leashes and don't like it when I encounter dogs off leash, but I do understand owners' preference to allow dogs freedom to run/play off leash. Thus I recommend a middle ground: 1) GGNRA should create a fenced off-leash area - there are more than enough acres to allow this, or alternatively 2) GGNRA should lease a small part of the many many acres in Rancho de la Tierra park to a local dog owners association (assn could be incorporated for the purpose of doing this) who would be responsible for creating & maintaining this area - thus removing any liability & staffing issues from GGNRA and providing an area for owners to let their dogs run freely & safely without interfering with other on-leash dog walkers or no-dog walkers.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	176	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	ngmoco:) Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 12:07:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I greatly value that San Francisco has many official off leash areas for dogs. Dogs are an important part of our society, they provide companionship, stress relief and an easy icebreaker for people in a community to start interacting. Dogs need exercise to be well behaved, happy members of the community. My dog loves to run in the offleash areas, and would not be able to get adequate exercise if he were only allowed on leash. We monitor him closely to make sure he does not disturb other people enjoying the area.

Please reconsider the proposed restrictions on offleash areas. The current rules have worked well since the 70s, please do not reduce our access to allow our dog and their owners (us!) healthy and happy lives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 177    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito , CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 12:15:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live right below the trail head at the top of Donahue St. When my wife and I first moved here we were excited about using the trail for walking our dog. 2/3 of the time we have tried taking him up there he has been charged and attacked by off leash dogs that are not even slightly under voice control. One time the owner of the dog was a least 1/8 of a mile behind the dog when he attacked ours and she had no idea that anything had happened until we passed and asked if that was her dog. The thought that the dogs up there are under voice control is a joke and I can prove that any time simply by taking my dog up there. The amount of dog walkers that flow through there on a daily basis that unload 6-8 off leash dogs from the back of the trucks is quite surprising. The entire parking pad up there has an overwhelming smell of dog urine because of the amount of people that unload cars full of off leash dogs and let them do what they will. I live close enough to the trail head that I hear people yelling for their dogs that have run off a couple times a week. There is an extremely small portion of people that use the trail that have dogs that are under voice control. The fact that I cant take my dog up there without being attacked is frustrating. We live in an area littered with off leash dog parks, but we also live in a area full of entitled people that believe they can commandeer any public park and turn it into there personal dog park regardless of how well or poor there dog behaves.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 178    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 12:48:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello, the following are my comments on the latest proposed off and on leash dog restrictions in the GGNRA.

I understand the need to balance on leash, off leash, and no dog areas in the GGNRA. However, I feel strongly that some of the proposed restrictions are completely unbalanced and unnecessary, and will result in further problems with dogs and people in the parks.

In general, there are a lot of people with dogs in San Francisco, and the dogs are a huge part of our ability

to enjoy recreation areas with our families and friends. Historically, everyone has gotten along and people with dogs have been able to enjoy the areas alongside people without dogs for so many years. Until the federal government came in and took over these areas, we were doing just fine. It is not really fair to just shut things down just because it makes it easier for you.

In particular, closing altogether the East Beach at Crissy Field, and especially the largest part of Baker Beach to dogs altogether, is completely unacceptable. By doing this, you will:

1. Crowd a large amount of dogs into much smaller, adjacent areas, creating overcrowding and potentially dangerous situations.
2. Disallow families and the elderly, people who cannot carry all of their things or walk far in order to play with their dogs, to enjoy these beaches.

I do understand that East Beach can be very crowded and is heavily used. However, closing Baker Beach to dogs is an extreme measure that is completely unnecessary. (Much of the time, it is practically deserted, EXCEPT for people with dogs!!) If you do that, there will be one tiny area for dog play on the entire north end of the park west of the Golden Gate Bridge! At the very least you should allow dogs ON leash on all areas of Baker Beach, with off leash in the currently proposed area. This is a huge beach, which by and large, does not get crowded at all because of the weather. Closing this beach to dogs would create a real hardship for people who cannot, for one reason or another (elderly, small children, disabled) exercise their dogs by running or walking long distances on trails.

Please modify the play areas to allow at least on leash dogs at Baker Beach, all areas of Ocean Beach, and East Beach at Crissy Field.

Thank you,

Dianne Younger Rosse

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	179	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,24,2013 12:50:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This plan reduces the off-leash dog walking area by far too much. This will have a terrible impact for dogs and their owners. Humans and their pets are part of the city environment, and are entitled to have access to plenty of space. Please reconsider this draconian plan. Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	180	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94158 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,24,2013 12:52:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We use the off leash areas in GGNRA several times a month. Our dog is blind, and it is one of the few places she can run around without fear of cars or other hazards. If the off-leash areas are limited, we will not have such a great place to take her for exercise and safe play-time.				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 181    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 13:50:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have ask numerous time WHY this is being proposed - what studies have been done to indicate that the parks need dogs removed or the psychological impact of the residence of this great city of ours who are dog owner that can no longer spend time in the open air with our beloved pets.

PLEASE SEND THE DATA, THE STUDIES or a SENSE OF WHY this is important.  
Also please disclose how much money this change is costing us the tax payers.  
Remember you all work for us!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 182    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Half Moon Bay, CA 94018  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 14:30:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As the current draft of the Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact statement is unacceptable. It fails to adequately address the past practices of much of the land and places an undue burden on one group ,dogs and their owners, who have historically had many of these spaces open for their use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 183    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 14:41:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do NOT reduce the amount of off-leash areas in this city. Dogs and their humans are vital to the unique flavor of this town.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 184    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 17:24:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the current dog walking policy at Fort Funston as previously agreed with the City and County of San Francisco. Do not change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 185    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 17:50:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** w.r.t the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge area:

Currently, the Cattle Hill section is a de facto off-leash region that is enjoyed as such by many local residents. Would the NPS consider a revised version of Map 19-F that acknowledged the current usage by making at least the Baquiano Trail portion of Cattle Hill off leash?

Thank you

Derek Gladding

---

**Correspondence ID:** 186    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 18:47:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** One of the reasons we love San Francisco is because of how dog friendly it is. Our dog is very active and with really limited backyard space, it's important to is to have parks and beaches where we can take her to get her exercise. Fort Funston is one of her absolute favorite places to go and run. Our family would not only be impacted by the measure to reduce off-leash areas for dogs, but it would also be very sad. Please reconsider keeping these valuable parks open to all families - human and animal.  
Sincerely,  
Jen, Art, and Lexi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 187    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 19:41:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Perhaps this 'plan' would enable the reduction of park personnel, but it is not in fact why the park exists, nor is it in line with the charter under which said park's management was handed over to the GGNRA. Sorry, can't go with this one at all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 188    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,25,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**



The GGNRA a Public Recreation Area is in a densely populated urban area of San Francisco , San Mateo, Marin Counties who's residents with dogs use the open space in its jurisdiction. Fort Funston is one of these recreational spaces that has had Off Leash with Voice Command & control with Dog Walking for over 50 years and should remain that way. These areas have evolved over decades as Dog Friendly Recreation Areas that have been the first and best place for residents of these counties to bring their Dogs. This is because of the health benefits that both the Dogs and thier Guardians receive from an outing to these Recreation Area's.

When the San Francisco Parks and Recreation thru the approval of Prop F in the 1970's gave these open space area's to the GGNRA it was understood that these area's would remain open to the popular recreation of off leash voice command dog walking.

The following Paragraphs contain information that refutes the GGNRA claims being used to drastically reduce or eliminate off leash dog walking in Fort Funston, Ocean Beach ,Fort Baker and Crissy Field. I emplore you to read them along with my concluding comment at the end of this letter.

Thank you,

Thomas Roop

\*\*\*\*\*

Where As:The GGNRA's Dog Management Plan/DEIS/SEIS asserts that the change in Dog Management Policy is essential to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The DMP/DEIS/SEIS is unlawful and must be set aside (thrown out) because:

Â” Where As:The enabling legislation and Memorandum of Understanding with SF require the GGNRA to exercise "sound principles of land use, planning and management."

Â” Where As: GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation, the Memorandum of Understanding with SF for this park property, and NPS Rules, Regulations and Policy because they have failed to perform "vital monitoring" which NPS considers an essential element of sound principles of land use, planning and management.

Â” Where As:GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources due to the presence of dogs nor their guardians, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes.

Â” Where As: Federal law requires site-specific, peer reviewed studies to justify and guide changes in management of National Park System resources.

Â” Where As: The SEIS acknowledges the GGNRA has no such site-specific, peer reviewed studies for the impact of dogs and their guardians on water quality, vegetation, soils and wildlife in the GGNRA.

Â” Where As: There are no plant species which are endangered or threatened on Federal or State registers that have designated "critical habitat" in the GGNRA. Displacing recreation to enhance the growth of any of these listed plants is not required by the ESA and violates the enabling legislation for the GGNRA. However, we see that GGNRA management has displaced recreational access to plant these plants with regularity, the most egregious location being Fort Funston.

Â” Where As: The Monitoring Based Management Strategy is again a poison pill. This proposed compliance strategy has a measure of compliance that is totally subjective, with the GGNRA making all the decisions. Further, short or long term (permanent) closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA. It appears the language is designed to allow the GGNRA to make most or all of Fort Funston a native plant restoration/habitat, despite the fact that this is inconsistent with the enabling legislation and MOU with SF.

Â” Where As: Federal Law prohibits agency actions which are arbitrary, capricious and an abuse of discretion. Accordingly, this agency action, findings and conclusions should be set aside as prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 706 (2)A.

A brief post WWII history of Fort Funston (aka Doggie Disneyland)

Where As: Post WWII, Fort Funston (FF) was pretty much abandoned. In the 50's and early 60's, FF was a fabulous habitat - but not for wildlife. Rather, FF became a favorite hangout for seedy S.F. and Daly City gangs, drug dealers and users, sexual predators, off road recreation vehicle enthusiasts and a few off-leash dog walkers. Parents in nearby neighborhoods forbade their children from playing at FF due to its reputation for being unsafe. Tired of being harassed/harangued at other city parks, the dog community soon recognized the value in FF. It was clear that FF provided them an opportunity to recreate with their dogs off-leash in a beautiful seascape without any of the hassles presented at the other parks. No longer would they have to be inundated by the claims that they were infringing on the enjoyment of the city parks by adults and children who were afraid of dogs and complaints about dog waste.

Where As: Soon the word got out in the dog community and in the mid-late 60's FF realized a huge spike in the number of dogs and their human companions. It was these people who became the true custodians of FF. They were the ones who turned it into a real park. They took pride in their park. They kept it clean and safe. In fact, because of the significant presence of dogs and their humans, the criminal element soon left FF in search of a new refuge where they had control and would remain unchallenged. Many went to Golden Gate Park. Truth be told, the criminals were afraid of the dogs. And the dogs, being the good judge of people that they are, didn't like the criminals. Yes, it was because of the dogs, and only because of the dogs, that FF was now a VERY desirable park. This did not go unnoticed by the National Park Service.

Where As: When SF deeded FF in 1972 to the NPS/GGNRA, they inherited a spectacular park that was safe and well taken care of by its true custodians - the dog community. In return, the GGNRA promised via its enabling legislation to respect the historical usage of FF which included off-leash dog walking. This promise was codified in the GGNRA 1979 Pet Policy which officially designated FF as an off-leash dog park. In the early 1990's a new management philosophy permeated the GGNRA where conservation would now trump everything else in this national recreation area. Most notably, it would trump recreation. In 2000, after several illegal closures at FF, Fort Funston Dog Walkers sued the GGNRA and won. In 2001 the GGNRA arbitrarily and capriciously wiped out 30 years of promises and promulgations and voided the 1979 Pet Policy (see Fort Funston Forum for details). This action was reversed in 2004 in Federal Court and then again in 2005 in Federal Appellate Court. The 1979 Pet Policy was reinstated as the law of the land and remains that way today (also see GGNRA Pet Policy History). Presently, we are embroiled in a process, i.e., the 2013 GGNRA Pet Management Policy SEIS, which assures us that the GGNRA will once again remove off-leash dog walking from all of its recreation/park spaces.

#### The GGNRA'S Proposed 2013 Dog Management Plan

Where As: It was at the conclusion of the latest legal battle wherein Federal Judge William Alsup reinstated the 1979 Pet Policy, over the objections of the GGNRA/NPS/DOI, that a statement was made by the Judge that became the impetus for initiation of the planned changes in Dog Management in 2006. The June 2005 decision by Judge Alsup cited in this SEIS noted that the court's action "in no way restricts the authority of the Superintendent to 'protect the resource,' including the protection of endangered and threatened species."

Where As: The GGNRA/NPS/DOI asserts that the change in Dog Management Policy (DMP) in this SEIS is intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. A Freedom of Information Request was made for the data, documents, and/or Staff Report which substantiated the GGNRA's claim that there was controversy over the dog policy, compromised visitor and employee safety and resource degradation which warranted the change in Dog Management Policy (DMP) and DEIS. The GGNRA's response merely stated: "The Staff Report and other documents you seek do not exist at this time". [emphasis added]

Where As: There is no mention in the DEIS or SEIS of the judge's additional admonition that "Congress has committed the proper balance of resource protections and recreation to the park professionals. Their judgments should be respected by the courts absent a violation of the law." [emphasis added]

Where As: The GGNRA has violated the law by ignoring the fundamental legal underpinnings provided by the enabling legislation, NPS Laws, Rules, Regulations and Policy. The GGNRA has demonstrably violated the enabling legislation and the Memorandum of Understanding with the City by failing to meet their requirement to utilize sound principles of land management.

Where As: The enabling legislation states specifically: "In the management of the recreation area, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall utilize the resources in a manner which will provide for recreation and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management."

Where As: The MOU with the City states: "The 1975 agreement for the lands transfer from the City of San Francisco to the NPS states that "The National Park Service, acting through the General Superintendent, agrees to utilize the resources of GGNRA in a manner that will provide for recreational and educational opportunities consistent with sound principals of land use, planning and management.."

Where As: The National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 established the sound principles for land use, planning and management. This Act provided the framework for fully integrating natural resource monitoring and other science activities into the management processes of the National Park System. The Act charges the Secretary of the Interior to "continually improve the ability of the National Park Service to provide state-of-the-art management, protection, and interpretation of and research on the resources of the National Park System", and to "assure the full and proper utilization of the results of scientific studies for park management decisions." Section 5934 of the Act requires the Secretary of the Interior to develop a program of "inventory and monitoring of National Park System resources to establish baseline information and to provide information on the long-term trends in the condition of National Park System resources."

Where As: NPS policy specifically states: "Natural resource monitoring provides site specific information needed to understand and identify change in complex, variable, and imperfectly understood natural systems and to determine whether observed changes are within natural levels of variability or may be indicators of unwanted human influences."

Where As: In short, site-specific, peer reviewed studies are required to justify and guide changes in management of National Park System resources. Clearly, the failure of GGNRA management to conduct

any consistent monitoring or study of the resources in the GGNRA is a violation of Federal law. This SEIS highlights the fact that GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation for this park property. GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes.

Where As: In fact, the DEIS asserted dogs negatively affect water quality in the GGNRA. Those assertions have been omitted in the SEIS with the following explanation on page 28:

Where As: "Although water quality monitoring currently occurs at GGNRA, no site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at the GGNRA sites to document impacts to water quality specifically from dogs. It is also difficult to discern what is causing an impact to water quality, especially in a large metropolitan area where water quality may already be degraded. The literature review found very few investigations or peer-reviewed, scientific studies that document the isolated effects dogs have on water quality in recreational settings. Water quality has therefore been dismissed as a resource topic in this document due to lack of literature."

Further, the SEIS on pages 373 and 376, admits the following:

Where As: "Site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have not been conducted at the GGNRA sites for the sole purpose of documenting impacts to vegetation or soils from dogs.... Very few site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at GGNRA for the purpose of documenting impacts to wildlife as a result of dogs."

Where As: Without the site-specific, peer reviewed studies, the GGNRA is left to argue that potential damage will be done should they fail to change the DMP. This is not sufficient to justify a change in the DMP by the standards set by the NPS itself.

Where As: The GGNRA has also embarked on a mission to create native plant habitats where no habitat previously existed. GGNRA management alleges this is a part of their obligation to "preserve" the park for future enjoyment, however, this is NOT what they are doing. When you read the overview for Fort Funston (in our full Comment text), it is abundantly clear that they are creating these native plant habitats, and in doing so they are destroying parts of the park that existed long before the GGNRA took control. This process is not preserving anything. Additionally, this is in violation of their authorizing directive, as they insist establishment of native plant areas requires the exclusion of humans from the site, eliminating all recreational activity in the area. Essentially the GGNRA is creating habitats adjacent to heavily used recreational areas, and then subsequently utilizing the habitat as a means to eliminate the recreational

area.

Where As: If you read the Affected Environment section carefully, you will learn that there are no plant species which are endangered or threatened on Federal or State registers that have designated "critical habitat" in the GGNRA. Based upon the ESA and the enabling legislation for the GGNRA, it is a violation of the law to displace recreation to enhance the growth of any of these listed plants in the GGNRA. However, we see that GGNRA management has displaced recreational access to plant these plants with regularity, the most egregious location being Fort Funston.

Suzanne Valente

\*\*\*\*\*

Conclusion:

In light of the fact that there is no substantial evidence that there are any endangered birds or plants at Fort Funston. I demand that the People's Public Land in the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco and being Maintained by the NPS thru the Golden Gate National Recreation Area forever stay open and free range for Voice Command Off Leash Dog Walking. Therefore the current one foot thick DEIS-SEIS Plan is to be withdrawn. The NPS should make a permanent policy of the 1979-1980 Dog Management Policy Plan with full access to Off Leash Dog Walking under voice Command as it is now. This would also include a more progressive attitude in the maintenance of Fort Funston, IE repair or replace boxes for bags for litter pick-up, trash cans at all entrances and the north Sunset trail. All of this can be accomplished by ratifying PLAN A and making this plan permanent and enforce existing rules.

Thomas Roop (13)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	189	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,26,2013 12:59:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Please adopt proposal 12 A. Dogs, humans, and wildlife cohabit perfectly well now. A park in an urban area is not like one in a purely rural one, like Yosemite, and should not be treated as such. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 190 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Millbrae, CA 94030  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,26,2013 13:05:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I travel the 13 miles to Ft. Funston once a week so that my 9-year-old dog can enjoy running and socializing with other dogs without the restrictions of a leash. Ft. Funston is unique among off-leash dog parks because the humans walking the trail provide structure to the experience. In a traditional dog park, my dog would just sit by my side instead of interacting with the other dogs. Please minimize the leash-required areas so that we can continue to enjoy this unique urban park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 191 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,26,2013 16:25:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** DEAR SUPERINTENDANT,

I am a longtime SF homeowner, SF resident. I live here and use the park area/beach year round. I have lived in SF as well as other major cities within the USA. The beach area in SF is clearly the most well utilized and self compliant dog/human/wildlife/nature interaction I have seen. The weather is too cold for sunbathing most of the year and even it were, there is easily enough beach for those who choose to be " dog free ". What I have seen when the weather does get " warm " , is a natural split of "no dogs" to the most Eastern point, which is better for people and less for dogs. The dogs tend to move more West. I am not sure who is pushing for this, but I would be interested to know. Please advise. The beach area under plan "A" effects no wildlife as it is only Sand. I will initiate a bonofide study at my expense utilizing a Federally recognized assessment team of your approval that is not who you have already used. please advise.

There could be a few areas tightened up in this plan if need be, however, it is working from the standpoint of the RESIDENT/TAXPAYER user.

Plan F is "almost ok" , however the "tide inlet " is quite vague.

SO IF A-F IS ALL YOU CAN PROVIDE AT THIS TIME, "A" IS CLEARLY MY CHOICE.  
I ALSO BELIEVE THERE IS A MORE RESTRICTIVE "A " THAT IS EASILY ACHIEVABLE, AS WELL AS LESS RESTRICTIVE "F".

I ALSO BELIEVE THAT IF YOU ELIMINATED " PROFESSIONAL DOG WALKING SERVICES " THE IMPACT WOULD LESSEN BY 50%. UTOMATICALLY. IMMEDIATEY!! THESE BUSINESS ACTUALLY MAKE MONEY OFF OF THIS PROPERTY, WE, THE TAXPAYERS PAY FOR IT.

THIS IS A FREEDOM I AM NOT GOING TO GIVE UP AT ANY COST. I AM NOT A

PROFESSIONAL DOG WALKER, BUT A VERY HIGH TAX PAYER WITHIN A GROUP OF PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS WHO ALSO FEEL THAT THIS IS A PRICE WE PAY TO LIVE HERE.

I WILL LEAD MY GROUP OF WEALTHY, HIGH TAX PAYING, SF RESIDENT, DOG OWNERS TO ENSURE PLAN "A " IS ENFORCED.

THIS FREEDOM WILL NOT BE FORGONE FOR THE " DOG WALKING " SERVICES. THEY WALK 10 DOGS AT A TIME. THE TAXPAYERS AVERAGE IS 1.

I WOULD LIKE TO COME MEET WITH YOU IN PERSON TO SEE IF A LEGAL TEAM IS REQUIRED.

IN ADDITION, TODAY IS 10/25. THE SIGN WAS FIRST PUT UP FOR PUBLIC NOTICE WITHIN THE PAST 5 DAYS.

I AM LOOKING FORWARD TO OUR MEETING.  
PLEASE ADVISE DAY, TIME, PLACE, ATTENDEES.  
MOST SINCERELY, MICHAEL THALER  
2841 OCTAVIA STREET, SF, CA, 94123.

THANKS.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	192	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,26,2013 18:44:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of the Homestead Valley area of Mill Valley for over 17 years. I leave next to the Homestead Fire Rd as drawn on MAP 3.				

I use the fire road on a weekly basis and STRONGLY BELIEVE THE DOGS NEED TO BE ON LEASH OR BANNED ALTOGETHER FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. I have been bitten by a dog. The dog was not on a leash or under voice control.
2. Dog walkers routinely walk 4 dogs who are rarely on leash. I see these dogs run wild disturbing hikers, families, bike riders, local wildlife (Rabbits,birds, etc.), digging/crush native vegetation, and defecating on the trail.
3. I routinely see "plastic poop bags" on the trail unclaimed - unsightly and unsanitary.
4. I have seen dog on dog clashes. I get concerned the dogs may then turn on a human - adult or child.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	193	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---



**Received:** Oct,26,2013 23:26:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our family support owners keeping thier dogs on leashes on Ocean Beach, with more resources provided for consistent enforcement However, since many dog owners consistently flaunt this requirement, unfortunately, there may need to be an outright ban on dogs in this area. I have seen unleashed dogs on ocean beach repeatedly attack pelicans and other seabirds, to the point of thier deaths, so this is not just a theoretical concern.

On mixed use, unleashed doges which do not respond to voice commands are a real risk to small children visiting the beach, as parents cannot ascertain if each of these uncontrolled dogs are an immediate risk to thier children or not.

Similarly, older people like myself risk falls when uncontrolled dogs jump up on us or trip us. This is a serious risk, and a fall can cause a broken bone, which can be life threatening at my age. And my young nephew who is frightened of uncontrolled dogs cannot visit our beach at all.

Our family lives 400 yards from the dunes, and often walk on the beach, typically on a daily basis. While some dog owners are responsible, others see the wildlife on the beach as something to entertain their dogs. I've regularly seen dogs encouraged by thier owners to chase flocks of shore birds attempting o feed and rest by the shore. They have a particularly unfortunate habit of separating a small shore bird from a flock, and chasing it to exhaustion. While dog owners in a city would prefer to have thier pets run unfettered in this area, the interests of the shore birds should also be taken into consideration, especially for the snowy plovers.

Some dog owners go as far a video taping this wildlife harassing and attacking activity of thier dogs, apparently to add to the entertainment factor. Interestingly, owners will have thier doges leased on the street, but then purposely take them off leash on the beach.

Yours truly,  
Kathleen McCowin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 194    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,27,2013 00:13:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs that are big enough, especially certain breeds like Pit bulls, must be on leash in all times. It would be a reasonable thing to restrict access to dogs on our pristine beaches. I often could see dogs defecation on Ocean beach which create health hazard to our children who like to enjoy playing on the sand. Dogs also disturb the birds that dwell on the beaches. All said what the point if I hardly or ever see a Ranger on the beach or in the Presidio for that matter. We should first and most have funds to get more Rangers to enforce dog leash policies. Rangers are the essence of our National Parks and their presence gives comfort and good feeling. My great memories are when hiking the Presidio I could hear the clip clop of a Ranger's horse before the sight. Then a polite exchange and a great feeling. Gone with the wind that time, and I wonder for what greed? How much does it take for a "rich" nation to have some Rangers on horsebacks?

Nafiss Griffis  
2474 25th ave.

San Francisco, Ca 94116  
415-681-1658

---

**Correspondence ID:** 195    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,27,2013 11:26:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a San Francisco native, a frequent user of Crissy Field East Beach, and also a Sports Basement customer. I appreciate Sports Basement as a locally owned retail establishment, but not at the expense of public use of public lands. the Environmental Assessment [http://www.presidio.gov/about/Administrative Documents/PLN-344-SportsBasementEA\\_20131004.pdf](http://www.presidio.gov/about/Administrative Documents/PLN-344-SportsBasementEA_20131004.pdf) points on pages 27-28 to the possibility of "spillover demand" for parking into the "currently unmanaged parking at East Beach," and refers to prior recommendations to "implement parking regulations, time-limits and/or parking fees in potentially affected parking areas under its administration (notably, Crissy Field)."

Time limits at the East Beach parking would have a MAJOR adverse effect on many users of East Beach parking, especially board sailors, kayakers, walkers and picnickers. I agree with the comments by the NPS on pages 102-103 that paid parking for Sports Basement would likely result in the need for the NPS to charge for and/or limit parking at East Beach. We should not sacrifice access to public lands to allow for a for-profit retail operation. I am all for Sports Basement, but the traffic and parking impacts should be borne by the developer, not by the public users of East Beach and Crissy Field.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 196    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,27,2013 14:05:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposal to restrict dogs on Ocean Beach is absurd. If the concern is habitat destruction for the Snowy Plover, how can you justify allowing humans to be in these areas? Kite surfing does far more to disrupt the avian habitat. Why not shut the beach entirely for certain days? Having a beach where dogs can run free is one of the best features of San Francisco. I will not let that be taken away, and I know that many others (only some of whom own dogs) feel the same way. There are much better areas to spend the park service's time and money.

This is not being run as a democratic process - - the input you received clearly shows that the public is not on the side of these increased restrictions. If you have any doubt about this I suggest the issue be put to a public vote.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 197    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,27,2013 16:51:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Banning dogs from Ocean Beach is outrageous and unfair! Dogs are major parts of peoples' lives and it is extremely unfair to not allow them to go to land that should belong to EVERYONE, including them. There are already restrictions on the beach that protect the wildlife and dogs causing issues with people/tourists is very rare... This is far to extreme.....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 198    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,27,2013 16:52:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dog owners pay taxes too!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 199    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,27,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow LEASHED dogs on Ocean Beach between Irving and Taraval in the Snowy Plover Protected area.

We live here and walk our dog leashed.

Instead of punishing those who follow the rules and respect the nature of Ocean Beach, please display more and clearer LEASH REQUIRED signage and issue citations to those who do not obey the rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 200    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,27,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow LEASHED dogs on Ocean Beach between Irving and Taraval in the Snowy Plover Protected area.

We live here and walk our dog leashed.

Instead of punishing those who follow the rules and respect the nature of Ocean Beach, please display more and clearer LEASH REQUIRED signage and issue citations to those who do not obey the rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 201    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,27,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow LEASHED dogs on Ocean Beach between Irving and Taraval in the Snowy Plover Protected area.

We live here and walk our dog leashed.

Instead of punishing those who follow the rules and respect the nature of Ocean Beach, please display more and clearer LEASH REQUIRED signage and issue citations to those who do not obey the rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 202    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,27,2013 18:35:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow LEASHED dogs on Ocean Beach between Irving and Taraval in the Snowy Plover Protected area.

We live here and walk our dog leashed.

Instead of punishing those who follow the rules and respect the nature of Ocean Beach, please display more and clearer LEASH REQUIRED signage and issue citations to those who do not obey the rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 203    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,28,2013 14:43:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is completely inappropriate for an urban setting like San Mateo. GGNRA is basically withdrawing ALL opportunities for dogs to be off leash ANYWHERE in San Mateo. Where is the fairness in that? This isnt what the original plan envisaged and we have as much right to enjoy SOME of these areas off leash as anyone.

All this will do is crowd out the city off leash areas. This CANNOT be allowed to stand!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 204    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,28,2013 22:36:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative F:

The document states:

"Alternative F provides balanced visitor use (no dogs, on-leash dog walking, and dog walking under voice and sight control in ROLAs) as well as protection of natural resources and visitor safety."

This is not true for Ocean Beach SPPA, zero dogs on the beach is not balanced, the alternative for the trail at Ocean Beach is sub-optimal This trail is heavily used by bikes and pedestrians. Banishing dogs to only this area is would be more disruptive to the bikes and pedestrians. In addition, dog walkers on this trail can't even see the ocean. How is that balanced? I can go close enough to the beach to hear it and smell it, but I can't even look at it. That's absurd

I having been living in the area for six months and walking my dog every day, I have encountered hundreds of dogs, both on and off leash and have yet to see one single dog go after a Snowy Plover, most of the dogs don't even notice the birds are there. Are you trying to protect against a perceived threat or a real one? I noticed the document sites the following statement: "Even if the chase instinct is not triggered, dog presence in and of itself may be an agent of disturbance or stress to wildlife" (Sime 1999, 8.3; Lenth et al. 2008, 218).

The key word in this statement is may. Well, that means it may not as well. Shouldn't these policies be based on something more concrete? If this statement is true then are you going to ban humans from the beach too? What about the raccoons and other critters and wild coyotes are you going to try and ban them too?

The document also states:

"At GGNRA, there have been multiple instances where dogs flushed or chased shorebirds or snowy plovers at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field as documented in NPS monitoring reports by the Natural Resources Division (NPS 2008a; Hatch et al. 2007a, 12; Hatch et al. 2007b, 4-6; Hatch et al. 2008, 2-4)."

I have been on SPPA every morning (and most evenings) for the last six months. If this were happening at a dangerously high level, wouldn't I have witnessed at least one of these instances?

Alternatives B,C,D,F

In several places the document refers to the visitor experience. In the section of Ocean Beach I use, I would venture to say almost all of the visitors are locals that live nearby and half of them (if not more) are walking a dog. Forbidding dogs on this beach is certainly not enhancing the visitor experience; it is detrimental. I live just a few blocks from this beach. My dog and I love walking on the beach; it has given me great incentive to get out and get some exercise and has greatly enhanced my wellbeing. Some of these proposals would now shut me out from enjoying my local beach.

Ocean Beach SPPA

The document states:

"...However, impacts to the wildlife in the Ocean Beach SPPA would be long-term, moderate to major, and adverse to shorebirds under the no-action alternative, and long-term, minor, and adverse under alternative E."

I am not sure I understand how alternative E can be both minor and adverse? If the dog is on a leash, how is that adverse? In addition, the alternative A represents what has been in place for many years, this impact statement implies that to be a danger to the Snowy Plover. Is that really true? I see hundreds of those birds over the course of a week, and never any dogs interested in them.

Other Options:

How about issuing permits for locals to walk their leashed-dogs in areas such as SPPA? This would limit the number of dogs in the area and truly provide some of the balance you claim to be seeking. A "No-dog" policy does not offer any balance.

#### General Comments:

The idea that some of these alternatives provide "multiple visitor experiences" is simply not true. If I am a dog owner visitor, I cannot experience the beach, I have to walk on a paved path with bicyclists (and you know the bike coalition is just going to love that!) and pedestrians and have no view of the beach. Even though I live at the ocean, I have to walk my dog around the city streets, take her home, then go back out to the ocean if I want to enjoy it. That is simply ludicrous.

Many parts of the document make reference to the effect dogs may have on the energy level and fat reserves of these delicate birds. That seems a bit ridiculous. I have seen the Snowy Plovers run up and down the beach non-stop all day long. How is an occasional dog chase going to wear them out? They run constantly anyway!

The comment period runs from September to January, how come the announcement poster was posted only for one day? Are you afraid to let people know what is going on?

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	205	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,28,2013 23:07:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Thank you for preparing this document and serving our community. This proposal is very near to my heart for many reasons. I love nature, community and dogs:)My undergraduate degree is in Recreation Administration. I know the current situation is complex. I believe most stakeholders do share my love for nature and community. I understand we can not all have the same affinity for dogs, children, horses, birds and hikers. However,each child, dog, horse, and hiker belongs to our community and our individual families. Each has a special contribution to offer for our greater well being, as do the birds and the plants. I understand as time has changed, our San Francisco beaches have been managed by policies established specifically for our city's parks. I know this makes our situation somewhat different than others. I know beaches are especially popular places and also important to our ecosystem. I believe the snow plover guidelines at Ocean Beach are a model for coexistence. I believe the no dog rule at China Beach is another form of accommodating the needs of some who want to keep children and dogs separate. While I have little desire to go to the beach without my dog...who NEEDS to go to the beach..to exercise and socialize, I respect that some people do want to spend time on the beach without dogs or horses. I imagine a child or horse might trample a plant or two too. I hope we are all trying to be respectful; but I know we all are prone to mishaps. Fort Funston is a haven for dogs and dog lovers and horses and their riders...also hang gliders. One thing I love about Fort Funston is the lack of trash. Yes, horses and dogs poop and pee in this place, but being a frequent hiker at Fort Funston, I can confidently say that I have never smelled urine. I do want to comment about the commercial dog walkers and the owners of multiple dogs that walk at Fort Funston. I feel that the commercial dog walkers do include experts but this group also includes some individuals with much less training. I believe ALL walkers (commercial / private citizens) should be required to complete pack management training and dog training certifications before being permitted to walk more than TWO dogs off leash or on. I would be thrilled to see a permit of this nature that required the walkers to carry a photo id badge whenever walking dogs

---

anywhere in the city. Dog trainers with pack management training are very capable of walking six dogs off leash in an open space like Fort Funston. Fort Funston is ideal for dog hikes as its layout is quite safe for them. It is important to keep in mind that dogs, especially larger dogs do need quite a bit of space to actually run and hike. This was a point I had some concerns about when reading over the space limitations for off leash areas at Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field. Also, the commercial dog walkers are really important to the health maintenance of our San Francisco dog population. Dogs NEED exercise off leash AND they need to socialize with other dogs off leash in order to remain friendly and healthy. During the week, dogs are utilize the beaches during off peak hours. They could be given much more room during the week to accommodate multiple dog walking groups as it is also important not to "pack in" too many groups. Dog behavior and perspective requires some space for each. Dog walkers / dog owners are very aware of this fact. I hope that your final plans to manage our San Francisco beaches will be one that reflects the needs of all our city's citizens..including dogs, horses, children and hikers. I hope the decision will reflect the need for all our citizens to mingle together in multiple use places and perhaps some expert use places / time spaces. Honestly, the weekdays at the beach are a very different dynamic than the weekends. Commercial dog walkers tend to walk the dogs mostly weekdays between 9am and 3pm. There are not that many San Franciscans free to visit our beaches during those hours; Work requires many of us to depend on professional dog walkers to keep our dogs life in balance with exercise and socialization. As a side note, I do believe most dogs tend to stay on trails and then have a good run on the sand:) Its great for them. Basic commands like "off" "not ours""come" are given frequently to guide a dog back to the appropriate walking space...much like you would guide a child or a horse..dogs are also capable of following voice commands. I think the key points to work out are how to make peace with the fact that San Francisco beaches are now managed by National Park Services but are a part of our city's daily lifestyle. Our citizen need this space to keep life balance for ourselves and our pets. The use of the beaches and parks is part of our way to commune with each other and nature. The pet policy was written for our city not for our nation. San Francisco locals see the beaches as part of our city recreation space. We pay city taxes happily to enjoy the surroundings and facilities of our great city. We all count the beaches as part of that desired surrounding. Perhaps the fiscal considerations of managing the beaches need to be reviewed. Maybe volunteer groups or subcontractors need to be part of the management strategy for our beaches and hiking trails. Certainly, I believe an upgrade of commercial dog walking guidelines needs to be considered. Dog trainers with pack management training are the best qualified to walk 6 dogs off leash. Those without this training would definitely be less able to guide dogs..though I am sure there are some that have a natural gift, I would prefer they all be formally trained. Those without formal training could perhaps apprentice with those more qualified. Thank you for taking the multitude of hours and patience required to review all of the comments related to this proposal and important situation.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	206	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,28,2013 23:14:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	If the snowy plover is so delicate that it can't survive with dogs passing by on a leash, maybe we should let evolution take over and stop worrying about protecting it. Let it go. It enhances my life to walk my dog on the beach, the existence of the snowy plover does not enhance my life at all.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	207	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94605 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Oct,28,2013 23:35:15**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please choose to implement all of the alternatives that leave the most area available to off leash dogs under voice control. I am a heavy visitor to both Crissy Field and Ocean beach with my off leash dog (who is a Canine Good Citizen certified dog). The dogs that visit these locations are overwhelmingly well behaved and the owners (tax paying citizens) deserve a public space to exercise their animals off leash. Fenced dog parks are a terrible alternative as they are dirty, smelly and have no access to water for natural swimming dogs.

Do the right thing NPS. Keep dogs off leash in the SF beaches.

Catherine

---

**Correspondence ID:** 208 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Oct,28,2013 23:54:28**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Humans, dogs, cats and other animals have the same rights to access Ocean Beach as snowy plovers. If these birds are so effected by the presence of other beings (which includes wildlife), move them off to the Farrallones and they can thrive without any outside influences.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 209 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francsico, CA 94121  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Oct,29,2013 00:06:40**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The document states: Physically restraining dogs on leash in the SPPA would reduce chasing, but even leashed dogs could bark and/or lunge at feeding and roosting western snowy plovers, causing disturbance and/or harassment in a relatively small area.....

Well so could children playing with a ball, or many other "natural " occurrences are we going to ban that too?

I noticed the document sites many sources that use terms like "may disturb", "may have an impact"- -- well I "may" win the lottery, but I am not counting on it- -- let's stop being stupid and heavy-handed with regulations.

We care more about protecting wildlife and less about the well being of our people and our dogs (which, by the way are animals too!) Isn't nature all about different species interacting with each other?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 210 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,29,2013 11:30:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the draft plan. Although I wish it would do more to protect wildlife, I see it as a step towards balanced use of the park that accommodates both dog owners and people who want to enjoy nature without dogs around.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 211    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,29,2013 12:41:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner in San Francisco, nothing makes us happier than taking our dogs to the various parks around the city. If half of those parks (the best ones, in our opinion) stopped allowing dogs, that would ruin the experience at all the parks.

Without being able to take our dogs for exercise at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, or other GGNRA dog friendly areas, we'd be in enormously overcrowded city parks. This doesn't suit anyone - - not the dog owners, non-dog owners, dogs, or city at large. It also doesn't suit the GGNRA, who to this point are beloved by the city which we share.

We all support the effort to preserve biodiversity and limit the environmental impact that dogs and people cause, but surely there must be a better way than simply banning dogs throughout much of the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 212    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,29,2013 15:02:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think it is completely irresponsible to disallow dogs to be off leash. If you take away this area, there will not be a place we can allow our dogs to exercise. We have thoroughly enjoyed using Fort Funston as a play area for our dogs and have found nothing but respectful people doing the same. I have never encountered a person displeased with us allowing our dogs off leash within the park. Please stop trying to take this away from our family!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 213    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco , CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,29,2013 15:23:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Your statistics are flawed as you state an 11% incident rate for dogs. But more than half of the incidents are tickets for off leash. These should not be counted as if there was no off leash law these tickets would not have been given and the rate would be insignificant in some places and average around 4-5%

---

Recreating for a senior citizen is walking with my dog not on leash. On leash is too hard for me and throws off my posture.

I really am opposed to making any chnge to off leash at any of the parks, particularly Chrissy field and fort funston.

I DO agree with your recommendations for limiting the number of dogs per person. Please also include that they must not drag leashes.

The dog problem is really a "dog walker" problem and i hate to see you punish all of us for this money making career.

I think you will just ignore the citizens and do what you want anyway.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	214	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,29,2013 17:50:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is with great sadness that I read the of the GGNRA dog plan. Option "F" is a TERRIBLE plan that does not provide balance. Dog owners & walkers need to have the same rights as other users of the park system resources.				

Currently, there are too few options available to dog owners & walkers within the GGNRA. Any user of the park who does not want to interact with dogs has many options for trails, beaches, etc that are closed to dogs. On the other hand, dog owners have few opportunities. THE REAL QUESTION THAT WE SHOULD BE ASKING IS WHAT ADDITIONAL TRAILS & BEACHES SHOULD BE NEWLY OPENED TO DOGS (BOTH ON AND OFF LEASH)!

The "A" versions of the maps are not acceptable in that they limit dogs in GGNRA land too much. We need to look additional options for opening additional trails. I recently went down to Rodeo beach near my home with friends and realized that although I live very close I had not been there in years (even though I am hiking, running & biking in Oak Valley & other areas almost daily)...why is that? I have a dog who I would like to bring with me when I hike, bike or run and that rules Rodeo Beach as well as too many other parts of the park.

Don't take away further from my use & enjoyment of the GGNRA. The park should be open and available to all...not just non-dog owners & non-dog walkers.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	215	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,29,2013 20:29:16				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hearing about this plan and how it is actually coming close to passing is troublesome to me. First off, I would like to ask the question to you, "How many house holds in the San Francisco / San Mateo County area own a dog?" Do you realize how many people you will be affecting? Do you not realize that the dog community is huge and all dog owners bond together quickly if they have something to fight for. The GGNRA will not hear the end of this even if this passes. Also, they will definitely not prevent people from bringing their dogs to these restricted places on or off leash.

I will put my money on the fact that most people on the board of GGNRA do not own a dog and if they do, I bet they are not good care takers. Anyone who owns a dog would not vote to pass this new plan. Why not address the real issue. Take pro-active steps in solving the reason that this plan came to petition, not simply try to pass a law for the sake of it.

If the reason for your plan is to preserve the land and make sure it is not being trashed, why don't you take a look at all of the pedestrians who do not have dogs. They account for a majority of the trash and waste that is left at parks or beaches. Dog owners in general are good at picking up their own and their dog's mess. If this is such a problem, why does the GGNRA not hire 1 or even 2 park rangers? All of the times I have been to the park, I have not seen one. They should enforce the rules to both dog owners and non-dog owners.

If this plan passes, this will not be the end and you should be prepared for a constant battle. I can guarantee that all dog owners will not bow down gently. Our dog is our child and if you were to do this to your child, I'm sure you would fight back just as much. I'm not asking for you to forget your ideas all together. There are different and better alternatives that can satisfy both parties.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 216 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,29,2013 22:24:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not limit the dogs. Dogs are a huge make up of the population in San Francisco. We are one of the happiest cities in the world, and we are dog friendly! Please do not change this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 217 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,29,2013 22:59:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No detailed comments here. Just a plea that the existing use of dogs off leash at Muir Beach and Stinson Beach continue. As a frequent visitor to both, I have never seen a negative interaction between dogs and people, nor dogs and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 218 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,30,2013 09:28:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I fully support the restrictions on dogs in the Presidio. I feel like I can't even take my kids to Crissy Field without a dog jumping on them or threatening them. Every dog owner thinks their dog doesn't act badly. Kids and dogs don't mix.

Dog owners just don't respect any rules or restrictions on dogs. It would be nice to be able to take my kids to one place in this City where dog restrictions would be enforced. Because they are not enforced in city parks and dog owners don't respect the rules in city parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 219    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,30,2013 10:04:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear NPS:

I am a dog lover, a Certified Wildlife Biologist, and a frequent user of the open spaces in Marin County. I have over 30 years of professional experience as a consulting biologist for a local firm assessing the effects of human recreation on the natural values of our open space lands.

While the Dog Management Plan is a step in the right direction to better controlling the use of dogs in trails, it does not go far enough in my professional opinion. The areas that are proposed to be "leash only" should be changed to "no dogs" due to the difficulties in enforcing the leash only provision.

There are already many areas with leash only requirements that are regularly ignored and by some dog owners even flaunted. In fact, many dog owners, including people from the Marin Humane Society, are on public record not only in opposition to leash laws but have stated that they will not obey them.

Simply stating a trail is leash only does not make it so. It must be enforced. The NPS does not have the enforcement capacity now to enforce that rule. And the future strongly suggests that NPS capacity will be cut rather than enhanced. As a consequence, stating a leash only rule has the effect of allowing unleashed dogs on trails in many instances.

I have collected data on the incidence of trail usage, dogs on and off leash, and have made incidental observations of wildlife usage as well. My findings are that off-leash dogs tend to drive out other recreational use of trails making them single-use trails. In particular, older people and young people with pre-school aged children are driven off of trails with heavy off-leash dog usage.

I am all in favor of compatible use and sharing our trails. Unfortunately, use of leash-only signs does not work in Marin County and tends to make trails single-constituency trails.

In addition to the recreational issue is the issue of wildlife compatibility. While I have statistics on human use, my findings on wildlife use are more incidental based on observations of sign (e.g., scat and tracks) and direct observations of wild animals. In areas that have heavy use of unleashed dogs, it appears that the use of these areas by small and medium mammals and especially carnivores such as weasels, skunks, raccoons, foxes, and even coyotes is vastly diminished.

The mission of the NPS is to protect and preserve the natural values of the land it administers. To do that best, dogs should not be allowed on trails.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Roger D. Harris  
Certified Wildlife Biologist

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	220	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,30,2013 12:40:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not impose additional restrictions on some of our greatest outdoor resources for our pets.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	221	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,30,2013 13:48:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Fort Funston:				

I walk my dog off leash at Fort Funston almost every day. This is a great place both for dogs and for their owners. GGNRA is a recreation area, not a national park. Please don't let environmental extremists who seem to be in charge at GGNRA ban off leash dog walking at Fort Funston. Put dogs and people first, not extremists who would ban everyone and every dog if they could. GGNRA belongs to us. Don't let the extremists steal it.

I am elderly and retired. This is the only place where I can go to walk my dog off leash. Please don't take this away from me.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	222	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,30,2013 16:47:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My dog is a runner and the sole reason I moved to San Francisco. I vote for option A which allows dogs to actually stretch their legs and get the energy out. Dogs are like kids - without the ability to release the energy they are misbehaved. Restricting the area will only hurt everyone.				

---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	223	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,31,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Your proposed policies are in contradiction to the conclusions you draw in the study. To wit, you conclude that dogs have minimal impact on compacted trails. On the south loop of the Oakwood Valley Trail, where the GGNRA plans to mitigate dogs off-leash, the park service built a compacted trail (built by the Conservation Corps.) Also on the Oakwood Valley Trail, your policy indicates that you want to protect the Mission Blue Butterfly habitat. No lupine grows on either the north or south side of the loop.

I have been heavily involved in the restoration of Oakwood Valley and am well aware of the habitat. I know the valley trails intimately and have walked each of my dogs there for 35 years. This is one of the only areas to walk dogs off-leash. Your proposals are out of sync with the needs of the population. My experience is that about 85% of the people on the trails are walking with their own dogs, about 15% without dogs. The only aggressive dog incident I know about was the falsely reported one submitted by a ranger the last time the GGNRA tried to shut down the trail.

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

1. Require and enforce people to CARRY leashes for their dogs. Monitor for voice control.
2. Require and enforce people to clean up after their dogs.
3. Limit professional dog walkers to three or four dogs per outing in all areas.
4. Add a fee onto dog licensure to pay for these services.
5. Use ticketing fees to deter irresponsible behavior. Put fees towards management.
6. Establish a complaint line.

Respectfully yours, Laurie Cohen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 224    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,31,2013 12:46:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a frequent Ocean Beach visitor, my recommendation is to base the dog and off-leash restrictions on visitor density.

For example, I tend to access the beach on Taraval. Unless it is a warm day (over 70), the beach has at most 10 people between Taraval and Noriega. North of Lincoln, however, the beach is always packed with tourists, surfers and locals.

I'm suggesting a modification to Map-E. The tourist heavy area from Cliff House to Lincoln should be leash required at all times. The area south of Lincoln should have seasonal off leash (Nov - May).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 225    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,31,2013 13:54:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not agree with what has been proposed in the current Dog Management Plan - it is far too limiting for dogs and their owners, with no just cause - it's far too extreme. San Francisco and other parts of the Bay Area already has very limited space for dogs to be dogs without being confined to pavement and a leash - taking away areas that are working is going to prove detrimental to dogs and dog owners and many others in the Bay Area population. Such an idea needs to be discussed openly, realistic ideas and options need to be come up with and then voted upon by a wide group that goes beyond the GGNRA most certainly - -- -- because we all live here and use GGNRA area. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 226    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,31,2013 16:29:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Preserving off-leash areas in the GGNRA is very important to me as a San Francisco resident. Being in a city does not provide adequate space and places to exercise my dogs. GGNRA spaces are some of the only large open areas still available to dog owners. It is very difficult for dog owner, especially seniors and the disabled, to exercise their dogs on-leash. We need large open off-leash spaces to adequately exercise our pets. SF city parks are not adequate and are limited, we need GGNRA open spaces preserved for off-leash use. For many of us our dogs are the only "family" we have and are an important part of our overall health and well-being. Please maintain as a much open off-leash space as possible in the GGNRA.

Thank-you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 227    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,31,2013 16:39:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to make a comment regarding the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan. I have been a resident of San Francisco since 1998 and a dog owner for the last eight years. I have taken my dog to nearly every park in the city, and I appreciate the green space provided as natural oases from the hustle and bustle of the city. However, the experience of "on-leash" vs. "off-leash" is quite different, both for dogs and their owners. Just as humans and children need space to run around and play and be free, so do dogs. As we know, dogs that get adequate exercise - including time to run off-leash - are happier and healthier dogs, with less behavioral issues. Some of the spaces you propose to change from off-leash to on-leash are marvelous places for dogs and their owners to get exercise and play. I have never had a problem in any of these areas, and the majority of the people I see are dog owners with their very well-behaved dogs. Exceptions to this are few in my experience. I respectfully ask, as a taxpayer, voter, and dog owner, for you to avoid any restriction of the limited off-leash spaces in San Francisco.

Taking away our dogs' space to play would negatively impact what many consider to be a very dog-friendly city, and would certainly negatively impact the city's dogs and their owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 228    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,31,2013 16:41:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not limit the dog-friendly areas in San Francisco. As a responsible dog owner who always cleans up after my pet, I appreciate the areas at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and other dog parks in the city more than words can say. Dogs are a huge part of San Francisco's character and there are already many limits on where they can run free. Please reconsider this plan to limit dog-friendly off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 229    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,31,2013 16:41:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE do not further restrict the off-leash dog areas! Dog owners pay taxes just like everyone else. Limiting off-leash dog areas will only serve to increase the number of under-exercised dogs in the city- insufficient exercise can lead to behavior problems. You want well-behaved dogs in your park? Let them exercise off-leash!

I have dogs and I vote

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 230    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,31,2013 16:56:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disapprove of the restrictions you intend to implement on the current off-leash areas of the GGNPS. I am elderly with a knee replacement. I am unable to physically exercise my dog properly on a leash. He gets better quality of exercise, a more natural form of exercise and socialization in these off-leash areas. Dog owners are responsible people that now only watch after their own animals but are considerate of others'. I see more destructive behavior from children than from dogs. Please let our dogs have a large off-leash area so they can exercise and be better citizens.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 231    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Menlo Park, CA 94025  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---



**Received:** Oct,31,2013 16:59:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe it is important to keep the current areas open to dogs and people. Off-leash activity is a valuable exercise option for dogs and their owners, and should not be restricted. Rather than limiting the areas and singling out dogs and their owners, the public as a whole would be better served by removing those who act irresponsibly, be it dog owners, litter bugs, people harassing wildlife or disturbing sensitive habitats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 232 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,31,2013 17:53:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family is often in the areas impacted by the plan. We have so much joy in watching dogs play in these areas - whether or not we have our dog with us. San Francisco dog owners are conscientious and committed to leading active lives, and extend that to their pets. Please keep with Alternative A - no changes to the current guidelines. Any changes would dramatically impact the quality of life in these communities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 233 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,31,2013 18:21:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is very important for the health of our dogs (and their people) to have open space to run and play. Dogs who are constantly confined to small areas are the ones that get neurotic. Please let us keep the remaining open off-leash dog areas.

Thank You,

JF Sudmann

---

**Correspondence ID:** 234 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,31,2013 18:27:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a resident of Daly City for over 27 years. For the past 18 years I have been enjoying the opportunity to walk my dogs off-leash in the GGNRA areas, in particular, at Fort Funston. Prior to getting a dog, I had never visited the GGNRA areas. Since I became a dog owner, walking my dog in the GGNRA areas that allow off-leash dogs has become a daily activity for me. The opportunity for walking my dog in these areas has become central to maintaining my quality of life and is our main form of recreation, exercise, and socialization. I am writing to you as it is very important to me and many of my friends and family to continue to have access to walk with our dogs off-leash in areas like Ft. Funston and Crissy Field within the GGNRA.

I strongly object to the GGNRA's attempts to restrict or eliminate off-leash dog walking in many areas of the GGNRA. It is not based on solid scientific evidence or objective monitoring and observation of the dog walking areas. I have a degree in Biology and I have had 18 years of closely monitoring these areas as I spend time there. I don't agree with the assumption that it is dogs and their owners that must be removed or restricted from the areas we have access to in order to meet the GGNRA's objectives to:

• Preserve and protect natural and cultural resources and natural processes

• Provide a variety of visitor experiences

• Improve visitor and employee safety

• Reduce user conflicts

• Maintain park resources and values for future generations

I am a responsible dog owner who has taken every effort to make sure that when I am with my dog at Fort Funston, I have voice-control over my dog, I clean up after her, we obey the access restrictions to certain fragile habitat areas, and I am aware of other people who are walking through the area who may not be comfortable with a dog coming up to them. In my experience, it is very rare to encounter anyone who has a problem with dogs using these off-leash spaces. In fact the opposite is true, there have been a number of times when I have met someone without a dog at Fort Funston who is delighted to be in the midst of dogs having fun, running, and playing. There have been people that ask me for an opportunity to pet my dog as they can't have a dog themselves but still love the opportunity to interact with well behaved dogs. It brings a smile to their face, and I have the opportunity to positively impact their experience with dogs in these beautiful spaces.

I would like to see the GGNRA employ options other than restricting access to the GGNRA resources to dogs in order to meet their objectives. Over the years of my nearly daily visits to Ft. Funston, I have seen dog owners take more effort than many other visitors to the area to preserve and protect the areas we visit. Dog owners know we are fortunate to have access to these beautiful spaces near a large city like San Francisco and we work together to make sure that these spaces will be available in the future for others like us who love to spend time with nature, family, and our dogs. There is a strong community of dog owners that use these spaces and these groups would welcome the opportunity to work with the GGNRA to preserve our precious spaces. I'm a member of the Ft. Funston Dog Walkers, SFDOG, and Crissy Field Dog Group. As a member of these groups, I receive news alert emails and reminders to be aware of swallows and other wildlife or native plants when walking. I work together with other members to do monthly clean-ups at Ft. Funston. We value these areas, respect the environment and want to do all we can to preserve this space for future generations. I have seen little in the way of cooperative work between the GGNRA and the dog-owner groups and feel this is a missed opportunity for the GGNRA. These groups are loyal supporters of the areas they visit and want to protect and preserve them.

Change of the public's behavior starts with education. Signs posted along the walking paths could increase awareness of the public to the wildlife and vegetation that needs protection in certain areas. This would allow the public to continue to enjoy these areas and dog owners to become more aware and take steps to control their dogs as needed to protect those sensitive environments. Most of my fellow dog walkers and I heed the few signs that are placed in these areas because we value the environment and feel it is our responsibility as visitors to these wonderful areas to do our part to preserve them. Of course, there will always be a small minority of people who feel the signs and rules don't apply to them. Should the majority of dog owners be denied access to these valuable resources in our SF area because of the behavior of a few irresponsible people? With increased public awareness and education, those who are ignorant of the rules may be encouraged to act in a more responsible manner. Please consider taking steps to educate instead of eliminate people from using these areas. What you do will have an enormous impact on the quality of life for me and other Bay Area residents who love to walk our GGNRA spaces with our dogs. PLEASE KEEP OUR OFF-LEASH SPACES!

**Correspondence ID:** 235 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,31,2013 19:02:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE save Fort Funston as an off-leash dog area for responsible dog-owners and their trained dogs! My active, athletic shepherd-type dog and I hike there at least weekly, usually in the early morning: on the beach, in the woods, along the dunes. We enjoy the solitude, the views, the wide-open spaces, and the opportunity to enjoy a real piece of wilderness inside SF city boundaries. My dog loves to chase her tennis ball in the waves and dig in the sand; we live in a tiny house with a tiny garden where she can't dig- - this is important!!!! She digs a hole in the sand to bury her ball and no one minds. The hole disappears when the tide comes in. People who want to avoid off-leash dogs (and I understand why they do - - I get annoyed with owners who can't stop their dogs from barking or won't train them to come when called. And I have an 86-year old mother who has nearly been knocked over by out-of-control dogs running wild) can choose a different beach to walk on. There are many nearby beaches where dogs are NOT allowed off-leash. Funston is SPECIAL and works amazingly well as a multi-use area. If its regulations change, San Francisco will probably lose another tax-paying, voting, responsible resident (who happens to be a public school teacher). I literally can't live here with my dog if we can't have our fix of Funston at least once a week! (Sometimes during my summer vacation, we are there every day!)

Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 236 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** South Beach Democratic Club Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Oct,31,2013 19:39:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the new rules.

The GGNRA must listen to the majority of people who care for and support NPS operations with volunteer efforts and tax dollars. This new plan caters to a minority of people who think protecting the Eco system at Crissy Field requires drastic changes. To support this radical view they complain about dogs, people, and groups who oppose them.

On any given day most dog owners are responsible people who enjoy the parks. You will NOT find the anti Dog people using the most used section of the park because they complain about everything including not enough parking, poor management, dogs, and it's NOT a gated community with exclusive entry. This is what most of the radicals truly want: a gated entry system so they can pursue federal grant money to study the Eco system at GGNRA expense without interference from dogs and people. The stupidity and pack of lies from the so called Eco radicals must end. The scam that these groups have been using to obtain grant money to further their lies and agenda ends now with budget cuts, and sequester imposed cuts. If the GGNRA does not stand up to this group 20 years from now the Tea party and republicans will sell the parks to private parties for a management fee. Then it's good by GGNRA. You failed in you core mission to protect the parks so we can ALL use them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 237 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,31,2013 20:48:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE HOLD TIGHT TO MORE RESTRICTIVE DOG ON LEASH AT CRISSY FIELD IN SF AND OCEAN BEACH...THIS HAS BEEN A MAJOR PROBLEM FOR MANY OF US...ADULTS AND CHILDREN ALIKE AND YOU ARE CORRECT TO DEAL MORE STRICKLY WITH THIS PROBLEM FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF ALL .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 238    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,01,2013 12:34:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the negative impacts of these sweeping dog park closures. For many urban dog guardians, especially seniors who find it difficult exercise their pets while on-leash, the GGNRA represents the only place where they can allow their dogs to play, romp around and release a lot of energy. Take away this haven for exercise, and guardians may be unable to meet the physical needs of their pets. Daily exercise, like food and water, is essential to a dog's proper health and well-being.

In addition, the GGNRA closures will nearly certainly result in serious overcrowding of dog parks within the City of San Francisco. As dog guardians and dog walkers can attest, the City's dog parks are already quite limited, with off-leash areas being particularly scarce.

The Dog Management Plan should benefit people, dogs and the environment. Striking the balance between dog recreation and natural resource degradation is, of course, important. We all need to help make sure that sensitive habitats and species are not harmed. At the same time, we need to preserve access to these federal lands for diverse constituents, including responsible dog guardians and their pets, so that everyone can enjoy them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 239    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,01,2013 20:10:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep ALL our dogwalking opportunities. For us old people, walking our dogs in these traditional places is how we get our exercise. And they need to run.

Or - give back the park. You agreed to traditional recreational uses when you got it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 240    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** dream conduit studios Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Nov,01,2013 23:56:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** greetings, anyone who even occasionally visits these recreation areas with "normal" rational minds sees that off-lease dogs and their guardians are of zero REAL ,ACTUAL and FACTUAL damage or distress to the GGNRA. as it is, they only have access to 1 percent of the GGNRA properties for dog walking anyways, and taking what little they still have left is just ridiculous! i mean, the dogs have to go somewhere.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 241    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94101  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 02:12:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** These comments refer specifically to Upper and Lower Fort Mason.

Alternative A, no action, appears to be working. Where before unleashed dogs were running free, now, after some ticketing and oversight by the police, things have quieted down. The Great Meadow especially has improved.

One should note that the monitoring of the Great Meadow has diminished somewhat, and with it, more dogs are seen unleashed. But a little action by the nps has made a big difference in usability of this particular area.

Dog walkers have never seemed a problem in this area.

- - - - -

Finally, one has to add, the elephant in the room is the complete collapse of the nps in supervising bike traffic in the area just discussed. The dozens of bikes coming over the hill and speeding at commuter hours going east is a self parody of dangerous and lazy mismanagement.

The nps did fine with dog management, with police scrutiny and ticketing. Now just complete the paradigm with bikes. What are you afraid of?

- - - - -

One note about your question below about preference in hearing about NPS docs in the future. Public posting in the area in question has been very effective - which is what I mean by checking "other".

---

**Correspondence ID:** 242    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 10:08:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Your preferred option for Muir Beach is terrible and poorly thought out. Your plan is unenforceable and will only create confusion and problems. Muir Beach is a dog walking destination and people come with the intent to let their dogs run off leash. Enforcing an on-leash rule will never happen and if NPS rangers actually show up at the beach to write tickets they'd be far better off writing tickets on Muir Woods road for parking.

---

Honestly, it seem the NPS is intent on being a terrible neighbor these days.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 243    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** NSTA Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 11:31:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Steward,

My name is Fred Andrews and I am a retired science curriculum developer for PBS's NOVA series and a consultant for MCET (Massachusetts Corporation for Educational Communication) as well as an author of many environmental and biological books including, "Backyard Biology", "Tracking Dinosaurs", "Zoo Sleuth" and "Plato's Pond", I find your lengthy document (The environmental impact statement downloaded from this website, that among other policies, bans dogs from the majority of Ocean beach in San Francisco) to be short of any scientific basis and long on opinion and politics. This is not be said that in an urban environment such as Ocean Beach in the GGNRA that politics and opinion should not have a significant role in land management. Indeed they should! I just want to state the obvious that dogs and their owners have contributed no more or less to the destruction of a pristine habitat that is to be expected in an urban environment.

In a nut shell dogs and there owners have become the scapegoat for your policy and decision making and that banning them from Ocean Beach will have little to no beneficial impact to the snowy plover or other wildlife in this habitat. It saddens me that in order to appease general opinion of the few and the misguided, I am speaking of the fact-less recommendations of institutions that I am shamefully a member of-namely the Sierra Club and Audubon Society, that dogs are incorrectly perceived as a threat to the well-being of the snowy plover. Indeed there has never been a study done to see if there is a direct impact between dogs the behavior of the snowy plover.

It should be noted that as people making decisions, common sense should be used when creating laws that affect habitat. It is obvious that dogs, ranger trucks, human children, surfers, as well as little old ladies with large pocket books who hate dogs, all contribute to the stress of the snowy plover. They do not however prevent the snowy plover from inhabiting the dunes and upper beach areas of Ocean Beach. Indeed there has been little research in finding out why snowy plovers would choose to use urban areas as habitat when the majority shoreline in their range is much more pristine!

I wish your environmental impact statement would address the real issues, which are how the public perceives dogs in parks, the political support of environmental groups and institutions and actual unbiassed "third party" studies. Once this is achieved then we can have a real debate based on the needs of maintaining a park in an urban setting and meeting the needs of all its biological inhabitants be it ranger, kite flyer, or dog.

Sincerely,  
Fred Andrews

---

**Correspondence ID:** 244    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 13:29:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to any further limitations upon dog walking/the allowance of dogs running freely at the coast line than those that are in place at this time. Fort Funston is the most wonderful SANCTUARY, a BASTION OF FREEDOM that no longer seems to exist anywhere else in the San Francisco/Peninsula area. People POUR into it, even those without dogs; we poured into it even during the shutdown. We need MORE of that, not LESS!!! There is no reason why ecology issues and sound land management cannot coexist with a little FREEDOM for heavens sake!!! I feel outraged!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 245 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 13:59:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a San Francisco resident since 1976 and a Golden Retriever owner since 1982. All three of my dogs have loved Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and Fort Funston. I have many memorable experiences there and these areas are part of what makes living in San Francisco so special. Golden Retrievers love the ocean and these places are the only places that I can take them and let them run off-leash to get the proper exercise they need.

As a dog owner I am more than just a dog lover. I am a dues-paying member of the National Parks and an environmentalist with membership in the Sierra Club, Audubon, the Marine Mammal Center and Greepeace, to name just a few. I take protecting nature quite seriously. I always clean my dog's mess and I always bring an extra bag to remove the beer bottles, fishing lines, plastic and even cigarette butts from the beach. I respect wild life and keep my dog far from mischief.

The Dog Management Plan should benefit people, dogs and the environment. Striking the balance between dog recreation and natural resource degradation is, of course, important. We all need to help make sure that sensitive habitats or species are not harmed. At the same time, we need to preserve access to these federal lands for diverse constituents, including responsible dog guardians and their pets, so that everyone can enjoy them.

I credit my time with my dogs out in the great outdoors that has made me the environmental activist that I am today. To walk along the beach with my dogs and watch the pelicans fly by in formation and the seals, sea lions and porpoises in the bay is a spiritual thing for me. To see from a distance the white egrets and blue herons hunt by the edge of the preserve along Crissy Field takes my worries away.

As a person who has lived with HIV for thirty-five years and who has hearing loss - my dogs have been as vital a necessity for my well being as these special places are. They go hand in hand. I can't imagine one without the other. Please don't take away this experience. Life would be a lot more difficult for me and my dogs without access to these places.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 246 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,02,2013 18:30:58**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Sirs:

We have read through the latest draft Dog Management Plan with a particular focus on Crissy Field. We have been and remain frequent users of Crissy Field for the eleven years we have lived as near neighbors. We are strong supporters of the GGNP Conservancy via membership in the William Kent Society. We took our labrador to Crissy Field for exercise off-leash for most of the years, and while he has passed we still interact with and observe many of the other dog owners. We strongly believe that Alternative A "No Action: Continue Existing Dog Management Policy" is the best alternative for giving the dogs much need running room off leash while not interfering with other users and meeting environmental needs. If there are irresponsible dog owners who pose issues with unruly dogs off leash or failure to pick up waste, these few irresponsible owners and dog walkers can be policed. Restricting dogs to leash-only at Crissy Field is unfair to the very large number of dog owners who use the park responsibly. As an aside, we have experienced more issues with irresponsible non-pet owners at Crissy Field (e.g., noisy, throwing footballs or frisbees that hit people etc. ) than we have with any dog owners.

Park Management should not feel that a change to policy is needed to somehow meet the balanced interest of all parties. All parties can co-habitate and safely use Crissy Field with minor changes to bad behavior of a few offenders. Do not penalize all of the responsible dog owners and their four-legged family members by imposing such a restrictive leash-only policy along most of the waterfront. Please reconsider and go back to Alternative A rather than choosing Alternative F or another restrictive dog-use alternative.

Respectively Yours,  
Michael & Miriam Burnside

---

**Correspondence ID:** 247    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,02,2013 18:49:27**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Ft Funston and Chrissy Field,

The new plan does not go far enough to allow dogs off leash at either location.

I am old enough to remember when this area was added to the GGNRA and I only voted for it under the conditions stated, that there would be no change of use.

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

This document to date is extremely disappointing.

Bye the way, why you would ask someone from the other side of the country to weigh in on a local issue . . . well . . I am going to remember this for the future.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 248 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** PACIFICA, CA 94044-4431

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 20:59:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have a dog and enjoy taking long hikes with her, it is much more satisfying than any dog park around. I frequent many of the trails in my town of Pacifica. Often we are the only ones around and my dog likes to explore of her own without the leash. I do not see a problem with this as long as she is under voice control. I do not understand where all this recent animosity towards dogs in National Parks is coming from, most of us are responsible dog owners. Please remember we vote and pay taxes.  
Debora A Kane

---

**Correspondence ID:** 249 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 23:39:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge you to continue to allow off-leash access for dogs at Crissy Field, Fort Funston and other areas within GGNRA. Responsible dog owners train their dogs to behave themselves at these wonderful places, thereby allowing people, dogs and wildlife to share these spots.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 250 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,03,2013 00:08:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of Alternative A but with permits for commercial dog walkers.

Mostly, I think dogs should be allowed off leash if under voice control. Dogs need to run and they should have some space on trails, so that hikers can have dogs with them. There are already few trails which allow dogs at all and even fewer allow off leash.

Keep at least those trails that are open to dogs open to off leash.

Need some trails, including loops, that allow for off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 251 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,03,2013 01:50:19

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** GGNRA: Please stop ignoring the people of San Francisco, who want to use the park lands to walk their dogs. This is all of our land. We all pay taxes, many of us have lived here for many decades, and we want to live our lives freely and enjoy the beautiful way of life San Francisco has to offer. And we want to do that with our dogs! Most people love dogs, and don't mind them walking on beach lands. Please don't trample the rights of so many good people with your rigid codes, and devastate the way of life of so many dog walkers.

Thank you,  
Dina Wilson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 252    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,03,2013 08:31:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You will best serve the community by continuing to allow off leash dog recreation at all presently available areas at Fort Funston. Fort Funston is, and has been the pre eminent dog exercise area in the Bay Area. The dominant plant species there is Iceplant, and the dominant soil there is sand. The wildlife is birds, and none of these three is damaged or disturbed by off leash dog activities. There are closed sections already in place which are in the main observed by all dog owners. People and dogs need a place where dogs run free. Close every other park to off leash dogs, but leave Fort Funston as it is. Regarding professional dog walkers, limit them to five dogs, and perhaps license them with an appropriate fee to maintain adherence.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 253    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,03,2013 10:47:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge you to adopt Alternative A for Fort Funston. Off leash recreation for dogs is essential for San Franciscan's city living. The alternatives are not reasonable, as dogs are not allowed in state beaches, and most other city parks are very small, so Fort Funston is one of the last voice control recreational areas left. It is also not a pristine natural park and should not be treated by the same rules as other national parks. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 254    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,03,2013 13:29:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've reviewed all the proposed mapping for Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties. I think a better idea for larger areas that have been historically off-leash would be: Instead of completely shutting down off-leash for places like Fort Funston, Land's End and Ocean Beach there be off-leash hours. For example mornings and evenings. I understand the concern at Land's End during high tourist hours (10-5) but not during low tourist hours (5am-10am & 5pm-8pm/closing) Also I think the

dogs in the early morning help to ward off the coyotes in some of these larger areas. It would be a shame if one of our tourists were mauled by one. I have nearly been and if my dog had not been off-leash I would have been. There is a balance to dogs and people and a need for some restrictions in some areas but the changes need a little more flexibility for the larger existing off leash zones. I think it would serve our community better if hours of off-leash dog use were imposed rather than a complete ban of off-leash use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 255    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,03,2013 13:40:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,  
Good Day to You!

I love NPS! I love enjoying our beautiful country! I am writing to oppose the Dog Management plan proposed for Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Crissy Field, etc. I bring my dog to the beach often and he had never caused any problems. He has never caught a bird, or dug up any bird eggs. He is very well behaved. Please allow us to continue to bring our dog to the beach and other areas.

Thank You,  
Zach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 256    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,03,2013 16:03:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have not reviewed all of the draft plan but I do not believe that dogs should be allowed in national and state parks. I think wildlife needs to be protected since humans have encroached on so much of their habitat already. I hike to see wildlife and to feel good knowing that the animals are protected in their environment. I do not enjoy seeing dogs when I hike. Dogs are domesticated animals who still have predator instincts and frighten away wildlife. The national and state parks have tried to compromise by only having certain areas open to dogs or dogs on leash but so many dog owners do not obey the rules. I hike a lot in areas where dogs are not allowed at all and I often see dogs off leash. I hike in areas where dogs are allowed but need to be leashed and most dogs are off leash. Perhaps the park service needs to spend more time educating people why lots of dogs are not good for wildlife. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 257    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,03,2013 17:22:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My wife and I have lived in San Francisco since 1984. We own a small dog and our greatest enjoyment is to visit our local parks. The parks we visit most frequently are: Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and Park Presidio. We are avid walkers and what makes visiting these parks such a

---

wonderful experience is that we can let our dog off leash in many areas. We believe that a healthy dog needs to run free at times. Running on the beach, fetching the ball and meeting the occasional other dog is great fun for both us and our pet.

We have seen great improvements in our parks since we moved here 30 years ago. In all those years we have never experienced a single incident where free roaming dogs interfered with wild life or harmed another visitor.

The vast majority of dog owners are very respectful to our wonderful parkland. In fact - very often the only people we see on walks on Ocean Beach are dog owners.

After studying the maps and reading about the proposed changes to off and on-leash dog access to our parks in the news, we are dismayed that the Park Service is planning to remove so many places that have been open to the enjoyment of dogs and their owners for so many years. I think these changes are unnecessary. They will not benefit wild life or improve the park experience. Instead they will make the park inaccessible to many of its greatest supporters and most frequent visitors.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	258	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,03,2013 20:15:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I live on Lincoln, 5 blocks from the ocean. I would be very sad if I could no longer walk my dog on leash on the beach until stairway 20. I completely agree that they should be on leash in that place, but not having that option leaves my traditional Sunday walks with my husband and dog to be VERY short. Why can't they just be on leash? Alternative E for Ocean beach is perfect!

I don't use Baker Beach as often, but again, I believe it should be open to on-leash all through the beach such as alternative C.

Finally, the Crissy Field alternative where you divide the field into ROLA and on-leash is going to be VERY hard to control. Will there be a fence to delineate the area? I completely agree that East Beach should now be on-leash since so many families with kids come there in nice weather, but the field should not be split in half. I believe that alternative E is fair for everyone.

How about giving trusted citizens a 'license' to patrol the areas. Make it a test or something and give them the power to cite people (not ticket, but register a citation) who do not clean up after or keep their dogs on leash in designated areas? Most of us dog owners would be happy to make sure others do their duty to keep things more free for all of us. I carry extra bags at all times to give to people when they don't clean up after their dogs. The extra policing could make a huge difference.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	259	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,03,2013 21:12:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** There are way too many dogs and dog owners. This city is overrun with dogs and dog feces. The GGNRA is pandering to these crazy dog people. Please ban all dogs (on leash or off leash) from the GGNRA lands. Any areas that allow for dogs would be unacceptable. Parks are for people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 260    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 08:00:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The new policy drastically changes long standing dog policy, severely limiting off leash access. If you visit these parks, you will understand how popular they are with the public.

These are urban parks, enjoyed by the current public.

Your repeated attempts to change these popular parks is creating thousands of enemies of the park service. Dog people tend to like their park rangers, and I wonder if you realize the damage you are doing to public support of parks.

I challenge you to place this on a ballot. Let the people decide.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 261    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Torrance, CA 90505  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 11:24:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This past month my boyfriends father was diagnosed with metastatic cancer. He is currently residing and receiving treatment up in San Francisco. This past weekend we had the opportunity to drive from LA and spend time with him.

While we were there we visited, Fort Funston and Crissy fields with our dogs. I cannot tell you what an impact that made for us in this time of emotional distress. I cannot imagine not being able to allow our dogs that freedom to enjoy theses open spaces, off leash as we did. Truly without these options we could not have spent the weekend up in your great city as we would not have had the facilities to allow our dogs to run and get the exercise they needed.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the restrictions you plan on placing for off leash dogs in these national park areas as this is a draw for tourist that do travel with their dogs.

Sincerely,  
Natalie R. Remacle RN, MSN, CCRN

---

**Correspondence ID:** 262    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 11:30:48

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dog access to GGNP Crissey Field area in general should be very tightly controlled. Wildlife protection should have top priority, as the area is small and heavily used by people. THIS SHOULD NOT BE AN AREA USED BY PROFESSIONAL DOG WALKERS

---

**Correspondence ID:** 263 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sacramento, CA 95819  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 13:26:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support pet dogs to run freely off-leash at area parks. There are recreation areas for all other sports (cycling, bird watching, etc.) but few areas for dogs and their owners.

I think the number of dogs to an owner should be limited and the dogs must be under voice control.

I would also be open to a limited user's tax for off-leash recreation.

Thank you, Liz Kanter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 264 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 13:33:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Your plan for Oakwood Valley is completely wrong. I have walked my dogs there 3 times a week or more for 10 years. It is one of the very few areas where dogs can run off leash. The sensitive wildlife areas are in the hills and the trail is in the valley. How is this going to be enforced? Are you going to waste the valuable time of our few park rangers by having them skulk on the trail, looking for offenders? I do support requiring all dog owners to carry leashes and poop bags.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 265 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 14:24:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for deciding to require leashes on dogs at Muir Beach. Can't tell you the number of times I have witnessed numerous dogs swimming in Muir Woods Creek as it enters the ocean despite numerous signs telling dog owners to keep their pets out of a very environmentally sensitive area. Dogs disturb the birds and the migrating salmon. A very good decision and a long time coming.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 266 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 15:17:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am all FOR restricting dogs at both Muir Beach and the Oak Valley Trail!!! I like dogs, but they aren't being adequately supervised by their owners. I often walk the Oak Valley trail and owners with their dogs on a leash are usually courteous and bring their dogs to heel as we pass. Dog owners with their dogs off leash are a different story. They let their dogs run around out of their view and are not aware of what their dogs do. Even when in their view, these dogs run around in the creeks and chase animals through the under brush and accost others on the trails, often jumping up on people. I was at Muir Beach and watched while dog after dog ran through the protected creek habitat restoral area in full view of their owners! When I pointed out the signs, one owner haughtily pointed to a park ranger who was standing near by. When I told her, she was so intimidated by the hostility of the owners that she didn't dare do her duty and speak to them! When one of us has brought these issues to the attention of an owner (when one could be found) they are hostile and confrontative, almost leading to a fight! It spoils the enjoyment of the area. This problem has gotten so bad that we, who live here in the area, have had to give up on trying to walk these trails. One of the biggest problems is the lack of care by the owners when it comes to picking up after their dogs. I see dog shit all over the place and plenty of baggies of poop that the owners don't feel like taking out wind up all along the trail and often are thrown into the creek. We have to constantly watch our step, not the scenery. Dog owners think that the poop is biodegradable, but forget that their animals carry diseases and parasites, and that any medications their pets are taking end up in the creek where they are toxic to the fish and other aquatic dwellers. It isn't the fault of the dogs, but the owners are behaving badly and it takes all the pleasure out of using the areas by those of us who don't want to have to deal with their dogs and their problems. The fact that dogs are so restricted in other areas (guess why?) means that areas which do allow dogs off leash are getting a concentration of dogs from SF and other places. When the rangers are too intimidated to even speak up, then changing the rules to protect the habitats and enjoyment these precious beautiful resources by everybody, is the only thing left to do. I can't wait to be able to go out on the Oak Valley trail and not see endless piles of dog shit and baggies everywhere! It will be a relief not have to cringe every time I hear a dog coming, not knowing if it will be a pleasant or unpleasant encounter. Thanks for taking on this issue! Dog owners have become organized around their "babies" and are holding the rest of us hostage so they can monopolize these public places. Nature simply can't stand up to this onslaught! Say "NO!" to these bullies!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	267	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,04,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am stunned that the park service is trying to shut this area down for dogs. This is one of the few safe places to walk a dog off leash and I have been doing so for 10 years and have NEVER witnessed or heard of a problem with any dogs on the trail. I cant imagine not having this as a place to bring my family AND exercise my dog...this trail is used more by people walking their dogs than any other trail I know. I read another comments, which I have included below and I firmly agree with her sentiments.

Here's what I wrote:

Your proposed policies are in contradiction to the conclusions you draw in the study. To whit, you conclude that dogs have minimal impact on compacted trails. On the south loop of the Oakwood Valley Trail, where the GGNRA plans to mitigate dogs off-leash, the park service built a compacted trail (built by the Conservation Corps.) Also on the Oakwood Valley Trail, your policy indicates that you want to protect the Mission Blue Butterfly habitat. No lupine grows on either the north or south side of the loop.

I have been heavily involved in the restoration of Oakwood Valley and am well aware of the habitat. I

know the valley trails intimately and have walked each of my dogs there for 35 years. This is one of the only areas to walk dogs off-leash. Your proposals are out of sync with the needs of the population. My experience is that about 85% of the people on the trails are walking with their own dogs, about 15% are without dogs. The only aggressive dog incident I know about was the falsely reported one submitted by a ranger the last time the GGNRA tried to shut down the trail.

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

1. Require and enforce people to CARRY leashes for their dogs. Monitor for voice control.
2. Require and enforce people to clean up after their dogs.
3. Limit professional dog walkers to three or four dogs per outing in all areas.
4. Add a fee onto dog licensure to pay for these services.
5. Use ticketing fees to deter irresponsible behavior. Put fees towards management.
6. Establish a complaint line.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	268	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,04,2013 16:29:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Limiting off leash access at Muir beach is a great idea. Sometimes the beach is a big toilet for dogs who have urinated and pooped all over the sand. Owners rarely clean up after their dogs, and it is a health hazard to children and adults as well.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	269	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,04,2013 17:06:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Alt A on Map 19 A , Cattle Hill Sweeney Ridge area. The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups. Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.				

---

I support map#20-E Alternative E for Pedro Point.  
This area is highly disturbed from past uses, and would be suitable for dog walking on the entire parcel.

I support map 21-A Alternative A for Rancho Corral de Tierra.  
The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.  
Spreading out user groups is key to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.  
Providing expansive dog walking within the Rancho will engage a valuable new segment of trails users in protecting these remote coastal lands.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	270	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 22:02:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner, and previously worked as a trainer of guide dogs for the blind. I am also a home owner in SF, a tax payer, and a frequent user of GGNRA spaces where I walk with my two obedience-trained dogs, for my own exercise and enjoyment as well as theirs.

I am particularly interested in the changes proposed for Sutro Park and Ocean Beach, as these are my neighborhood spaces.

I suggest that Sutro Park and Ocean Beach be entirely open to dog owners walking their own dogs, but restricted to on-leash only, everywhere and all year long. This would include the stretch of Ocean Beach currently protected for snowy plovers, since leashed dogs can be controlled at all times. This would also include the current off-leash areas of Ocean Beach, where I suggest this be changed to on-leash only with the following exception:

In the non-protected areas of Ocean Beach, and in Sutro Park, I suggest that dogs should be allowed off-leash IF (and only if) their owner can show physical evidence (ie the test certificate) of that dog having passed the AKC Canine Good Citizen Test, when asked by any park police officer. Here is a link describing this well-established test: [http://www.akc.org/events/cgc/training\\_testing.cfm](http://www.akc.org/events/cgc/training_testing.cfm)

The AKC Canine Good Citizen Test is readily available to SF dog owners through the SFSPCA training programs as well as through private AKC certified dog trainers. This is the test used to certify Therapy Dogs (one of my dogs serves in the VA hospital). Passing the AKC Canine Good Citizen Test requires significant effort by the dog owner, and demonstrates good temperment, as well as obedience training, of their dog. Here is a link to the SFSPCA test page: <http://www.sfspca.org/programs-services/dog-training/classes/canine-good-citizen>

I am strongly against allowing all dogs to go off-leash on Ocean Beach, or Sutro Park, as I have had several bad encounters with aggressive, uncontrolled dogs in those areas. But I also feel that responsible dog owners who have spent significant time and effort to train their pets, resulting in their dog passing the AKC Canine Good Citizen Test, should not be penalized because of irresponsible owners with unruly, untrained dogs.

The Canine Good Citizen certificate should be a requirement for ALL off-leash dogs, everywhere - - and would be just as easy to verify as checking to see if that dog has a current dog license; just ask the owner to show a current test certificate - - we responsible owners would be happy to do this, and to help inform the public about this change.

I am also not in favor of off-leash dog walking anywhere in the GGNRA for professional dog walkers with the current limit of 8 dogs; I strongly believe that no one can control that many dogs at a time. And I don't think dog owners, walking their own 1 or 2 pets, should be penalized for the excessive use of GGNRA spaces by professional dog walkers.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	271	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94117				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	San Francisco resident Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 22:33:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the preferred alternative in the supplemental EIS. I would prefer more restrictions on dog access to Chrissy Field. It is a sensitive area and already over impacted by human beings. I feel that the dog owner community is uncompromising and unreasonable and many don't use the existing areas in city parks that are designated for dogs. Dogs should not be allowed in GGNRA - they are not allowed in other national parks. That said, I support the preferred alternative because I believe that the NPS has acted in good faith, bent over backwards to accommodate the dog community and I'd like to see this issue come to closure.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 272    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** MILL VALLEY, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,05,2013 09:07:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have taken our dogs to RUN at Muir Beach for the last 39 years. We are responsible pet owners and often clean up the beach of the refuse left by "humans" plastic, bottles, paper uneaten food - if the seagulls haven't found it. The beaches are for everybody families pets etc. Please keep this open for all to use as we always have.]

Our taxes pay for this. You have no right to take this recreation area away from us all. Most dog owners - probably those who live in the area take care of the beach for all to enjoy - especially running dogs. What joy!. We respect nature but give us a break - we all share this planet.

Tony & Lynne Barnard & Alden

---

**Correspondence ID:** 273    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,05,2013 11:15:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** irs:

While you request comments regarding "changes" from the earlier plan, my comment is short, simple and likely one that is shared by the thousands who commented previously. In fact, the reason it became necessary to revise your ridiculous plan was due to the avalanche of negative comments you received and adverse opinion of it. I predict that the revised plan will fail for the following reasons: You don't have the enforcement ability to gain compliance, the majority (albeit a narrow one) both opposes the plan, most important and IT'S OUR PARK TOO, so we will overcome a tyrannical effort by a top heavy, bureaucratic, inefficient agency such as yours to impose a minority view to ban dogs from GGNRA

A few years back, I received a citation from one of your rangers for having my dog off leash on the Oak Valley Trail in southern Marin county. I received a notice to pay a \$50 fine, which I did. A few months later, I was walking my dog one very late afternoon in winter (again off leash) on the same trail. A ranger was hiding behind a tree and confronted me over the infraction of walking my dog in near darkness at a time when no one else was on the trail and gave me another citation.

I never received an opportunity to merely pay a fine for this but was noticed that an appearance in federal court in SF was REQUIRED. I appeared at the appointed time to find 9 others waiting to be admitted to the courtroom. It turns out that all 9 were there for the same offense. I assumed that a second offense required an appearance but after I was informed that all defendants were obligated to meet with a federal public defender before speaking with a magistrate, I began to get nervous. When my turn came to talk to the lawyer ostensibly there to defend me, I asked what the penalty is for a second offense for walking my dog, off leash in the GGNRA? He replied that he didn't think there was a "graduated" level of penalty.. he thought it was a \$50 fine and that was it. After reviewing the CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) a hardback tome of some 10000 pages, he determined that in fact, it is a straight \$50 for any number of multiple offenses. I said, so, in essence, if I want to walk my dog anywhere in any national park/rec area, it costs \$50, an amount less than what it costs to park my car in SF for the day. He suggested that I not mention that attitude to the judge.

Well, here in Southern Marin, we understand that there is a price to be paid for some things. I don't know how many of my fellow dog lovers/walkers know the penalty provisions for walking/running a dog off leash in GGNRA, but I intend to work diligently to educate them. It is my guess that many of them will feel as I do that \$50 is a small price to pay (on the occasions of being caught) for continuing a 25 year practice. And if I am really successful, I expect that I might just overrun your enforcement capacity, overload the court and ultimately overturn this ridiculous example of bureaucracy gone wild, with the sheer volume of like minded people who abhor idiocy and tyranny!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	274	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,05,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not restrict the few places left to walk dogs off leash.				

Your proposed policies are in contradiction to the conclusions you draw in the study. To whit, you conclude that dogs have minimal impact on compacted trails. On the south loop of the Oakwood Valley Trail, where the GGNRA plans to mitigate dogs off-leash, the park service built a compacted trail (built by the Conservation Corps.) Also on the Oakwood Valley Trail, your policy indicates that you want to protect the Mission Blue Butterfly habitat. No lupine grows on either the north or south side of the loop.

This is one of the only areas to walk dogs off-leash. Your proposals are out of sync with the needs of the population. My experience is that about 85% o the people on the trails are walking with their own dogs, about 15% ae without dogs.

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

1. Require and enforce people to CARRY leashes for their dogs. Monitor for voice control.
2. Require and enforce people to clean up after their dogs.
3. Limit professional dog walkers to three or four dogs per outing in all areas.
4. Add a fee onto dog licensure to pay for these services.
5. Use ticketing fees to deter irresponsible behavior. Put fees towards management.
6. Establish a complaint line.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 275    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fremont, CA 94536  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,05,2013 11:27:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand the need for safety and environmental health. I also know that the more people who can connect with a space, the more people will support it. We love that we can take our dogs off leash to Fort Funston. I greatly hope that that will continue. We also love hiking Sweeny Ridge from Sneath Road with our dogs, even though they need to be on leash. We wish that they were allowed off leash, since there is no danger of them disappearing away from the trail, (as it is bordered sharply.) We really rely on that hike as a way to replenish ourselves mentally and physically, with our dogs. I would be so upset if dogs were no longer allowed on that trail, leash or no leash. There are just not many places where one can hike in the San Francisco area without cars.

Thank you,

Kate

---

**Correspondence ID:** 276    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,05,2013 11:48:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm a responsible dog owner. I pick up after my dog, keep her on leash when not in an off leash play area. I also own a home and pay A LOT in property taxes. I pay fees towards teachers associations and don't even have children. NOW YOU WANT TO TAKE AWAY WHERE I CAN WALK MY DOG?

I am writing to urge you to do everything you can to stop the Golden Gate National Recreation Area from implementing its new dog management plan. This plan will cut where people can walk off- and on-leash by 90% compared with where people can walk with dogs now. It is going to create a huge impact on the Bay Area, which we simply cant afford.

I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.

The GGNRA was created in 1972 for the maintenance of needed recreational open space, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. Thats why its designated as a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. With the new dog management plan, the GGNRA is renegeing on its promises to preserve and protect recreational access to the GGNRA.

Don't even get me started about the amount of horse poop that's left along the running trails. I get police

---

officers on horses help protect us but there are many other non-police horses that roam our trails and they don't appear to be under any mandate that they clean up after themselves. And the trash that people leave ALL OVER THE CITY and PARKS is a real issue, hazard to our health and unsightly mess.

There is no credible reason why people with dogs are not allowed to have adequate and reasonable space to walk their dogs in the vast 80,000 acres that comprise the GGNRA. Please take action to stop the GGNRA from imposing this radical plan on the San Francisco Bay Area.

Thank you,  
Rachel Frederick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 277    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,05,2013 12:26:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Affirmative vote for 12A for Baker Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 278    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** SFUSD Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Nov,05,2013 14:38:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello there!

I love dogs so much!!!

But, I do feel that there needs to be some sort of 'accountability' for dog walkers who walk dogs off-leash.

For instance, I work as the teacher on special assignment with the SFUSD Environmental Science Center at Fort Funston.

Our site at Fort Funston is beloved, and has served SFUSD for ~40 years. The site works well to provide SFUSD's underserved population a no-cost overnight to experience the joys of nature.

During my first year as TSA for this site, it has been interesting to see the massive dog walking population at the site. When I am not with the students, I often go up to chat, and pet the dogs, and truly appreciate that there is a majestic space where dogs can get their mental and physical stimulation in 'play dates' with other dogs.

yet, I do believe that these spaces are shared space, and there needs to be a heightened sense of responsibility with some of the dog walkers. the students we work with often see countless plastic dog poop bags littering the trails, and dogs trampling through the native restored areas, which is one of the primary areas we work with our students.

while I do value off leash areas, I do see that these areas are not taken care of and respected, and dog owners need to be accountable to clean up after themselves. I don't know what the solution is to this, but

just wanted to provide commentary on this.

Thank you for the open forum.  
Lisa Wojcik

---

**Correspondence ID:** 279    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,05,2013 15:43:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I walk my dog on Oak Valley Trail a few times a week. In my experience 80% of the people on the trail are walking dogs. I have only once seen a dog that I felt was not under voice control and well behaved.  
Most people pick up after their dogs and ensure they are well behaved.  
I walk early in the morning and late in the evening. I would not feel safe doing that without my dog.

I also enjoy weekends on Muir Beach.

Please don't disenfranchise all of us. We love our walks and dogs. Won't walk without my dog

Karen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 280    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,05,2013 17:41:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let us take our dogs to the parks as long as they are on leash

---

**Correspondence ID:** 281    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,05,2013 18:45:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is important to allow dogs on as many trails as possible. I understand that occasionally there is a need for dogs to be on leash on some trails and that is alright as dogs can still get their exercise while the owners are enjoying their parks. Sweeney Ridge is one of those trails we especially enjoy using with our dogs. We meet many people on the trail with their dogs who all love enjoying the trail with their dogs. If our dogs can't be on the trail, it means a large number of us will not be using the trails.

There also needs to be some trails that dogs can be off-leash. It is important for dogs to learn to walk with their owners under voice command.

---

Please continue to allow dogs on Sweeney Ridge and as a general policy ensure some trails are available where dogs can be off-leash.

Many thanks for your consideration,

David Kiachko

---

**Correspondence ID:** 282    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,05,2013 19:20:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 283    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 09:43:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I continue to horrified by the draconian laws enacted against pet owners. I cannot enjoy ANY national park with my golden retriever nationwide. That is incredibly unfair, and disproportionately burdensome for taxpayers. We should get a tax credit for our inability to enjoy national resources which we fund.

But more importantly, simply cannot enjoy our "America's Best Idea" when I travel. There's no chance I will leave my family me in a kennel, or locked in the car.

Until I have the same access as others, I will not be voting for park funding.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 284    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 09:47:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I see that there has been one violation of the existing dog rules in Oakwood Valley and it looks like that violation happened on a paved road in Tennessee Valley, so I'm guessing that might

---

have been the road to Tennessee Beach, not near the Oakwood Trail.

The preferred option would put dogs on leash on the Oakwood fire road / trail. I walk this loop daily with my dog, at different times of the day. What I observe is that most of the people who use this trail, especially during the week, are people with off-leash dogs. The dogs stay on the road with their owners, with few exceptions. It is one of the few places where people can walk freely with their dogs and it is greatly appreciated. It has become a community. A community of people who love the valley and love their dogs.

I see that the two environmental reasons for restricting dogs are protecting the mission blue butterfly and the spotted owl.

I have often seen mission blue butterflies in my back yard in Tam Valley - a back yard that has a dog. They seem to like the elfin thyme growing in the yard.

Please let us continue walking freely with our dogs on this short loop of land on the edge of GGNRA.

Best regards,  
Barbara Robertson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	285	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94705 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,06,2013 14:54:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	While I understand that there are many more dog owners than ever in the history of the park (as there are more children, park users, people etc) please do not restrict or eliminate off leash dog areas as much as this plan includes. It is possible to encourage responsible stewardship of our dogs- on & off leash- and eliminating off leash areas will only lead to more "incidents" as those off-leash dog-owners are marginalized into smaller & smaller areas.				

The park is huge and if you gave over even a small area of the park to the percentage of population dog-owners as an off leash area, it would be amazing.

I am not asking for THAT much, but a lot more than you are offering.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	286	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,06,2013 16:19:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As far as I can see reading the proposed documentation for the NPS Dog Plan, the NPS has ignored the majority opinion in resisting the curtailment of people walking their dogs and enjoying a healthy activity. The NPS can't have failed to grasp, after the last round of scoping, that the majority of people want to be able to walk their dogs off leash in more areas than the NPS currently				

---



propose. Further this latest round of recommended legislation is even more restrictive than the NPS's initial scope. Why?

NPS evidence is at best unsound and uses unproven statistics and the NPS is guilty of collusion with a very privileged few organizations.

What is the point of spending the government's money to seek opinion if that opinion is to be utterly ignored? What is the point of seeking our opinion a second and third time to only ignore the majority will?

The NPS actively encourages the introduction of more and more people into fragile areas of the ecosystem the result of which is far more destructive than the much fewer people who want to walk their dogs and enjoy an hour of recreation.

Muir Beach and Stinson Beach is a disaster of debris and garbage after every weekend: bottles, cans, used diapers, detritus of fires never adequately extinguished, overflowing trash receptacles even when people bother to use them, trashing of provided bathrooms, on and on ad infinitum. I live here and I see it every weekend and holiday.

I have lost all faith in this process of "scoping and public comment". It's a cynical exercise in PR and a panacea to those of us who believed we might have a voice. It seems that the NPS made up their mind at the beginning as to how this plan was to take shape and have moved through the motions so that they can say they did. ... You're not listening to us and you never intended to. The notion of Park Conservancy is a joke.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 287    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 16:29:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please read this. I don't only have comments but I also have a suggestion that might work for everybody.

I feel like the park service is spending a lot of money to promote more people going to places like Muir Beach and Tennessee Valley beach by creating toilets, picnic areas and extended parking. We live in a world with an ever extending population putting more and more pressure on each other's needs. We cannot just alleviate this problem by excluding one group from certain areas.

Dogs don't create problems. People who don't take responsibility for the environment they live in do and it doesn't matter if those people are mothers with children, people in cars, runners or mountain bikers. I don't feel you can restrict just one group of people.

I know there are people out there that don't train their dogs and there are people like me that are working very hard to train their dog and I'm very proud of my well behaved friend.

I have a suggestion. I think it might be an interesting idea to have people after 1 year of owning a dog, go to the humane society to have their dog evaluated. If it is well trained it will receive an -A- badge, If not a -B- or a -C-. Dogs with an -A- badge will have more freedom than dogs with a C badge. An -A- badge might mean off leash while -C- badge means on-leash and B off leash in restricted areas. The dog can be re-evaluated on a yearly basis and upgrade their badge if training is successful. If a dog creates problems the badge can also be downgraded.

I think this would be a very fair way of dealing with dog issues.

Another note I would like to make is that if you ban dogs in certain areas you will end up with a

---

concentration of dogs in other areas and I can only foresee problems with that.

I do see the problem of the pressure our environment is under but I don't see how you can argue that this problem is created by dogs. I think this problem is being created by people.

I hope you really read our comments but I have to say that my feeling is that the NPS has already made up their minds and that this is just an exercise of false democracy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 288    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 19:56:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love walking my dogs on the beach in Muir Woods. We try to be clean and respectful and enjoy such a wonderful place. Often, in winter and on week days ,we are there with only 2 or 3 other dog owners. There just are not enough off leash areas to take you dogs, (and with Rodeo Beach having such fierce undertows, I am terrified when walking there). The beach use during summer's 3 busy months keep me away at prime time (hot days and week ends) without regulations or limitations. I would be very upset to have the off leash area limited or eliminated. I am not happy that you have proposed this. I worked for years to be able to retire here and walk my dog at the beach. Many places would have been easier and I could have retired earlier, but I loved going to the coast for a long walk at Muir Beach. Pleasedon't ruin my dreams.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 289    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 20:57:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I know at this point I'm supposed to say something measured, calm, and respectful. But here's how I really feel:

I am completely disgusted at the unrelenting, ceaseless attack by the National Park Service to vastly infringe on the ability of pet owners like myself to enjoy our public lands with our pets. The truth is that I and millions of my fellow citizens will rarely if ever take advantage of our public lands if this unprecedented assault on our rights to enjoy them is allowed to go through. I, like the vast majority of dog owners, carefully pick up after our pets (and others when the occasional owner irresponsibly or careless fails to) and my dog is always under voice command. The whole explanation that dogs need to be banned or leashed to save some birds is a ridiculous canard. Over the last twenty years I've owned two, very active Australian Shepherds, and not once has either of them ever caught a bird. Perhaps, this has been overlooked, but you might note that they have wings and can fly. Catching a bird is unquestionably a very rare event that I cannot ever recall having seen. I would further note that these precious birds whose wellbeing evidently trumps the interest of every other living being have rest of the California coast enjoy, where days if not weeks no doubt go by between their being disturbed by a human, much less a dog.

Muir Beach and the rest of the areas under consideration for these draconian measures are designated recreational areas. They are literally within the very large San Francisco metropolitan area where, despite the Park Service's fervent wishes, human beings would like to enjoy them with their families, including their pets. When this land was transferred to the Federal government under the mistaken belief that it could be trusted to hold it for purposes it was given, recreational use, off-leash dog walking was a long-

established practice that was expected to continue.

This outrageous attempt to trample our rights on our land (yes, they are our lands, not the private reserves of the Park Service), has caused me and a great number of people to lose respect for that federal agency. Previously, I thought well of their efforts to preserve our natural resources. Now, I and many others look at them with disdain; they are the officious, obnoxious, heavy hand of the federal government, solving problems that don't exist and destroying little-by-little, but unrelentingly (Dakes Bay Oyster Company anyone?) that which made this region such a special place to live. I am hardly the only one disgusted. The backlash in people's attitudes toward this oppressive agency is reaching a tipping point.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 290    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 21:42:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a frequent user of the Oakwood Valley trail. It is a wonderful trail and is enjoyed by many local residents like myself. Many users of the trail bring their dogs and benefit from being able to let the dogs off leash. Please do not implement Map F for this area as it would be bad for the people of this area. Please keep Oakwood Valley as an off leash area (Map A).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 291    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 21:47:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that Oak Valley should remain open to dogs off leash because obviously it's not dogs hurting environment, its people because dogs have been here from the beginning and the LAND didn't get screwed up with dog; it's people bulldozing it to build their pristine homes. I've been using this with my dog since my childhood and have seen very little dog-to-human contact, and very little harm that has been done to the environment by people. If the trail is unable to be accessed by dogs, this piece of beautiful land will be ignored.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 292    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,07,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Please do not restrict the few places left to walk dogs off leash.  
Your proposed policies are in contradiction to the conclusions you draw in the study. To wit, you conclude that dogs have minimal impact on compacted trails. On the south loop of the Oakwood Valley Trail, where the GGNRA plans to mitigate dogs off-leash, the park service built a compacted trail (built by the Conservation Corps.) Also on the Oakwood Valley Trail, your policy indicates that you want to protect the Mission Blue Butterfly habitat. No lupine grows on either the north or south side of the loop.

---

This is one of the only areas to walk dogs off-leash. Your proposals are out of sync with the needs of the population. My experience is that about 85% of the people on the trails are walking with their own dogs, about 15% are without dogs.

Here are several alternative solutions to closing trails and beaches. They are less expensive solutions for land management and people management: 1. Require and enforce people to CARRY leashes for their dogs. Monitor for voice control. 2. Require and enforce people to clean up after their dogs. 3. Limit professional dog walkers to three or four dogs per outing in all areas. 4. Add a fee onto dog licensure to pay for these services. 5. Use ticketing fees to deter irresponsible behavior. Put fees towards management. 6. Establish a complaint line.

Thank you.

Chris Neal

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	293	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,08,2013 09:55:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm wondering why I cannot walk with my dog from my home adjacent to the Countyview Trail to Muir Beach. I can go up to a certain point with a dog on leash and then in the middle of nowhere I have to turn around. Why is a dog OK on one trail and not another?				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	294	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,08,2013 09:59:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I suggest that all involved in the planning process visit the Mill Valley dog park on at least 6 separate occasions at different times of the day. including Friday afternoon around 5. You will experience the peaceful and joyful interaction among dogs, of all sizes and types, which are under voice control. You will also see the positive interaction among members of the community, young and old, as the dogs frolic peacefully.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	295	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,08,2013 14:25:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	A tired dog is a good dog.				

---

A dog on leash never gets anywhere close to the amount of exercise that he does off leash. On leash, dogs are restricted, less stimulated, they grow frustrated and angry, energy builds up and has

---

nowhere to be released. Their behavior, in turn, can become destructive, reactive, impulsive and unpredictable.

A wired dog is a not so good dog.

To quote and reiterate comments I have read and profoundly agree with...

"I oppose the draft foundational purpose and all management alternatives for park lands in Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo counties. The goal of the Plan should be to increase, not decrease, recreational use. These lands are part of local communities where millions of people should be actively encouraged to continue enjoying regular relaxation, exercise, and inspiration that make it one of the most valued and visited lands in America.â€”â€”The GGNRA is not the equivalent of the vast Yosemite wilderness and should not be misrepresented as an idealized "backcountry". Neighborhood trails and beaches should not be managed to artificially exclude people so that a selected few have "solitary" and narrowly defined recreational experiences and expect others to drive farther away and increase crowding in a few small 'diverse opportunity' areas."

My daily off-leash walks with my dog, at Land's End and Fort Funston are my exercise, my therapy, my church, my meditation, my vitamins. I am enthralled by the nature I have the privilege to immerse myself in. From the plethora of flora, to the sparkling black sand and wondrous birds. Never knowing what fascinating creatures the receding tides will reveal. The hawks I marvel at through my binoculars and the thrill of spotting a dolphin pod or playful sea lions sunning themselves in the distant waves. I share these joys with my dog and with so many other people enjoying these extraordinary spaces.

I am a responsible dog owner. In areas where there are a lot of people and picnics and kids, I choose to put my dog on leash. And in areas that are open and sparse, he is free to explore, people calling to him, where he is happy to greet them with a friendly sniff, welcoming a friendly pat. I believe in caca karma, and often carry other people's pooh bags along with my own to the nearest trash can. I've seen other equally responsible dog owners do the same.

I have not, nor can I explore a large portion of the GGNRA parks because they are already closed to dogs. The whole point of being out walking in nature is to share it with my dog. Why would I leave him home and go walk myself?

The thought of our tax dollars paying a salary for someone to ticket me because I have chosen to live my life in an all-encompassingly healthy and balanced way, utterly astounds me.

Instead of going backwards to match other cities in their restrictions and limited thinking, I wish that the GGNRA would continue to be the trailblazer that SF has always been, to do things better. To do things that have for years, clearly proven that they work and to build upon that.

People are happy and healthy because their dogs are happy and healthy. I've read many biographies of people looking back on their lives recalling that some of their most treasured moments are the walks they shared with their dogs. Nothing more pure and simple than that.

With your new and severe restrictions to substantially fewer areas where dogs can be at all, and almost no areas where they can be off-leash, these areas will become overcrowded, worn and rundown. The increased tension of the gathering of a higher concentration of dogs in these limited spaces, having had substantially less exercise, can create conflicts and inevitably aggressive situations with grave repercussions.

I moved to SF a year and a half ago, amazed to discover that I landed in doggie paradise. A city and its

magnificent surroundings, that welcomed and celebrated dogs. A city that finally got it. That understood that if it treats its dog owning residents with respect, that they in turn would behave in no less a manner.

Dogs in large and small numbers pass each other on the streets, in the parks, on trails and on beaches, playfully, peacefully, and naturally. They've figured it out. They are social and socialized. A dog yanked back on his leash instills a sense of defenselessness which can immediately translate to aggressiveness. No leash, no problem.

We are incredibly lucky to live in magnificent Northern California. In all the places and cities I've lived, I have never met so many conscious, responsible, respectful and aware people who so greatly appreciate how blessed we are to be here. Please enable us to continue to celebrate that, in our freedoms, in our choices, in our cherishing and sharing of our beloved natural wonders, with our very best canine friends by our sides.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Saxon

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	296	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,08,2013 17:11:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am writing to support increased restrictions of off and on leash dog access in GGNRA, especially in the Ocean beach area. As a long time local resident, I am concerned that the interests of a narrow class of users ( dog owners) are being place above those of both wildlife and the greater public. As a long time local resident and beach user, a day at the beach virtually never passes when I do not witness off leash dogs harassing sea birds ( in restricted areas) while their owners refuse to control them, even when politely asked. Also the large number of dogs using the beach areas daily turn it into essentially a dog urinal, despite the fact that children, surfers, sunbathers, etc. should be entitled to a beach free of waste from domestic pets. Thank you for considering the interests of both wildlife and the greater public in supporting continued restrictions on dog usage in our National Recreation area.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	297	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Austin, TX 78704 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,09,2013 08:02:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As a former resident and frequent visitor to Marin and San Francisco counties, I want to express how much having leash free areas in the GGNRA for dogs contributed POSITIVELY to the quality of life for people and their dogs.

People benefit positively from dogs and dogs have a real psychological and physical need for open space and the ability to exercise without being on a leash; people also have this need! Dogs - and people - have an innate need to spend time in a natural setting, which the GGNRA provides.

The issues that NPS presents as problems with dogs in these areas is really an issue with a small minority

---

of badly-behaved dogs and their owners. These issues can be easily remedied by requiring those offending dogs to be on a leash, or barring those particular dogs from the areas. This could easily be accomplished by having citizens report to the NPS staff - as they do now - which dogs and their owners are causing the problems. The answer is NOT draconian over-reach by the NPS to cause the majority of dogs and dog owners (tax payers) be disallowed their rights to public recreational lands.

I am certain that responsible dog owners could actually help the NPS create a positive environment for the public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 298    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 12:19:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs should not be allowed in National Recreation areas. If dogs are allowed in some restricted areas they should ALWAYS be on leash. Please protect the natural flora and fauna and the visitor experience by banning dogs whenever possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 299    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 21:13:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for all of your hard work on this. It is clear that you are listening to varied groups and trying to balance a lot of factors.

If I'm understanding Alternative F, the NPS preferred alternative, I'm supportive of this proposal. I've been living in the city for 17 years, now have a wife and 2 kids (7 and 4) and frequently enjoy East Beach (and the far West beach). We have had numerous unfortunate encounters with dogs during our time visiting the beach. We are dog lovers and plan on getting one in the near future, but think it isn't fair to everyone to have dogs running around off leash. My kids have been knocked over, our food eaten, our toys urinated on (sorry to say) and had dogs tearing across our blanket and shaking off their water all over us. I think having East beach as dog-free (except of course for ADA dogs which should be able to go anywhere) will be welcomed and keep San Francisco family friendly.

I like that there is a designated place to run the dogs (central beach) which isn't as crowded.

I wasn't able to tell if the western beach (by Petite Baleen, etc.) would be dog-free (or dog-leashed), but think that would be beneficial as it is also a crowded family area.

Thanks for doing this.

Ron

---

**Correspondence ID:** 300    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 21:48:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** SAVE OFF LEASH!

Off leash dog walking in GGRNA's off leash areas greatly increases me and my pooch's quality of life on a daily basis. Reducing off leash in GGRNA will cause severe and unsafe crowding in other off leash areas within GGRNA and other San Francisco Parks.

In a time when our country is trying to rebuild its economy is not the time to make changes that negatively impact many dog walking businesses and the other pet businesses they support.

Please do not make changes to off leash in GGRNA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 301    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Beaumont, CA 92223  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 22:30:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Keep dogs off leashes. There are limited areas for dogs in the city, this is a place for them to exercise, stay active, and enjoy freedom. Dogs deserve to have a place where they can be dogs. I vote against this action. Changing this will also affect local pet businesses. Do what's right for the animals and the citizens of your city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 302    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,09,2013 23:06:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Save off leash!

We need quality sane time outside with our loving pets.  
That is the best time of my grueling day. Please don't  
Restrict that!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 303    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---



**Received:** Nov,10,2013 12:03:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't shut down the off-leash dog play area in GG Park! This is the only fully fenced-in park within a reasonable trip on public transit from my home, and my dog and I love going there every week. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 304 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,10,2013 12:16:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I walk with my dog - a 14 lb Cotton - at Rodeo Beach every weekend morning that I am not working and would really hate for this to end. I would in fact be willing to pay for the privilege to walk my dog off leash at Rodeo. Dog owners could, for example, pay \$150 per year for a permit proceeds of which could be use for beach cleaning/maintenance as well as enforcement of "dog rules" (e.g., fines for lack of dog feces clean up, aggressive dog behavior, etc.). This would be a small price to pay for the ability to visit such a magical place with our friends.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 305 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,10,2013 14:00:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please find a way to make sure dogs walkers keep their dogs on a liesh and are held responsible if they choose to neglect this rule which is for everyone's safety.

Sincerely,  
Matthew

---

**Correspondence ID:** 306 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,10,2013 16:01:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA must protect and preserve the parklands. The growing population of dogs is invasive to a sensitive and natural environment. The parklands are increasingly becoming dominated by dogs. All park goers- -not just dog owners- -should have the opportunity to safely enjoy the parklands.

A recent visit to Chrissy Field felt like being in the middle of an off-leash dog park. We could not relax and enjoy the view. Dogs were bumping into us, kicking up sand and shaking water all over our clothes. In addition, dogs were chasing the shore birds and pooping in the sand. It was a shame that such a beautiful area had "gone to the dogs".

Dog owners are often not aware of how their dogs impact other trail users and wildlife. Many dogs are not under voice control. It seems many people do not understand what that means. They think the dog is

under control until it encounters the unfamiliar. An example would be the Pit Bull who recently attacked an Officer's horse.

I strongly urge GGNRA to take control of it's parklands. Loose dogs should be confined to a fenced-in area. Dogs should be on a leash in the majority of the parklands. Leash laws need to be strictly enforced.

I have been a professional Dog Groomer for the past twenty years. I'm a dog enthusiast and dog owner.

I support the proposed GGNRA changes to dog policy.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	307	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,10,2013 17:53:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

I was at Fort Funston yesterday. There were hundreds of people with their dogs, there were surfers in the waves, and people watching the dolphins. It was crowded: this is an urban park in a densely urban area. It was a great day.

We need to preserve the space for the people who use it intensively. I disagree strongly with the proposal to limit dog areas. You've heard the arguments, I'm sure, so I won't repeat them all here. But really, it's silly to try to create a wilderness experience in a place where lots of people need park access. Your plan essentially closes the park to nearly everyone who wants to use it. I'm kind of amazed that you'd advance this idea. I usually love the park service, but you've really misunderstood what people in San Francisco want. Let go of this ridiculous plan, and offer local folks a way to use more of the space, not less of it.

please don't hesitate to contact me for more - - Patrick Ball.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	308	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,10,2013 20:58:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog owner and Parent of 3 young children I welcome the enforcement and request dogs on leash at Sutro Park. I have had my young children jumped on and knocked over to the floor by dogs more than 5 times in the past 6 years and I have had to kick unleashed dogs off my kids. The part that is most disturbing is that the dog owners don't pay attention to their dogs when they are off leash. Additionally when I am out with just my dog on a leash other dogs charge us. It is not safe at all for kids and we have a lot more kids now in the neighborhood. We all go to the park at the same time after work dog owners and kids and there is no enforcement officers to provide a safe environment for kids. The same is for Kelly's Cove (the area of Ocean Beach under the Cliff House). My kids have been attacked several times and the dog owners have told me that dogs are equal to humans and not to kick their dog off my kids. Let me ask you - is a dog equal to a human? If a dog kills or attacks one of my kids are they still equal? I				

---

feel that where I live in SF Outter Richmond dogs rule and kids have to deal. I would like leashes enforced. If I can leash my dog for the safty of others, can't we all?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 309    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San FRancisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,10,2013 22:18:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I totally support god strict leash laws in the GGNRA.

While this "urban park" is next to high density dog ownership, the parks or for people in nature, and dogs, while natural, are natura predators of much of the wild life there.

Even more problematic is the fact that often urban dogs are not well trained on appropriate park behavior especially in really open spaces, not just pocket parks.

Don't let the dog crowd overwhelm good land management. I own pets, and really feel that they do not have more rights that people citizens.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 310    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,23,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** G.G.N.R.A,

My name is Barbara and I have been going to Ft. Funston for over 30 years. I have many fond memories and have found solace there, when things weren't going so well.

I am concerned about the environment and want other generations to enjoy Ft. Funston and all of mother natures domains. I've been around for over 60 years and I think people do more damage to the environment than animals, including dogs. Restricting the dogs to a small area is going to create frustration. I do not like having my dogs on a leash all the time. Dog parks can be nice, but there aren't that many. I have to drive to mine and its very small. I love coming to Ft. Funston. My dogs can run, swim, and play with other dogs for hours and I get a nice work-out. Tourists are amazed that San Francisco has such a place and I haven't ever seen a sad person who complains. More and more people are going there because there aren't any places quite like it. I wouldn't mine volunteering or paying a small fee, if you keep it like it is. Dogs to a service to mankind by search rescue, guide dogs, service dogs security work. They make people happy. I think thats why San Francisco has so many.

The G.G.N.R.A. has done work there before, but the fences are falling, the landscape is changing, and more military structures are showing. Dogs didn't do anything except trample ice plants and dig some holes. Now more wild flowers and strawberries are growing. There are lots of crows and some sea birds, but I don't think it would be a good place for mammals. Harg. #1 would be a killing field as they try to get to Lake Merced for water. Ft. Funston hasn't changed that much is 30 years and Mother Nature is more in charge than the G.G.N.R.A.!

Barbara, Zeus Hera

---

**Correspondence ID:** 311    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,26,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** September 24, 2013

Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Bldg 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Ref: Dog Management Plan and Draft EIS

Dear Mr. Dean:

For minimum public safety any dog in the National Park should be on a leash.

There should be no off leash areas for two reasons: first, as you know, many dog owners will abuse that privilege by allowing their dogs unleashed into leash areas.

Second, dogs are animals and therefore totally unpredictable, as anyone who has been around them and whether bitten or not can attest. Even when on leash they injure people, particularly large size dogs that owners cannot control. For that reason I believe the study is remiss in not addressing the hazard of large size dogs in the park.

Crissy Field should have no off leash area, dogs should be banned from Crissy. People use it. Dogs attack joggers and walkers and I have seen the result of dog of attacks there- - even when the dog is on leash

Sincerely;

Charles P. Burns

---

**Correspondence ID:** 312    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Sep,18,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Dean,

Please explain how the powers that be in the GGNRA failed to carve out a few acres at Rancho de Corral for off-leash dog walking, while providing off-leash areas at both Ft. Funston and Crissy Field. Rancho de

---

Corral is vast in size, 3,000 acres, and lies in a semi-rural part of the country. I would have thought its locale and decades-long tradition of usage primarily by canines and their companions would have made it the ideal choice for an off-leash area. Please take a second look at your "preferred" option.

I am a resident of Montara and have walked my dogs in the open space since 1977. I am appalled to learn that the GGNRA wants to ban dogs from the back of Montara and Moss Beach!

I have come to the conclusion that POST was a superior custodian of the land - less intrusive and maintained positive relations with the community. Certainly, no local citizen was ever assaulted by one of POST's representatives. Dogs and their owners were respected and welcomed and, to my knowledge, there were no negative repercussions during POST's tenure.

I will attend your public meeting.

Diane Miles  
P.O. Box 13  
Montara, 94037

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	313	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Santa Rosa, CA 95409 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,17,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Golden Gate National Parks Building 201, Fort Mason San Francisco,CA 94123-0022				

Sept. 11, 2013

Dear Golden Gate National Recreation Area,

I would like to applaud your efforts to limit dogs in the recreation areas. I fully support these efforts. In addition, when I read about the Park Ranger who stood up to an irate dog owner and disciplined him, I was in full support.

I have often encountered dogs whose owners have taken them off leash. When the dogs go to the bathroom off the trail, the owners pretend not to notice and do not clean up after them. Additionally, these dogs may have run through poison oak and then run up to people or other dogs, with the potential of spreading poison oak to people.

I also note that when I ask the question "Shouldn't your dog be on a leash?," the answers are often hostile with shouting, name calling and use of profane language etc. This is a danger to myself ( a single senior citizen and person of color) which I am glad the GG NRA is willing to address and try to limit.

Lastly, I note that as a scientist with a B.S. and M.S. in the biological sciences and a career in an environmental agency, dogs do impact and degrade the natural environment.

Please feel free to use my comments, but do not use my name. Angry dog owners can take

reprisal.

Thank you for your attention,

Fay Shon  
522 Jackson Dr.  
Santa Rosa, Ca. 94509

---

**Correspondence ID:** 314    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 11:36:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am wholeheartedly in support of more dog management, really in \*any\* area of san francisco. I appreciate the rights of dog owners and their love for their companions, but having to avoid walking in poop, seeing dogs off leash charging at my children, and otherwise having to \*avoid\* dogs to just get around on the weekends is ridiculous.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 315    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 11:53:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This proposal does NOT provide sufficient access for on- and off-leash recreations for dogs and their people in Crissy and Ft. Funston, in particular. It will degrade what was intended as a recreation area for the residents of San Francisco, where our dogs outnumber our children. Your revision did not adequately address concerns to this effect raised from the prior proposal. This proposal must NOT go into effect as currently written.

I support protection for endangered species, and for enforcing leash laws where birds are at risk. That does NOT require eliminating access from such broad areas as indicated in the current proposal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 316    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 13:05:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose restrictions to dog walking on beaches. I favor the status quo. We are in a city, and those beaches have not been wild for over a century. Restoration of native plants, wilderness experience are all great concepts, but they do not work in a densely populated area. This area was set aside for recreation, and this should remain its primary function. The restoration of habitat and native plants can be done on other stretches of the coast. The beaches in San Francisco and the headlands should be accessible to all. Like many people, I got a dog for companionship but also because he forces me to go out and exercise. While I do not go to Ocean Beach or Fort Funston often with my dog, I would never go without him: my time for exercise is limited, and any walk I take must include the dog. Closing the beach

---

to the dogs means pretty much closing it to many of their owners. If getting rid of people on beaches is the goal, which I suspect it is, indeed closing the beaches to dogs is the way to achieve it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 317    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 19:40:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In April of 2013 the perennially dog friendly East Bay Regional Park District's Board voted unanimously to amend Ordinance 38 adding significant controls and limitations for dogs and their owners accessing the EBRPD's system. The basis for this ruling was public safety and environmental preservation. I ask that the National Park Service at least rise to the level of EBRPD's action.

As a dog and horse owner and lifetime Bay Area resident, I support a strictly enforced version of the Dog Management Plan. Environmental issues are important, and dogs by their nature and through no fault of their own are invasive and can be disruptive to local wildlife and fauna. That should be obvious to all parties. Other places besides the most pristine areas of our State should be identified where these wonderful animals can roam and play, which are not as destructive to sensitive natural habitat.

These are some of the most aesthetically stunning places in the world, and having dogs running wild while residents and tourists, old and young, attempt to enjoy these beautiful places begs the question "who does this belong to?". Many of these places have become off-leash dog dominated.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 318    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,11,2013 19:53:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off leash dog walking areas should be available for each park, as each park serves a separate community. Depriving neighbourhoods around those areas (such as Lands End) of a park to let their dogs off leash is not sustainable, and will be difficult to enforce. The best way to balance the need to protect trails from dog damage, and to provide a space for dogs is to always present an alternative area for off leash walking. I can see an effort at that at Ocean beach for instance, but Lands End needs a ROLA area, as does the East end of Ocean Beach. The middle beach section is too small, and not very accessible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 319    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 00:54:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was at Ocean Beach this afternoon and had a lovely time. I was delighted to see so many beautiful, joyous, playful, glorious dogs bounding around. I don't have a dog, and am more of a cat person, truth be told. However, dogs need to run around at the beach- -and dogs generally are an enhancement to people's experience at the beach. Dogs need to be part of the Ocean Beach experience.

---

Ocean Beach is huge. There is certainly enough room to allow dogs to be off leash with voice control. I read as much of the 1500 pp report as I could, and yet I don't remember which Alternative I'm referring to, but I think dogs should NOT be on leash a Ocean Beach, and do NOT think there should be a restricted or controlled dog area. I find the assertion specious that there needs to be uniformity of NPS policies. There are so many variables from site to site. I might have a very different opinion of another NPS site. As to the piping plover areas of Ocean Beach - - they should be marked clearly as such, with clear signage indicating "NO DOGS - PROTECTED AREA," but that is sufficient.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 320    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** SFSU Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 09:54:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As of 0853 PST 11/12/2013 I am unable to download ANY documents.

I get the following response: Failed - Network error

I will continue to try and download the PDF documents, and will time stamp and record all attempts

Darren Gewant

---

**Correspondence ID:** 321    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** After looking at your "preferred alternatives" for Headland trails and Muir Beach, I feel trapped. We live in Muir. Totally surrounded by Park. Need to be able to walk out of Muir Beach with a dog. As a woman, this is very important You (please) cannot take away all of our access to these important trails. Please reconsider your plans for these trails!!! Enforce existing leash laws & don't make Muir inaccessible to the people who live there & love these trails. Your plan is too DRACONIAN.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 322    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Preferred PLAN FOR MUIR BEACH & COASTAL TRAIL:

- 1) Do not direct public to the "Little Beach" adjacent Muir Beach. This beach cannot sustain the traffic, nor is access all year round as tides vary with the season.
  - 2) Coastal trail is currently open to dog walking. In preferred plan no dogs will be allowed. This will virtually cut the community of Muir Beach off from any dog walking other than on the busy Frank Valley Rd, Hwy 1 community roads.
-



**Correspondence ID:** 323    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Marin Headlands, Alta trails, Pacheco Fire Rds. - -> please allow dogs on loop trails as opposed to out back. (A - A) to offer a more active experience for both dogs and owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 324    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Muir Beach - Dogs should be allowed off-leash seasonally when coho, steelhead are not in the seasonal creek/lagoon area. On any given day 3x as many people are in the lagoon as opposed to dogs. People are also using the rocks & dunes as bathrooms. The new bathrooms are now further from the beach will enhance this problem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 325    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Oakwood Valley - Existing Trail and Fire Road make an excellent short loop on leash. What are the resource issues in closing the trail? It is generally well designed, in good condition

---

**Correspondence ID:** 326    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Listen to suggestions and find more areas to compromise, especially to find more off-leash areas. Muir Beach and Oakwood Valley are especially important. Don't encourage people to get in cars drive further - ie to Rodeo Beach to find off-leash opportunities. Reconsider times of day/week. Like weekdays or before noon.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 327    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other

---

**Correspondence:** Inconsistency re: Alta Trail ROLA - Permit language implies that Alta Trail is a ROLA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 328    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** I want dogs OFF LEASH areas to be sustained. Dogs should be under voice control. Owners must be responsible! Get rangers volunteers to work towards responsibility (incl. dog litter pick up).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 329    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Even before putting any plan in place why aren't we encouraging people to p.u. feces be in control etc drop feces in trash. Now then of people are educated and understanding how important it is to follow these considerations. Signage - there are few signs to let people know.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 330    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Keep current off leash areas - especially Muir Beach!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 331    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Commercial Dog Walking

-permits for 6 dogs should be on-leash only. It's too many dogs for one person to control, especially around families with children  
-permits should be visible - like fishing license

---

**Correspondence ID:** 332    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Other**Correspondence:** Include small, fenced areas with benches with arms, and long-handled "scoopers" for seniors (perhaps people with small children). See Sausalito dog park behind "76" gas station on Bridgeway

Muir Beach - Include some off-leash

Peninsula - include some off leash areas

Reconsider time of day or weekday - like in S. Calif - for off leash. On fire roads beaches (re: Muir Beach, Alta Ave)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 333 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Other**Correspondence:** 1. Rancho - as a single woman, hiking with a dog offers more security than when alone (see Pacifica police report encouraging hiking with others). would like access, with dog, to more of Rancho trails.

2. Yes.

3. Support Alt A for Rancho - spreading user groups out across all 4000 acres is recipe for success

4. Upper Mori Trail - Dirt path used by dog walkers and bicyclists. No strollers, few kids (generally, kids with dogs). Excellent candidate for off-leash as well as on-leash area up to Headlands

5. Yes

6. Rancho: where trails emanate from a neighborhood where dog walking has historically occurred, provide some kind of dog walking opportunity.

7. Yes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 334 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Other**Correspondence:** 1. Dogs could be certified to be off leash if they demonstrated compliance with verbal commands - as in Boulder. The plan states this is cost prohibitive, but if private firms stepped in and charged a fee then there would be no fiscal implications for GGNRA.

2. There needs to be a place in Moss Beach where those of us who have been walking our dogs can continue to walk our dogs. Our dogs have been staying out of the way of horses for years and will continue to do so. Do not make Moss Beach like Pt. Reyes - trails coated with horse manure but no dogs allowed. Right now you ban dogs entirely from Moss Beach.

3. (close to Seton beyond along slopes)

4. Agree

---

**Correspondence ID:** 335 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** 1. Off leash dogs protect single women walking alone. Dogs should be allowed on leash on any trail. Off leash areas of 10-20 acres should be defined - they should be easy access one per community.  
2. Enforcement.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 336    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** 1. Allow dogs on Bootlegger steps at Mori Pt - healthy for visitors and dogs. Completes a loop of 4 miles.  
2. Add cans to trail.  
3. [consider different surface on wooden bridge very slippery when wet or frosty]  
4. Ft. Fun - area by Environ Sci Center is where older dogs often go to have an off-leash, calmer frolic. Very important for area bet Sci Center main hang glider area to remain off leash for fewer dogs experience  
5. A lot of money is being wasted on a fight when an agreement can be easily reached by just listening, & actually doing what the majority of people want.  
6. Confining hundreds of dogs to such a small area is asking for trouble.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 337    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Area between Sunset trail and Horse Trail is great off-path hiking with dogs. Please leave it as is. In fact, leave Ft. Fun as it is altogether and see how it's affected by all the changes you make to other areas. Revisit in a few years. You will generate an enormous amount of good will.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 338    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** 1. Dogs allowed in the meadow Rancho Corral open space for Dog area off leash  
2. Please carve out at least one off-leash area in Rancho de Corral. There are off-leash areas at both Ft. Funston and Crissy Field. Our open space is the largest. Many in Montara own sporting dogs, and they

---

need to run!

3. It seems stingy to ban dogs from the large GGNRA open space in the back of Montara and Moss Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 339    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. More off-leash areas  
2. Training for off-leash areas  
3. ROLA too small - insult  
4. Open back of Montara and Moss Beach to dogs  
5. Alternative G - true no action alternative - all area off leash as it has been for 30 years. Train people this is off leash RECREATION area and how to be good dog owner neighbors as we have been. At the very least a substantial area (~50 acres)  
6. add dogs to Vicente Ridge Trail.  
7. Prefer dogs ON leash, but want dog park areas for off-leash  
8. Service animal needs off-leash space  
9. 1 off-leash trail connects to ROLA. to exercise bigger dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 340    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Rules not being enforced. Off leash ok if contained.  
2. What about Moss Beach?! more dog walking.  
3. Dogs need places to run - need on off leash areas.  
4. Moss Beach - more dogs on trails closer to residential areas  
5. We NEED designated off on leash areas they need to be clearly marked w/ obvious signage  
6. Behind Seton  
7. Medical Center  
8. Vicente Ridge Trail above Moss Beach should allow dogs.  
9. Proposed ROLA needs to be larger. We need a trail going to and from ROLA from residential area.  
10. Yosemite & GGNRA are very different!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 341    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. ROLA - Montara from southern boundary up to San Pedro Mtn Rd. (x2 comments)  
2. Current ROLA too small  
3. People using this park have dogs

---

4. Off leash near Vicente Ridge Trail. (continued loop).
5. Dogs near park/Alamo (back of Montara/MB).
6. Safety for owners.
7. NO ROLA in Montara - detrimental to community Traffic, ruins only paved access area to GGNRA make more natural.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 342    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 12:27:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for your efforts to find agreement on this difficult topic. I have reviewed the full text and am in support of Alternative F. However, my greatest focus and concern in moving forward relates to Fort Funston and the area of beach south of Fort Funston. (Morton Beach). I believe the new plan will work if maps are broadly distributed city and county wide as well as posted prominently at the start of each trail. I horse back ride and have a dog. Both my companions are very well trained. I feel safe and can call my dog away from any bird, dog or distraction, even when on horse back. My horse is the best dog ambassador I have ever met. Not everyone trains their animals like I do and I have been put in some very dangerous situations by dog owners that just don't know better. It is with this in mind that I suggest a broad and continuous PR campaign on the part of the NPS and the GGNRA so we can all enjoy the beautiful surroundings safely.

Lisa Dunmeyer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 343    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 12:47:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think Fort Funston should be left as it was supposed to be. An area for people and dogs to enjoy. On any given day people with dogs outnumber people without dogs 100-1. May I also suggest maintaining the park. 1. Clear the paths of sand and fill in the potholes so the park meets A.D.A. compliance. 2. More garbage cans for dog waste and peoples garbage. 3. Trim back dead tree branches and remove dead trees.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 344    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 13:47:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I advise you to read the editorial in the S.F. Examiner paper of Sunday Nov.10 2013. It can be found in The City Section [pg.6] It expresses my sentiments completely and that of my many neighbors and friends. The author is Joel Engardio. His blog is at [www.engardio.com](http://www.engardio.com) and his Email is [jengardio@sfoxaminer.com](mailto:jengardio@sfoxaminer.com). Please check this out and make your fellow workers aware of it. Thank You John Arnaudo.

**Correspondence ID:** 345    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sacramento, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 15:27:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Saturday, Nov 9 around 1030 I was walking (in the direction of the Warming Hut and GGB) across the "wooden bridge" watching the birds below. I stopped (close to the guard rail and bench) to text my son to let him know where I was.

A dog, running with a (about 2 ft, I would guess) stick in his mouth, hit me from behind, full speed ahead. The dog (and owner) continued on their run.

The back of my leg was gashed, other walkers stopped to my aid. One of them knew of the Emergency Care Center on Scott and Lombard. I spent the rest of the morning and part of the afternoon at Emergency Care, (instead of meeting my son for his birthday celebration). I drove back to Sacramento and he went back to Mt View.

The wound required 10 stitches.

I know of the controversy about dogs and leashes - until that gets resolved a good "rule" would be not to let dogs run with sticks in the mouth.

I doubt the owner had a clue what had just happened, however, I did see her down the path take the stick from the dogs' mouth.

Please pass this on to the admin that should be aware of this incident. Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 346    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,12,2013 18:49:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Facts About the Dangers of Dog Poop. Keep it off the trails and away from creeks! The U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) confirms pet waste can spread parasites including hookworms, ringworms, tapeworms and Salmonella. When infected dog poop comes into contact with your lawn, the poop will eventually "disappear", but the parasite eggs can linger for years! When a human or animal comes into contact with that soil through everyday activities like walking barefoot, gardening or playing, they risk infection from those eggs ... even years after the poop is gone. Pet waste is teaming with E. Coli and other harmful bacteria including fecal coliform bacteria, which causes serious kidney disorders, intestinal illness, cramps and diarrhea in humans. (There are 23 million fecal coliform bacteria in a single gram of pet waste!) Dog poop often contains roundworm larvae, which cause blindness. If a human ingests a roundworm larva, it can migrate through the body causing disease to the brain, lungs, kidneys, liver, heart or eyes. So when people (especially children) touch soil, dog toys or anything that has been in contact with dog feces and then touch their mouths, they can become infected. Dog poop doesn't just "wash away" or disappear. So if you're not disposing of your dog's waste, you're putting yourself, your family, your dog and your water supply at risk.  
<http://dogtalk101.blogspot.com/2010/01/facts-about-dangers-of-dog-poop.html> Posted by Joanne Osband

---

**Correspondence ID:** 347    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Arlington, MA 02476  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 11:11:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** November 13, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a visitor from the Boston area. I just wanted to comment on how wonderful I find the experience of a community that has areas that are so open to dogs. I especially delighted in the experience at Fort Funston. It is truly remarkable to see such a dynamic community interaction between hang gliders, dog groups, individuals including children and a beautiful environment... and it seems to work for everyone.

San Franciscans' are so lucky to have a large area where dogs can run freely off leash. I wish we had that kind of option in the Boston area.

Keep up the good work!! This is an inspiration and an important "ecosystem".

Thanks so much,

Kathleen Wolf RN (I work in the mental health field and maybe this is one of the reasons I delighted so in this environment.)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 348    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 15:44:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I support Alt A on Map 19 A , Cattle Hill Sweeney Ridge area.

The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.

Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

I support map#20-E Alternative E for Pedro Point.

This area is highly disturbed from past uses, and would be suitable for dog walking on the entire parcel.

I support 21-A Alternative A for Rancho Corral de Tierra.

The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.

Spreading out user groups is key to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing expansive dog walking within the Rancho will engage a valuable new segment of trails users in protecting these remote coastal lands.



Thank you for your attention to this matter.  
Amy Owens

---

**Correspondence ID:** 349    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 16:37:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs/Mdmes:

I am categorically opposed to further limitations on access for dogs. San Francisco has approximately 150,000 dogs. (more than children!)

I have been visiting the parks and beaches with my dogs for many years. I can't think of one instance of seeing a dog destroy property or chasing wildlife. Furthermore, any dog guardian will tell you that dogs are much less a danger to people when they are off-leash, rather than constrained.

I believe that if an irresponsible dog guardian allows her/his dog to misbehave, then the person should be cited. A sweeping ban on access for dogs is unfair, and punishes the innocent.

Thank you,

L. Chardin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 350    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 17:25:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am an individual dog owner and have been for years in San Francisco. I live in North Beach and find that Crissy field is a lovely and convenient place for me and my dogs (2) to walk and run in the afternoons - it is restorative and fun for all of us.

While I appreciate what the NPS is trying to do, but I think that a balanced approach is the best one, after all, this is an urban park and not a remote wilderness, like many of the NPS parks. Crissy Field is used by many different kinds of people in many different kinds of ways, dog walkers included.

While I would like to keep access to what it has been for many years (Alternative A), I can accept Alternative F with somewhat limited off leash access, but nothing less than that. The off leash areas have to be somewhat close to parking for people who can not walk too far, and both open field and beach frontage should be included.

thanks - Wells Whitney

---

**Correspondence ID:** 351    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,13,2013 18:59:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dog owners deserve access to open space just like everybody else. To limit access is an unjust misappropriation of our rights. Not only do the proposed restrictions unfairly demonstrate a bias of written law, it violates the laws of nature by constricting an animals instinctive need to run. There are very few places left for responsible owners to run their dogs; please do not impose a senseless law that will makes our lives more difficult. At the risk of being trite, the more I get to know people, the better I like my dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 352    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,14,2013 16:24:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I reviewed your original plan choices and your preferred plans for San Francisco and have now reviewed the Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. I am deeply disappointed in your plans, which once again, seek to remove significant areas which I currently enjoy on a weekly basis from access to off leash dog use.

This is a major city, not a rural area. San Francisco has more dogs than children residing within this city. You may not like that but it is a fact. The residents of San Francisco own dogs and want to walk dogs and have them with them when they visit the city parks. Dogs need exercise and on leash exercise is not sufficient for many dogs larger than a Chihuahua. I am over 60 years old and no longer jog with my dogs. I cannot hike over sand dunes at Fort Funston and want to walk on paved roads while my dogs are off leash. Your "preferred" plan for Fort Funston will make it no longer a place I will want to walk my dogs, so I will not go there anymore. My husband does not walk well and he can only walk on the paved roads and cannot manage a leash as he uses walking poles to maintain balance. He cannot use the off road areas either. So Good bye, Fort Funston. Chrissy Field will get the overflow in a reduced area and will soon show damage. You are creating an environment that will be damaging by upsetting a balance that works right now.

I read the impact reports very carefully. There was no proof of damage to the areas from the current dog use. The dog walkers and other users make a big effort to keep the places clean and pick up after the dogs. I see much more damage at Fort Funston & Chrissy Field from gophers than dogs. Furthermore the damage to the cliffs is from the weather not dogs. Go out to the beaches on any fine day - Ocean Beach, Baker Beach - Chrissy Field and you will see garbage everywhere from people with children. Drink containers, candy wrappers, cigarettes and diapers everywhere. Perhaps you should ban cigarettes, food and drink from the beaches? I know I have cleaned beaches for earth day and I do not pick up garbage that dogs left - it is all from people. The dog people are the few to pick up after themselves.

Leave it alone - it ain't broke!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 353    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Nov,14,2013 18:30:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** When considering the needs of a varied group of users of the NPS it would inappropriate to not consider the needs of animals, meaning dogs, and their owners. The NPS is not just for humans and we shouldn't be too high on ourselves to think that is the case. Is it appropriate to limit dogs to sidewalks only? If this were truly about the environment then we would limit human traffic and impact, which is the more damaging to the environment. But the reality is you are trying to balance the needs of the environment while ensuring that humans and other animals can enjoy it. So if we let humans roam wild, and I don't see anything about limiting horses and the piles of waste that they leave behind, why are we picking on the dogs?

I am fully supportive of protecting the environment, from us, for us. I would strongly encourage you to allow the access that is currently allowed but to more stringently enforce it. If dogs aren't under voice control fine the owners, if dogs aren't on leash but should be- fine the owners, and most importantly if an owner doesn't pick up after their dog- FINE the owner. With this approach either you wouldn't have any work to do and there would be no more staff needed, or more likely, at least initially, there would be steady income to support the salaries of the staff you need to enforce.

I am also fully supportive of limiting the number of dogs being walked, three should be plenty, as more than that do have a much larger impact on both the environment as well as other visitors.

I am strongly encouraging you to go with Alternative A with more enforcement. Please consider these thoughts and perspectives. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 354 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,15,2013 15:14:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There should be no off leash dog walking at Crissy Field or the beaches there, especially not on the old airfield area. Dogs chase wildlife and dig into the gopher holes with no interference from their owners. Dogs urinate on the path, on the field and on the beaches making for unsanitary conditions, especially on the beaches where children are playing the sand. There is almost no monitoring of off leash activity by the Park Rangers. The Crissy Field area should not be considered a city park but considered wildlife refuge.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 355 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Oct,17,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** September 28, 2013

Attn: Frank Dean 1

General Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Fort Mason, Building 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

RE: Dog Management Plan/EIS

The following are comments on the National Park Service Supplemental Environmental

---

Impact Statement for the Dog Management Plan, Golden Gate National Recreation Area. As a National Park and National Recreation Area user, I support a total ban on dogs (other than ADA service dogs on lease) in our National Parks (NPs) and National Recreation Areas (NRAs).

Dogs provoke unneeded conflicts with other NP and NRA users and wildlife. NP and NRA visitor experience is diminished when confronted by barking dogs, whether on- or off-lease. A NRA is a National Recreation Area, not a National "Pet" Area. It does not make sense to allow dog owners to threaten wildlife or other visitors with their animals. The National Park Service should adopt a policy that dog use in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is NOT an appropriate use; that dog use does NOT preserve or protect natural and cultural resources and natural processes; that dog use does NOT improve visitor and employee safety; and that dog use does NOT reduce user conflicts. Department of Interior funding for NP and NRA maintenance is woefully inadequate. Taxpayers should not bear the costs of having to provide for additional law enforcement, erect fencing, or repair damage from dogs.

Unfortunately, too many dog owners are not responsible owners, especially those who maintain that their dog does not need a leash because it is under "voice-control." Such dog owners are often hostile and become abusive and threatening toward other park users who object to being approached by unleashed dogs.

Good planning requires identifying non-compatible uses. Dog use in our NPs and NRAs is a non-compatible use. Just because dog is god spelled backward, does not give dog owners any god-given right to run their animals in our NPs and NRAs. Please ban dogs (other than leashed-dogs under the ADA) from our National Parks and National Recreation Areas.

Because many dog owners are not only irresponsible dog owners, but vindictive as well, this comment must remain anonymous.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	356	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,12,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	You are creating problems where none exist.				
	1. There is already a variety of visitor experiences in Bay Area - non-issue				
	2. No substantial problems instigated by off leash dogs - dogs who exercise are known to be less aggressive. non-issue.				
	3. For whose benefit is all this being done not the owners of 178,000 dogs in SF.				
	4.I have seen areas roped off when necessary for natural wildlife needs - always observed				
	5. Future generations - so present ones suffer!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	357	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94111 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I fully support the GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan (SEIS). The problem of uncontrolled dogs (leashed and unleashed) is an endangerment to people, other living creatures, and vegetation. I've been a life-long walker and, am now, a senior citizen. In the 'leashed dogs only' portion of the San Francisco GGNRA I have been chased, threatened, run into, and tripped by dogs whose owners couldn't or wouldn't control them. Owners of offending dogs were either far away, had no effective 'voice control,' were dismissive of my complaints, or blamed me for their dogs' behavior.

On my visit to the GGNRA open house on November 2, 2013, at Fort Mason, Bldg D, San Francisco, I saw that the research and analysis upon which the proposed changes are based were well documented and illustrated. I hope the GGNRA will become an area that all responsible visitors can use and enjoy.

Sincerely,

Jane Church-McDaniel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 358    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** From:

Cynthia Ehrlich

222 Montcalm St.

San Francisco CA 94110

415-572-8361

To:

Frank Dean, General Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area,

Building 201

Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Re: Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Within a few days of going for a walk on the beach and enjoying, among other things, watching dogs scramble after tennis balls, I was surprised to learn that the GGNRA was planning to require that dogs be on leashes. Watching the dogs is as much a part of our enjoyment of the Dolphin Club I am familiar with and a user of the waterfront and beaches.

We are not currently dog owners, but understand the value of dogs being able to run free in open areas whenever possible. This is particularly true of dogs in San Francisco, where housing density precludes many dog owners from having yards, and the city's being on a peninsula precludes, taking dogs elsewhere to run on a frequent basis.

From having had dogs in the past, we know firsthand how necessary it is for dogs to break out and run loose regularly, to keep them mellow. Few dog owners (definitely not us) are able to run leashed dogs at a speed natural to them. Dogs' behavior in dog runs make it clear that they still have pent-up energy that is not being adequately discharged. Unhappy dogs are more likely to bite and otherwise misbehave. The beauty of running on a beach is that it wears 'em out quickly with minimal damage. Sand is a forgiving medium.

If someone has a dog that's out of control, that dog (and that owner) needs to be dealt with. It shouldn't determine the availability of open areas for all dogs, any more than shutting down the roads is a reasonable response to irresponsible drivers.

Taking our dogs to the beach also got us to the beach and exercising, way more than we manage to do now without them. (We're about to get another.) It's a stretch to think that we would have gone if the dogs had to be on leashes anyway.

I hope this bad decision will be reviewed and reversed, Its unnecessary, counter-productive, and extreme.

Thank you for your service.

Sincerely,  
Cynthia Ehrlich

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	359	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Unknown, UN Unknown United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,31,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	October 22, 2013				

Dear Superintendent Dean

I am writing to you in much distress because of the ongoing dog situation at Crissy Field. I continue to be frightened at walking on the path and on the beach because of large, aggressive dogs off leash. I frequently have to turn back from my walks because I encounter a pack of them fighting, barking, jumping. I am so upset about this matter that your organization continues to allow dogs and dog owners to control Crissy Field. I simply cannot understand it. At the very, very least, the dogs should be on leashes. And, in my opinion, they should be restricted to a specific area and not given free reign of all areas. This is terribly unfair to those of us for whom the Park was intended to serve. Let the dogs have some portion of the field or designate some more remote park for their use. Crissy Field is a heavily used Park and it is insane and unsafe to allow the current situation to continue. I hope that you will address it, though I have serious doubts in light of the dog lobby

Sincerely,  
Mary Faust

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	360	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,13,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRA Dog Management Response				

Executive Summary

The GGNRA Dog Management Plan (SEIS) seems to have artificially created a problem with dogs within the GGNRA parks, then makes a convoluted case of supporting why the impact of

dogs within the parks is so substantial that they need to make dramatic restrictions. I live in Burlingame near 280/Trousdale, so the focus of my comments will apply mainly to the 3 parks in San Mateo County that I frequent multiple times each week, namely: Milagra Ridge, Mori Point and Sweeney Ridge.

Im stunned that the SEIS makes a dramatic case about habitat destruction and the environmental impact of dogs within these parks, but fails to quantify that their impact is an extremely minor rounding error vs. other factors (including human impact) that are many orders of magnitude more significant. The comments seem to clearly indicate that the GGNRA management has never frequented any of these parks, or, at least not on any sort of regular basis. Alternatively, it points to the possibility that GGNRA management started with a mission of restricting dogs, regardless of the actual facts of their impact.

Milagra Ridge, Mori Point and Sweeney Ridge are 3 fantastically stunning properties that draw surprisingly few regular visitors vs. a multitude of other GGNRA properties. Many of the restrictions that challenge visitors coming to these 3 parks are obscure locations, parking limitations and steep/challenging terrain. All of these natural limiters virtually guarantee that these 3 parks wont ever be overused. Theres just a surprising trickle of people at all of these properties, even on weekends. On weekdays or weekday evenings, its not improbable to only pass 2-3 people during an hour long walk.

The bulk of the habitat and environmental damage I saw at all 3 of these parks is almost entirely human-caused. Its orders-of-magnitude greater than that of dogs. In fact, its almost impossible to see any impact of dogs at all except for the rare occasional 'poop that a neglectful owner didnt pick up. At Milagra Ridge, most of those poops look more like they come from coyotes than from domestic dogs. I also want to be very clear that these 3 parks are all in fantastic shape. Even though the human impact is dramatically greater than that of dogs, there are only minor changes required to address them. Those changes should be focused on human causes, as I struggled to find the impact of dogs.

Im a strong environmentalist and a member of Environment California. Im also a strong believer in responsible use of our treasures, as thats part of their true value.

My writeup below, including pictures, is specific and detailed on each property. Since there are specific nuances of each property, Ive tried to provide a thorough description so readers can understand why there just isnt the problem with dogs at the San Mateo County properties that the GGNRA indicates. I really want Milagra Ridge, Mori Point and Sweeney Ridge preserved with the existing dog management rules (Alternative A) for responsible dog owners that frequent these locations. Theyre such stunning treasures that Id never have spent the considerable time exploring had it not been for my dog!

#### Milagra Ridge

Milagra Ridge is one of the most beautiful, and most difficult, of all of the GGNRA properties to utilize. The parking area allows only 6 cars (possibly 7 if smaller cars are parked in very tight formation). The remainder of the lane is entirely red curb, no parking zone. This is a natural throttle on this park, and guarantees that it can never be over utilized. The beauty of this park is its isolation, the views and the limited people traffic.

On an ongoing basis, 30-40% of the total visitors to Milagra Ridge are dog owners who come to walk their dogs. During much of the winter, spring and summer Milagra Ridge is challenging. It sits on an unprotected ridgeline overlooking Pacifica, so it is regularly very foggy, windy and wet. It requires a coat, gloves, hat and strong motivation to be there during these times. During these times, the few that dare brave the elements are almost entirely dog owners, representing 70%-95 of the visitors Ive encountered. Also, when its foggy and windy, there are usually only ever 2-3 cars parked in the lot.

#### Habitat Protection

Except for the occasional dog poop that a neglectful owner hasnt picked up, I havent found any impact of dogs on this habitat. In fact, most of the poops I see across the entire Milagra Ridge

site look more like they come from coyotes than from dogs. Its as if dogs have never even used this park. However, the human impact is stunning! Heres what I have cataloged:

" Tagging: Someone tagged virtually every sign in Milagra Ridge during the summer of 2013, which took the Park Service significant time (and likely associated cost) to fix. I dont think dogs were responsible.

" There are a number of off-trail trails that continue to show wear where humans are going cross-country within the park, even around fenced-off and designated closed areas. However, theres not a single track to indicate that dogs are culprits.

" On a few occasions, Ive seen kids riding their mountain bikes cross-country at Milagra Ridge through protected habitat and down below the batteries. Its also visible via the tire tracks, although I havent seen a single dog track in these same areas.

" Finally, Milagra Ridge was used for Nike missiles from 1954 to roughly 1974, so there is likely perchlorate and other extremely toxic chemicals interlaced throughout the soil and complex near the batteries. Although no missiles were ever fired, the contamination of the area from both the missile containment areas and human staffing is likely still very present. Dogs werent responsible for any of that contamination.

My main point in bringing up these specific environmental and habitat abuses is to contrast the incredible toll of humans at Milagra Ridge compared to the extremely minor impact that dogs have made (or are making) at this site. It seems completely disingenuous of the GGNRA to attack dogs as even a rounding error of environmental and habitat destruction at this site when the human impact is so stunningly more dramatic.

#### Conclusion

I would like to see Milagra Ridge kept with its current dog permissions with Map 18-A. Any impact of dogs is a rounding error compared to the human impact at this site. Ive never seen a single professional dog walker at this location in 8 years. This is such a wonderful site, and the limited use it now receives would be stunningly negatively impacted by the Alternative F restrictions. The ridgeline trails are some of the most beautiful areas of this park, and the fencing and shrubbery along this route already form a contained walkway that protects adjacent habitat.

#### Mori Point

Mori Point is a fantastically beautiful site overlooking the Pacific Ocean near the Sharp Park Golf Course. Since its entrances are somewhat difficult to find amongst the adjacent bedroom community, this park is never very busy. At most, Ill only pass 8-10 people during a walk through this park during busier times, and 3-4 people during off-hours. Additionally, Mori Point has two fantastic peaks/ridgelines that have stunning views of Mt. Tamalpais and the Farallones on clear days.

The peaks and ridgelines at Mori Point are not for the faint of heart. Even the easier climbs to the top of Mori Peak or to the Timigtac ridgeline (from Upper Mori trail) are extremely steep. There are circuitous routes to the top of Mori Peak, but theyre steep, narrow and often hard to find because they arent marked very well. The net effect is to make both of these parts of the park very minimally travelled. In my 8 years of traversing the Timigtac ridgeline with my dog, I think Ive only ever passed 4-5 people. Try the trails sometime and youll understand why. Mori Peak has some easier access points, but is also a stout climb through some tough terrain. Seeing people on Mori Peak is more common, but 70-80% of the times that Ive been there Im completely alone.

#### Habitat Protection

Ive traversed Mori Point regularly for the past 8 years, and have only seen an occasional dog poop or trailside poop bag left by a neglectful owner. Other than that, its virtually impossible to see any impact from dogs at all. Ive only seen a single occasion where a dog ran into the protected areas near the boardwalk. Ive never encountered a professional dog walker, nor have I seen any dog owners with more than 2 dogs. On an ongoing basis, only about 10-20%



the total visitors to Mon Point have dogs.

However, the human impact at Mori Point is stunning. Im including a number of pictures I took during my latest walks to make these points:

" Beer cans, liquor bottles, fast-food containers and general trash thrown into the ponds and streams along Polywog trail. This is the bulk of protected frog habitat and the human impact is insane. I've seen overnight camping in the woods and campfires too. One of the park rangers said they continually clean dumped trash out of the creek, including tires and even a cash register. Dogs certainly aren't the culprits.

" Graffiti and destruction of various signs throughout Mon Point. Ive also included pictures of these too. Taggers have not only hit the signs, but also the bunkers and cement near the old batteries. Additionally, someone completely ripped out the sign at the intersection of the Coastal Trail and Timigtac Trail during the summer of 2013 and left it on the trail. The sign is now missing altogether. Im pretty sure that dogs arent responsible.

" Automobile tires buried and half exposed all over the Timigtac ridgeline. Not sure why these are there at all. Theyre not environmentally friendly.

" Non-native, invasive vegetation. The park service did a major cleanup at Mon Point in 2012 and 2013 to try and corral and destroy the invasive species impacting the local ecology. Ive included pictures of the black plastic covering a number of these hotbeds that are being used to burn up and kill the plants. These invasive species are completely human introduced and have had a stunning impact on the native ecology. Again, dogs arent responsible at all.

" Cats from the neighboring subdivision regularly frequent the protected habitat areas along Polywog trail. There are at least 5 cats that Ive seen going under the fence.

However, during the 8 years Ive been going to Mori Point, Ive never seen a single dog in this protected area. The existing fence keeps dogs completely out, even if the dog werent on a leash. The fence does nothing to stop the flow of cats, which are a significantly greater risk to the protected habitat than are dogs.

" Off-trail hiking. I see myriad areas of Mori Point (and have witnessed countless hikers) going cross-country and forging their own trails. This is incredibly destructive to habitat and contributes to erosion. Ive never seen a single indication that dogs are responsible for any of this impact.

My main point in bringing up these stunning human abuses is to make the point that dogs are a mere rounding error for environmental concerns and habitat destruction at Mori Point, while humans are 1000x more negatively impactful to the same areas.

#### Conclusion

I would like to see Mori Point kept with its current dog permissions with Map 17-A. The impact of dogs at Mon Point is strikingly minimal to nonexistent. Any impact of dogs is a rounding error compared to the human impact at this site. Alternative F eliminates the least-used and most isolated portions of the site that I consider to be some of the best dog walking areas in the entirety of San Mateo County. Additionally, keeping Alternative A enables key portions of the adjacent land and trails of the City of Pacifica that allows dogs to be accessed through and along-with the Mori Point trail system. Please keep Mori Bluff trail, Mori Peak trail, Upper Mori Trail, Lishumsha and the Timigtac trail accessible to dogs.

#### Sweeney Ridge

Sweeney Ridge is one of the more challenging GGNRA sites because of its steep terrain, but it is stunningly beautiful. There is ample parking on the Sneath Lane side, and access is fairly easy to find. Since Sweeney Ridge requires a very challenging uphill climb to get to the rest of the site, it is probably one of the least traversed parks of the San Mateo sites, especially in the more remote regions of the park.

Because of the steep climb required from almost every entrance to get to the flatter ridgeline

areas of Sweeney Ridge, it makes it a fantastic location for walking dogs to complete exhaustion while encountering only a very few people. Because of the cut of the main road and surrounding shrubbery and guardrails, it funnels traffic strictly on the roads up to the ridgeline. The walk on the Sweeney Ridge Trail between the Notch trail and Shelldance Nursery is so steep in parts that most hikers never attempt it, despite it being an actual fire road. The net effect is that environmental damage from both humans and dogs is virtually non-existent at this site.

#### Habitat Protection

I struggled to find anything other than the occasional off-trail footprints of humans cutting through a few parts of this site and an occasional mountain bike tire track off the main trails. However, I could find no sign that dogs have been there at all.

Sweeney Ridge was also part of the Nike missile site along with Milagra Ridge, so toxic contaminants left over from human use are likely the main environmental challenges.

#### Conclusion

I would like to see Sweeney Ridge kept with its current dog permissions with Map 19-A. This site is incredibly challenging for both humans and dogs alike to get to the ridgeline. As such, human, dog and mountain bike traffic beyond 1/4 mile up from any of the entrances is a bare trickle at most. The restrictions on this beautiful property are all completely natural, and there is no value in artificially imposing the additional restrictions of Alternative F for problems that just don't exist.

#### Professional Dog Walkers

I attended the Nov. 4, 2013 meeting in Montara at the Farallone View Elementary School and spoke at length with multiple GGNRA representatives, most notably Shirwin (sp). She was one of the most knowledgeable representatives I've met. Her comments and our ensuing dialogue seemed to gravitate most heavily toward professional dog walkers as the bad apples. She indicated that some of them can bring 6, 8 or even 10 large dogs to GGNRA properties, and struggle to have them under any sort of control. The problem seems most heavily centered on the GGNRA properties that allow off-leash dog access.

I'm dismayed that a few bad apples are likely creating the bulk of the problems that the GGNRA feels they need to address. I'm absolutely in favor of restricting professional dog walkers; as I feel that they are not indicative of the bulk of responsible owners.

In the 8 years I've been going to Milagra Ridge, Mori Point and Sweeney Ridge, I have never seen a single professional dog walker. In fact, I've never seen any owner with more than 2 dogs. I just don't think that that problem exists at these properties, mostly because of the natural access restrictions I mentioned previously. Owners that I've seen are very responsible. Putting restrictions on professional dog walkers, even pre-emptively at these properties, is probably not a bad idea.

#### Submission Information:

Submitter: Glenn Hout

Email: glenn.hout@gmail.com

Phone: (650) 343-0863

Address: 3112 Margarita Ave.  
Burlingame, CA 94010

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	361	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Marin City, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Oct,17,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

---

**Correspondence:** September 28, 2013

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
GGNRA, Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94 123-0022

Dear Superintendent Dean,

The purpose of this letter is to comment on the most recent (September 2013) issue of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the GGNRA Dog Management Plan. I am a non-dog walker who lives in Marin City, adjacent to the Alta Fire Road and the Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Trail, which I use regularly. I use other GGNRA trails occasionally. So my comments are limited to the Marin portion of the GGNRA. My comments are generally directed toward Alternative F, the NPS Preferred Alternative for each of the Marin sites listed.

Permits: It is not clear to me that the requirement for permits for dog walkers with 4 to 6 dogs is worthwhile. It seems that signs posted on the trails and fire roads designating the allowable times more than 3 dogs could be walked beyond that point would serve the same purpose just as well, and would save both dog walkers and the Park Service a lot of administrative paperwork. But I have no strong opposition to permits so long as they are free and easily obtained. So while I favor Alternative A on permitting, Alternative F is acceptable.

Stinson Beach ' Alternate F is acceptable.

Homestead Valley ' While I would prefer Alternate A, Alternate F is acceptable.

Oakwood Valley/Alta Trail ' As a regular (several times a week) user of these trails, I do not understand why off-leash walking should not be permitted on the fire road portions of the trails (i.e., the Oakwood Valley Fire Road and the Alta Fire Road). For this reason, I support Alternate A. However, since these fire roads are also heavily used by joggers and bicyclists, and occasional horseback riders, I can at least see a reason why some users would prefer no off-leash walking in this area. This being the case, I can understand how Alternate F might be the most acceptable alternate for everyone. I am glad to see that Alternate F now includes the short link between the upper Oakwood Valley Trail and the Alta Fire Road within the allowable dogwalking boundary and that dog walking along the Alta Fire Road would be permitted clear out to and including the Morning Sun Trail, thus allowing access to Sausalito residents. I am very glad to see that the nonsensical environmentally unfriendly idea of constructing a wildlife habitat subdividing fence along the Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Trail is not contained in Alternate F. Whoever dreamt up that idea should be ashamed. Hopefully the Park Service environmental reviewers of the Dog Management Plan would never allow such a travesty to be built.

Muir Beach ' Alternate F is acceptable. While dogs love to run free on the beach, that beach is not that large and is heavily used by families and sunbathers who might not like dogs running loose around them. In this case, I think requiring that dogs be limited to three per walker and be on a leash is reasonable.

Rodeo Beach ' Alternate F is acceptable. At least there will be one beach where dogs can run free.

Marin Headlands Trails ' It is not clear to me why Alternate F eliminates some of the trails that allow leashed dog walking in Alternate F from being included. But since I do not use those trails regularly, I do not feel I am in a position to pass judgment on the selection of allowable dog walking trails in this area.

Fort Baker - - Alternate F is acceptable.

In conclusion, I consider Alternate F of the current draft to be an improvement over the previous 2011 draft proposal. It appears you have been open-minded about many of the comments you must have received on the earlier draft.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments on the September 2013 draft,

Robert Hollingsworth

26 Dutton Court

Mann City, CA 94965  
robert.hollingsworth@comcast.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 362    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94063  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** San Mateo County Government Center, District 3 County Government  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Oct,24,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** October21, 2013

Frank Dean, Superintendent  
National Park Service - Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Frank,

I would like to comment on the most recent version of the GGNRA DRAFT Dog Management Plan (Plan). As I reviewed the Preferred Alternatives (Alternatives), I am concerned over the effect the implementation of the Alternatives may have on the San Mateo County Midcoast, City of Pacifica, and visitors.

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

In addition to the aforementioned issues, I have concerns over the potential impact this can have on San Mateo County's coastal communities. By reducing the amount of trails people can access with their dogs and citing people for violations, GGNRA will be discouraging people from engaging in outdoor activities and enjoying their national park lands.

GGNRA states that they have selected the Alternatives because it grants multiple user groups the opportunity to enjoy the property, allows for habitat restoration, and is justifiable and enforceable by NPS Rangers. For decades, dog walkers, non-dog walkers, mountain bikers and horseback riders have all enjoyed the trails that are now managed by GGNRA. Multiple user groups have been enjoying the trails together in the past and should be able to continue to do so. Additionally, as the County has proven through projects conducted at San Bruno Mountain, habitat restoration can be successful while still providing recreational opportunities for a variety of visitors. Given these points and the strong desire by dog walkers and the community to continue to use these trails, I suggest that it may be difficult for GGNRA and the NPS Rangers to effectively enforce the Alternatives.

I ask that you reconsider your Alternatives and not place such heavy restrictions on trails currently used by dog walkers. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Don Horsley  
Supervisor, District 3  
San Mateo County

---

**Correspondence ID:** 363    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,17,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Building 201  
Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
October 5, 2013  
Tim Irving  
3344 Divisadero Street  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Mr. Dean

I fully endorse the application and enforcement of lease laws in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, most specifically the Presidio Trust region.

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

Best regards

Tim Irving

---

**Correspondence ID:** 364    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-2421  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,13,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog guardian who believes/knows that dogs need to run play, without leashes, for the health of all (overly confined dogs are the ones most frustrated likely to attack), I am for as much off leash area as possible. But there are 2 specific concerns I have that may not have been already addressed.

Around xmas time 2012, I was accosted by a park ranger in what I call the wild area between Sutro Park and the ocean. I did not know this was an on-leash area did not mind being told so by the ranger (mid-40s I'd guess w red hair). But as a 60 year old woman, I did mind being told to sit in the dirt be rudely questioned as to whether I was carrying weaponry in my purse. He seemed to be training a younger ranger (my guess IE the training) but I was remind of him 1 1/2 years later when the teen, Andy Lopez, was killed by a sheriff's deputy near Santa Rosa. The responses of both the Sutro pk ranger this deputy were both over-the-top out of control. I am a Sutro Heights home owner who contributes to my neighborhood park-not that anyone should be treated the way I was - for so little reason.

We need East Beach to remain leash free!

And re Crissy Field, East Beach - the only accessible beach for the elderly physically disabled w dogs needing off-leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 365    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94111  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for having made the program more understandable and effective wiht the "draft plan/SEIS." I am 88 years of age, trying to recover from a spinal fracture. Walking is essential but hazardouse where irresponsible owners are allowed to let their dogs off-leash. This has denied me the pleaseure and healing of Ft. Mason Meadow, Muni Pier, and the Marina-Crissy Field-Ft. Point route. Indeed, uncontrolled dogs swarm the entire region. A personal vow: I love dogs!!! But I learned a sad lesson at age 20: it was animal abuse to confine a puppy to city rooms!!! My saddest memory came when I sent my cocker spaniel puppy to rural relatives.

Enclosed is reference to a scholarly study proving again that our problem is NOT dogs. The challenge is to educate dog-owners. Congratulations on your excellent efforts.

Dennis McDaniel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 366 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,03,2013 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:** To GGNRA,

I oppose any law or rule which would restrict or prohibit dog access to any area in the GGNRA. I have no problem with laws which require dog owners to clean up after their dogs, or require dogs to be under control so they don't bother other beach users, but to prohibit off leash dog walking on the beach is wrong and unAmerican. I have walked my dogs at Crissy, Stinson, Funston, and many other Northern California beaches since 1964.

Keep our beaches open to off leash dogs!

Thank you,

Gordon Meyer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 367 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA Unknown  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Oct,17,2013 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:** September 30, 2013

To: Frank Dean, General Superintendent, GGNRA

Fr: Robert Rosiner,

RE: Comment on Dog Management Plan

Dear Mr. Dean,

Yesterday, I was attacked by a large vicious dog on the Crissy Field beach. I almost went to the hospital and instead saw my doctor. I am very, very upset and scared. This was the second time I have walked on the beach in quite a while, out of fear because of past incidents, and now I will not do it again. I am 62 years old, well able to walk, but not that strong. I have osteoporosis, so if I fall I am at risk of fractures. The dog management plan has taken more than a dozen years. In my view, the conclusions are outrageously slanted in favor of dogs and dog owners. Crissy Field is a heavily used urban park, closest

to the largest concentration of the public. It naturally should favor use by pedestrians, who include small children, the elderly, disabled people. Your plan continues to put us at risk. I am outraged that dogs will be allowed in all areas and off-leash in some. The most sensible solution is to fence off a portion of the field for use by dogs.

There are plenty of other parks that are not in as heavily populated areas where dogs can be freer. Crissy Field should have as is priority the enjoyment and safety of people not the absolute freedom of dogs.

I urge you to review the situation in light of the needs of ordinary people who have a right to be safe.

Sincerely,

Robert Rosiner, San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 368    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,14,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I've had 3 wonderful dogs thru the years. I loved to let them off leash roam frolic about nature. But my dogs stayed close to me, obeyed my command I was attentive to them their surroundings. They obeyed the rules of the road. Now I go to the beach at Fort Funston (of Pacifica Park, take your life at risk) to enjoy the sun, sand water I've some intense experiences where I feared my bare legs would be ripped apart. Most dog owners are responsible but there are enough that are surley, inattentive on their cell phones consider my fears cries for help an inconvenience at best. When a dog is aggressively coming forward, barking incessantly, showing his teeth nipping at my clothes - I have good reason to be afraid. Packs of dogs are the worst. But one horrible time a woman was there with her boyfriends dog for fifteen minutes the dog was running rapid circles around me with her between me the dog as he fiercely growled showed his teeth. Panicked I yelled he wants to bite she said No he just wants to harm me, I'm not sure what the difference is. Finally I took refuge in a tall hefty guy walking down the beach. Suddenly the dog calmed down. The woman told me this was a rescue dog with fierce instincts to protect her. Micronare/rescue dogs

All I know is over the last five years dogs have become a public menace. When a car hurts or kills someone, the verdict is vehicular manslaughter. The same applies to a dog. The verdict donicular manslaughter.

Dogs should be on leashes or muzzled. Dogs packs of dogs dominate the beach now at Fort Funston. I know an older woman whose leg was ripped wide open - she screamed for help the dog's owner did nothing. She another friends both carry bear repellant.

Thank you for your time. Please do something.

Thank you-

Sandi Sinll MFT

78 Perllo St.

S.F. CA 94110

415-282-8185

---

**Correspondence ID:** 369    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA Unknown  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,12,2013 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** TO: GGNRA General Superintendent, Frank Dean  
**DT:** 11/6/13

As a resident of Muir Beach and concerned citizen of Marin, I am writing to express my concern over the GGNRA's current Dog Management Plan and Draft EIS, specifically the proposed dog rule changes to Muir Beach and the surrounding trails of the Marin Headlands. Because of its location, the community of Muir Beach is uniquely impacted by decisions of the National Park Service and the GGNRA. We are virtually surrounded by the Park, and the proposed changes would negatively impact our community.

In the NPS's "preferred alternative" for Muir Beach, leashes would be required on Big Beach. The NPS's justification for the workability of such a change is that Little Beach is there for all who want to let their dogs run. Here is the language cut and pasted from the draft EIS:

"There is some limited availability for off-leash dog walking, on the beach below the adjacent neighborhood, a small county beach (Little Beach) adjacent to the NPS beach. Visitors could access Little Beach by walking their dogs on leash across Muir Beach."

I am especially disturbed by this missive. This is using Little Beach as a de facto ROLA (Regulated Off Leash Area). Little Beach is not part of the park. The property is County and privately owned and, as a practical matter, often inaccessible due to high tides. We have serious concerns about funneling an entire user group over to Little Beach- -without services, trash, restrooms or parking.

Local residents are concerned about the impact on Pacific Way, Sunset Way, Cove Lane and the beach trails when nonresidents try to access Little Beach with their dogs. From a safety standpoint, we are concerned that visitors will cross over to access Little Beach and become stranded during high tides, then try to unsafely cross over the rocks to get back to "Big Beach", creating more incidents for our emergency services. From an environmental standpoint, we are concerned for the continued erosion of the hillside trails and the potential increase of dog waste left at these trailheads.

I appreciate the new barriers that have recently been placed on the beach to protect the restored Redwood Creek area and feel this is a reasonable solution to keep both people and pets out of the area. However, by removing the off leash access to the beach, we feel the GGNRA is cutting off one significant user group from enjoyment of the beach.

I also object to the proposed rule changes to the trails around Muir Beach. These changes would virtually lock in our community with no hiking opportunities with our dogs. We'd be left only with a looped trail around the parking lot.

Historically, Muir Beach residents and dog owners from around Marin have always enjoyed off leash access at Muir Beach and the Headlands Trails. These proposed changes don't just affect residents of Muir Beach, where these areas are, quite literally, our backyard. The loss of these currently available areas for people and their dogs would change the quality of life for the worse for all Marin residents and their dogs.

Please keep off leash access on Muir Beach and on the surrounding trail system so that we can continue to enjoy these areas with our pets. At a minimum, I request that limited hours of off leash use be allowed when the areas are not in peak use. (i.e. non-holiday, midweek, early morning/late evening). Quite literally, the beach and surrounding trails are often nearly empty at these times and, as a result, we should be able to continue to enjoy these areas with our dogs as we always have.

Tha you for your consideration,  
Joan Wynn ' Muir Beach resident  
415-388-5456  
I Starbuck Drive, Muir Beach

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	370	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---



**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Oakwood Valley has been an area for me to walk my dogs for over 20 years. My dog walk off leash & are under voice control. To apply a leash law will impact my life tremendously in an awful way. I can not drive to Rodeo Beach every day to exercise my dogs. It is impracticable & unfair! There are seven to nine areas in Marin impacted by your plans & only one is off-leash. Alternative E is acceptable & doable for me & my "friends" - "Preferred Alternative F is NOT!"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 371 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Mill Valley, CA Unknown  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** For Oakwood Valley alternative E is reasonable. We walk our dogs responsibly under voice control; we pick up after them. If anything more restrictive were implemented we would feel you are driving us out of the area! We would have to decide between giving up our dog or moving to another area. This is patently unfair. We pay taxes to use these areas, and we have a right to use them!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 372 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Restricting off leash areas to designated areas at GGNRA sites essentially creates enclosed dog parks. The impact of all the dog walker's dogs plus individual's dog being confined in smaller areas would be detrimental to both the dogs the owners. Off leash is a necessary method of exercise for dogs. In such a dense city, space is needed for dogs to burn energy. They would no longer have that freedom if all dogs were packed into the same area. I do not support any restrictions. Having off leash areas for dogs is one of the perks of living in a liberal, amazing city. Its exercise for me my dog! Its necessary for dogs to properly socialize while still having their personal space. A socialized dog is a safe dog. Trying to socialize a dog by tossing it into a small, densely packed area would be dangerous. I love my city. I love my urban parks. Keep them free!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 373 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** The Dog Management Plan does not reflect the requirement to maintain traditional recreation in the GGNRA, noted also in the Congressional Record in 1972. Keep the present parameters at Fort Funston Crissy, expand the dog walking areas in Ocean Beach, and open up areas in Marin San Mateo.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 374 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

<b>Address:</b>	N/A, UN N/A United States of America
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
<b>Affiliation:</b>	
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,02,2013 00:00:00
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My income & livelihood counts on unfettered access to GGNRA lands, and restricting this access wil put me out of business!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	375	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	N/A, UN N/A United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,02,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Permits for commercial dog walking are unnecessary and restrictive. City & county of SF already have this in place!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	376	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	N/A, UN N/A United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,02,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The GGNRA was the site for the start of a national exercise initiative, and yet you are seeking to curtail the most benign form of exercise around - a person walking with their dog. This doesn't make sense!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	377	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	N/A, UN N/A United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,02,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRA don't take our 1% away!!!				

We are avid dog lovers and walkers who enjoy the recreational areas very much!!! We are long time residents and users of the areas and share it well with everyone - families, dogs and more. Don't take our parks, beaches and rec areas away. People and dogs need places to play and relax together!!!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	378	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,18,2013 11:39:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my opposition to the GGNRA plan to severely restrict canine access to certain parts of the Golden Gate recreation area.

I do not own a dog, but I certainly enjoy seeing dogs - along with their guardians - play at Ocean Beach, at Fort Funston and at Crissy Field.

In a city and region where canine companions outnumber children, it just doesn't make sense to so drastically limit the places where, under constant supervision, dogs can roam and play free.

Please reconsider this draconian proposal; more than anything, it is seen as a punitive measure and not as a way of preserving public lands.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 379    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** As a tax payer please keep our parks off leash. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 380    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** The coastal area provides trails for people and their dogs. Provide trails in San Mateo and Marin, and more access in San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 381    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not take our remaining 1% away. Our dogs love your off leash parks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 382    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

---

**Correspondence:** I oppose any restriction on dogs in the GGNRA. Here are some BETTER ideas:

1. NPS leave. Let local people handle things.
2. Horses out. The make big piles of poop which nobody cleans up.
3. More dog areas. There are more dogs than ever and we need more space.
4. Cars out. They are responsible for bird hazards, not dogs. In fact, dogs scare away ferral cats, which helps birds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 383 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** (Frank Dean: I'm the person from the Berkshires)

I am concerned about all the areas, but the area I visit most and can speak to is Ocean Beach. For the last few years I've gon fairly often, independently picking up trash and observing. Every time I go when I see shorebirds I see dogs chasing them. I often see bags of poop on the beach. The birds were here first, they are in decline, and they REALLY don't have alternatives. Their habitat is declining. We need to prioritize the migrating shorebirds, and most of all we need ENFORCEMENT. Realistically, dogs have other places to go. Realistically, the birds don't.

I support the strongest measures to protect wildlife, which in the case of O.B. I think is Alternative B. Alternative F maybe, if the boundary is rigid (I heard vegetation would be planted) and enforced. P.S. how do you plant vegetation in intertidal zones?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 384 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I am 50 years old and an SF Native. I have walked dogs in what is now the GGNRA for my whole life. I think the key word here is recreation. The GGNRA is part of an urban area. It is not pristine wilderness like Yosemite. I have no problem with barring dogs from some areas, but there should also be areas where dogs may run free. Dogs area a huge part of SF culture. As you know, there are more dogs than children in SF. Give them adequate places to run, just as you provide places for people to hike, sail, kite surf, mountain bike and so on. Dogs that can't run free are actually more likely to cause problems because they are pent up. Give us a few places in each county. Ft. Funston, Crissy Field, parts of Pt. Reyes, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach. Give dogs in San Mateo County a place to run!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 385 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I support banning all dogs and all people during snowy plover nesting season. I am not aware of any research demonstrating that the presence of many people is healthy for nesting plovers. If there is a "silent majority" of non-dog owners out there who are significantly effected by areas where

dogs are allowed off-leash, I am more than willing to give them all current off-leash areas in exchange for all areas where dogs are not currently allowed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 386 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Regarding Fort Funston other parts of San Francisco which have traditionally been off-leash: keep them off leash!  
If I were forced to choose one of the current options offered, it would be option A, i.e., no action.  
The sunset trail at Fort Funston should be off-leash, not on leash. Reserving the most beautiful trail there for the few non-dog walkers seems excessive.  
There is a typo in the Fort Funston poster. "Seperation" is spelled "separation."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 387 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** I walk at Funston twice a day, and then we go there for our weekend rest as well. I have submitted many comments in the past (as have many others), and what I see and would like to point out is that all of them are ignored. Not just mine either. Comments the last time around were overwhenlmingly against this plan, and that hasn't caused you to change it at all.  
This is a coastal city. These are our beaches. You have an obligation to us (out of decency, and as part of the original creation of GGNRA) to allow us to use it for our recreation, as our parents grandparents did. You have made it plain that we don't fit into your plan, and guess what you don't fit into ours either. Llisten to us. We matter. We are the people this is our home, and so these are our beaches. Our dogs are a huge part of that, but not the only part. We will be heard. We will not be locked out of our lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 388 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs have rights too  
think of what your doing to the dogs that are meant to run free in Beaches and Parks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 389 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

---

**Correspondence:** I can't believe that almost 2 years later I am back writing the same thing: you have made it almost impossible throughout the Bay Area to walk a dog - off-leash in the GGNRA. You made the restrictions even worse. You will be crowding the local SF neighborhood parks with more dogs since you are restricting so much of Crissy Field and other areas to off leash dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 390 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs need to run, just like we need to exercise. An unhealthy dog is an unhappy dog, and an unhappy dog is a violent dog. If you take away 90% of the places dogs are allowed off-leash, then the level of dog aggression will rise.

As for the argument that dogs destroy the wilderness, well, that's complete pfoeey. Humans have and always will destroy more. The GGNRA should be working on stopping rainforests being cut down, not on stopping dogs from being happy. This is supposedly a revised version of the old plan. What exactly have you changed. Next to nothing. Why do you feel it is necessary to squash the livelihood of our furry friends? It is a waste of time.

I am 13 years old but I felt that it was necessary to come all the way across SF to get here. Maybe that will make you think about what you're trying to do to the community.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 391 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** My concerns are:

1. Grandfathered off-leash privileges - we have been walking here since I can remember, not fair to have GGNRA com in so recently and take away this right
2. this is a city first, and a N.P. second.
3. dogs need space to run
4. Crissy field is better because surf is safer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 392 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,18,2013 12:37:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I walk my dog off leash several times a week at the beach at Crissy Field. The walks keep me and my dog happy and healthy, and they also keep her tired and well behaved when we aren't at Crissy Field. I don't think it is in the best interest of the residents of San Francisco to take away so much space where dogs can free. This will overcrowd other areas of the city with dogs, and will be much worse for the human residents of the city.

Please help me and my dog stay happy & healthy by allowing us to use the open spaces we were

---

promised to run free and enjoy the outdoors - the beautiful outdoor spaces make San Francisco special, and it would be nice if everyone were allowed to continue to enjoy them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 393    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** We love having our dogs on the beach with us and they love the water and freedom on the beach. Especially they love us if we were to take that away from them it's like having to feel caged. As we humans we have freedom we can do anything eat anything we want well dogs have the same thing they are like humans to but different looking and fuzzy fur. Imagine if it was you and someone told you you can't go on the beach how would you react? how would you feel? if you like animals reconsider them to be free on the beach everyone deserves to be happy free and most of all loved. Having love is everything for dogs and it would mean a lot to them if you said they can go on the beach without their leashes that would pull their necks all the time. and if they are passing the beach it would be like you're teasing them if you don't like being teased don't do it for the dogs. If you see how they act on the beach they love it and so do we. So take it BACK and let them be free please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 394    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposed plan to ban people with dogs from 99% of GGNRA land would have a devastating effect on the people of San Francisco & the Bay Area. I have been walking my dog in all your parks for over 30 years. It means the world to be. This is an urban park given to the GGNRA with the explicit understanding that traditional forms of recreation would continue.  
We need recreation not an urban wilderness.  
The GGNRA needs to be held accountable to their promise to serve the recreational needs of the people of San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 395    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,18,2013 12:45:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposed restrictions pertaining to the Ft. Funston site fails to comprehend the use of the area. The greatest number of users are dog-related activities where thousands of citizens of San Francisco have been using this site well before it became part of the GGNRA.  
The NPS has failed to identify important habitats for wildlife. The Ft. Funston Bluffs do not harbor endangered species. The only wildlife seen at this location are ravens and a few red-tailed hawks. More important are the bluffs right above the beach, where the cliff swallows build their nests, but the NPS has failed to protect these birds and have concentrated and diverted their attention to the upper bluffs.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 396    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** As a resident of the marina and a dog owner - these plans make the area less desirable. Having a dog and regularly using a dog walker - as numerous friends do as well - these proposed changes will make it basically impossible to 1) have easy access to an off leash area 2) it makes it unfeasible for dog walkers to do their job while keeping prices and availability w/in reason 3) getting a dog proper room to run and exercise - I am more concerned by two legged foot traffic, keg parties on the great meadow, and tourists who can't read and don't obey rules. Numerous times we see responsible individual and dog walkers call non responsible dog walkers/owners out for not picking up feces. We want to keep the parks beautiful and around for years to come - I just don't feel this is the way to do it. Education, ongoing community service - these may be better options but don't take away the areas and freedom for dogs, dog owners, dog walkers - this doesn't change things just for "dog people" - events, city experience, and the numerous friends that gather in these areas is affected. I support a lot of the GGNRA initiatives - however this is NOT one of them! If this goes thru - I would love for you all to be a professional in the city w/ an active dog - and see how it works!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 397    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** San Francisco's many beautiful off leash dog areas - specifically Crissy Field and Fort Funston - are what makes this city so special. This is a dog city - we love our dogs and there is no reason to take these off leash areas away from them. Comparing the GGNRA areas in SF into other national parks is ridiculous - there are no bears running around SF or other animals present in other national parks that would pose a legitimate threat to off-leash dogs. The incident at Crissy Field involving Charlie and the horse is the only incident I have heard of, and it was frankly the fault of the officer riding the horse who had no business riding through that area and frightening dogs. This plan is restrictive and completely unjustified.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 398    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** These Forts are one of the few places left for dogs to be off leash! Owner & Dogs are able to get their exercise they need! Dogs need freedom too!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 399    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA is purposed for Recreation...NOT "backwoods" experience.  
Dog recreation (walking on and off leash) is critical to my needs for fitness & well being. It appears NPS is ignoring public comment. Show us that GGNRA will listen to the public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 400 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Please leave the entire airfield open to off-leash

Please know that our taxes go to enjoying the parks. Without off leash access our dogs will have no where to excersize and run.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 401 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Please preserve Dog walking and off-leash areas in Crissy Field/marina green Baker Beach Ocean Beach Ft Funston.

The current situation works well for urban Parkland. I favor more restrictive rules in National parks (yellowstone, yosemite)

But, please let us Be a city with Integrated Parks for our city

---

**Correspondence ID:** 402 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I'm here to PLEAD for a complete RE-EVALUATION of any and all plans which would restrict, impede and/or eliminate the current off-leash dog walking rules in the GGNRA.

My dogs and I - and literally hunded - of friends of four legs and less are happier and healthier the way things are.

PLEASE DO NOT DECIMATE OUR WAY OF LIFE!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 403 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Bring back the fountains at Sutro Park!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 404 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Why do you provide energy bars at the Open House when you're removing the places that we can exercise?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 405 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park system is a golden gem in the US. We are so lucky to have these parks.  
Dear NPS, please adapt and grow and change to reflect our changing world. We need great, remote, pristine preserves of wilderness to protect biodiversity and for education.  
We also need access to nature in urban areas for the well-being of humans, for education - so that we all learn to love nature, and for recreation! Denying access to dogs is a HUGE blow to recreation and access and to education!  
Please preserve in remote areas and expand access in urban areas to make outdoor/nature lovers out of all of us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 406 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** We are parents, dog-owners, voters and business owners in SF. We are very upset about the proposed changes to off-leash access for dogs.  
We have walked our dogs, often with children, on Crissy Field, Baker Beach and Ocean Beach for over 12 years. There are ~120,000 dogs in SF - more dogs than children. In an urban environment, it is not realistic, desirable or SAFE to deny dogs off-leash recreation in a city like SF.

Off-leash access is critical for SAFE well-socialized dogs. The city and families will suffer without it.

Dog owners are also nature lovers! We financially support the Nat'l Park system, GGNRA, Friends of NPS, CI, etc. We believe in wild places and preservation. But this is an urban environment! It is not realistic to deny park use to the over 100,000 families who own dogs in the city!

For over 20 years, Alternative A has been in place. Leave it be.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 407    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposed plan has a number of serious shortcomings, and its an embarasment that our elected officials and public services have proposed such an incomplete and shortsighted plan. A few points that I would like to draw to your attention:  
-dogs and dog areas promote community building as it allows for owners, walkers and the general public a chance to meet in a comfortable area  
-off leash dog walking develops dog socialization  
-controlled areas will in time develop anomisty, stress, and a brewing sense of angst within the community  
-off leash dog walking areas enable many dog walkers to earn a liveable income  
While I could go on, the point I want to make is good dog owners are an asset to this community, help us make sure all support dog owners and enforce legislation upon the careless and ignorant, don't take a fascist approach to oppress the many to support the few. We appreciate your leadership and trust you will make the right decision by rejecting this proposal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 408    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** I visit East Beach with my dog almost every day, rain or shine. We've been going there since he was 2 months old and now he's 26 mos. It's the highlight of our day and I love to watch him run with the other dogs he meets there. He's a rhodesian ridgeback and to watch him run in a wide open space is stunning.  
By limiting the amount of open beach and field, the assigned space will become dangerously crowded and probably unusable. Dogs need open space to run and trying to confine them will present hazards of both people dogs getting run into as well as ruining the enjoyment of visiting the beach field with your dog if it's too overcrowded to join.  
I also recently had a baby daughter. While I've seen how some families with young kids do not like dogs to play near them, I would love to have my daughter and my dog able to play together in the open spaces at East Beach. I also see that being impossible if the dogs are forced into an overcrowded, limited area. There are many other alternatives to the current proposal. Limiting the on leash section to be directly across from the parking lot, while keeping the stretch of beach in front of the marsh off leash could be a fair solve for all parties. Or in the essence of public pools, have an "adults only lap swim" period of time where dogs aren't allowed off leash. This could be during peak tourist hours from 12-2 pm, which also coincides with lunchtime, which will prevent dogs from interrupting picnickers.  
Again, there are many other solutions that do not limit the amount of of-leash space as significantly as the current proposal.  
I hope that a more fair and appropriate solution for all parties involved.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 409    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** You are taking our comments & not hearing what we are telling you and asking for. You have had an agenda of your own all along and have not moved off your position. Do not forget what the "R" in recreation GGNRA means. There are so many choices for no dogs or dogs on leash, we must keep lots of space for the lots of dogs belonging to the lots of voters/taxpayers who demand the option to hike/walk with their dogs & let them chase balls, play together, and enjoy our beaches & open spaces too. The EIS is no option at all. I vote no on all proposals & the underhanded GGNRA reps. You work for us too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 410 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Kudos to all the hard work navigating this very contentious issue. The current status quo is incredibly unfair to those who DON'T own dogs. As a regular user of Crissy Field, it is frustrating to see almost the entire area overrun by off leash dogs. We all have a right to enjoy Crissy Field. The preferred alternative is a fair balance that will allow dog owners a very large area to run their dogs off leash. I cannot understand why the dog owners do not like this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 411 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposals to limit access for dogs to Fort Funston and other GGNRA areas is in direct opposition to the carter of the parks when turned over to GGNRA. People with dogs make up a large percentage of San Francisco residents. Dog access to Fort Funston and off-leash recreation is a critical component of city life for many in S.F. This should not be taken away by GGNRA. Fort Funston works today for thousands of people. Do not ruin a wonderful thing!  
Kenneth Aron  
201 Fair Oaks St.  
SF 94110

---

**Correspondence ID:** 412 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

---

**Correspondence:** Please keep beaches "off leash"

Brent Blanchard  
2839 Pierce St.  
SF 94123

---

**Correspondence ID:** 413 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** From Robert D. Brownstone [charlieandjoe2@yahoo.com]

I have 3 dogs and regularly take them to Fort Funston and Ocean Beach.

Doing so is a huge part of my life and my exercise.

Same for my wife and my two teenage children and our neighbors who oft times accompany us on these walks

Do not RESTRICT Fort Funston or Ocean Beach. Leave the rules the same

Robert D. Blanchard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 414 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Keep Fort Funston friendly to dogs!

The GGNRA as a governmental organization should exist to serve the needs of the people and promote harmony and peaceful co-existence for recreational use in the surrounding territories. Dogs are valued members of their family packs, not just simply property. A well socialized dog is a well trained and exercised dog. Without space and freedom (from leashes) it is nearly impossible to properly socialize a dog. The GGNRA is not adding more off leash space, they are in fact contracting this space in an urban environment with an ever growing population of people and their dogs. Listen to the will of the people and respect dog owners as well by expanding and maintaining the less than 1% off off leash recreational space now available. No to the draconian proposed Dog Management Plan! More open space for recreation, not less.

John Chirico

---

**Correspondence ID:** 415 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,18,2013 16:46:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear reviewing committee:

Please do not restrict dog walking in GGNRA, especially in Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and Fort Funston. These areas are a crucial lifeblood of this city. I care deeply about preserving wildlife and would welcome

seasonal restrictions in specific areas to protect wildlife. However, this city depends on GGNRA areas for dogs and owners to responsibly recreate and enjoy, as there are not sufficient parks in the city to accommodate these activities. Responsible dog owners should not be penalized and restricted from use in these areas.

Our city is unique and lucky to have these beautiful lands within our borders. However, the fact that these fall under federal jurisdiction makes them prone to scrutiny that is appropriate for vast wilderness national parks but is inappropriate to these urban spaces. The SEIS and dog management plan do not account for this unique nuance of urban lifestyle which can and must coexist with nature and wildlife. I urge you to consider the needs of our large urban population and do not enact restrictions that are more appropriate to national wilderness areas.

Sincerely,  
SatKartar Khalsa

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	416	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,18,2013 16:57:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My wife and I are have lived in the Marina District of San Francisco for over thirty years, within walking distance to Crissy Field. We have one small dog, Daisy, a miniature Schnauzer. Daisy goes to Crissy Field on almost a daily basis, either with us or with a dog walker.				

Having spent a great deal of time at Crissy Field, I have seen very few problems with off leash dogs on the beaches or the airfield. Almost all dog walkers are extremely responsible in terms of controlling their dogs and picking up after them. In addition, because of the weather in San Francisco and the water temperature, these beaches are not a prime area for swimming or picnicking.

I recommend that the regulations allow dogs to be off leash under voice control on both the East Beach and the Central Beach and on the whole of the airfield.

I don't believe any more restrictive rule would serve the interest of the people who use the park or make any significant contribution to maintaining the nature of this protected area.

Thank you for considering this comment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	417	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,18,2013 23:10:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern:				

My name is Charlene Ho, and I have been a resident of San Francisco since 2007. My husband and I live in Noe Valley with our 7 month old Pembroke Welsh Corgi. Our dog is a valued member of our family. He frequently exercises at Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, and Fort Funston. He has a dog walker who takes

him to Fort Funston 3 days a week.

Like many San Francisco residents, we do not have a yard. The opportunity to let him off leash in a park is one of the ways he gets his exercise. His physical stimulation at these locations allows him to be the well-adjusted dog that he is. My husband and I were very disappointed to hear about the proposed new restrictions for dogs at the aforementioned locations. It will affect our entire family greatly. We would prefer no change to the current park plans.

San Francisco is known to be very dog friendly. Please do not change this. Generally, the dogs in San Francisco are well socialized and well behaved. I believe this is due to the openness of the parks in San Francisco. With these proposed changes, there will only be 100,000 dogs in the city that will not be as well socialized or exercised. This will only lead to unhappy dog owners.

I appreciate your time.

Regards,

Charlene Ho

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	418	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Unknown, UN Unknown United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,02,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	WWJMD? (What Would John Muir Do?) He would keep Ft Funston as it is. There needs to be a place for dogs to run off-leash, as there are very few places to do so. That area has been used that way forever. Considering how many people and dogs use the park there are very few issues. I've been going there for 15 years - with and without dogs - and have never seen a dog fight or confrontation. What I do see are scores of people and dogs enjoying the space. It is a unique place that brings the community together - people are smiling happy, talking to neighbors, really using the time to connect with each other and nature. Many here are isolated, busy, and live in small apartments. This allows dogs to get out, but really it helps the humans and makes the city a nicer place.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	419	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Richmond, CA 94804 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,02,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't take off leash on Muir. Don't take off leash at Crissy Field, Golden Gate Bridge area. Don't take off leash at Fort Funston. Thank you Pamela in Richmond CA.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	420	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I am a 24 YR SF resident w/ 2 kids and a dog & I am a business owner - I am very supportive of the GGNRA & have in past supported it financially but this proposal is misguided.

Where is the significant environmental impact on these urban parks which rise to the level of trumping the sure to be negative impact on such a significant segment of the environment - US the dog loving population of San Francisco?

Many areas such as Baker Beach are areas rarely visited by non dog owners & greatly enjoyed by dog owners & dogs. The weather alone means dogs & dog owners are the people who typically use those areas. How does it make sense to close this to dogs?

I would like the GGNRA to have it put on record now that if you restrict so drastically the off leash areas in SF, over time dogs will become less socialized & THEN you may have a safety problem. Please Keep SF unique and as is!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 421 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 09:56:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** One of my favorite things about San Francisco is its dog friendliness. Cutting off dog access and requiring leashes in the areas proposed, particularly Chrissy Field and Fort Funston would severely limit the options for dog owners looking to their dogs some exercise and outdoor time - it would also ban my dog from some of her favorite places :(

Please don't do this!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 422 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 12:36:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are 329 trails for hikers and runners in Southern Marin. The GGNRA would deny off-leash dogs on TWO MILES on the Oakwood Valley Trail. This is a safe trail for dogs off leash. At the Tamalpais High School meeting on November 6th, rangers readily admitted that there was NO HARD DATA,ONLY ANNECTDOTAL,on runners or hikers who felt impeded by off leash dogs on the Oakwood Valley Trail.

By the way, in regards to picking up dog litter, the least responsible dog owners leave litter on the weekends. The locals who walk their dogs their notice this consistently. Did you ever consider making on-leash requirements on the weekends and let us locals have off-leash Monday through Friday?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 423 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** MILL VALLEY, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 13:05:13

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Any way to curb the professional dog walkers that park at the gate on Lattie? not only are they parking illegally but are not using leashes and leaving lots of doggie calling cards behind. I recognize 5 or 6 vehicles that are there on and off all day. (Red Chevy Suburban and Mazda minivan, white pickup truck with camper are worst offenders- -I have photos of the cars if you like)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 424 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 949414018  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 13:24:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a runner, hiker and biker on the trails of Marin and Crissy field, I completely agree with your recommendations for those areas. There has not been a single run that I've taken in the past year on your referenced trails or beaches where I have not had a negative encounter with an off leash dog. 100% o the time. It may be that I'm skittish as I've been bitten more than a dozen time by a dog in my life but every run, hike or bike ride an off leash dog makes an aggressive move to me. "Oh he's a good dog" doesn't cut it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 425 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,20,2013 11:44:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog responsible dog owner I want to have more free space to bring my dog on leash in addition to more space that is safe with other responsible dog owners to have my dog off leash. So that dogs can be dogs, socialize with other dogs, play and be happy. Please do not take away more areas from us and our dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 426 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** daly city, CA 94014  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,20,2013 13:21:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169204613002065>

"If we want to encourage birds to flock to city parks, we should make some areas off-limits to dogs, researchers say. According to a new study in Israel, pooches can lower the diversity of bird species in urban gardens."

"To minimize this effect we recommend creating areas in gardens that will be inaccessible to people and dogs," the authors write in Landscape and Urban Planning. "This can be done by planning trails in such a way that relatively large areas of shrubbery will be far from them, and also by keeping dogs on leash, as required by law in Israel."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 427 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94914  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,20,2013 20:37:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't let the dogs ruin the beach, lagoon and stream areas. These should be off limits to dogs. It's such a wonderful place, the headlands, but small beach to have shit and piss all over. Check by your comment sign, there are two stinky piles. You can't trust the owners to be responsible. And who wants to be confronted, woken up, sand kicked on by a dog. Let the dogs go shit and piss on the trails, and have rangers there to give out stiff fines for the assholes who won't clean up. Does every beautiful park and beach have to be ruined by shit and piss; you dare not sit down anywhere. You are making parks toilets.

The dogs don't care, they just want the stickiest place to poop; so keep them on the land trails, on leashes, and other less special places.

Also please rope/fence off the fragile cliffs; they are getting trampled.

Larry Pruss

---

**Correspondence ID:** 428    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Jose, CA 95131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,21,2013 13:24:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off-leash dog walk is about being humane and that's what we should strive for in our society. Off-leash dog walk is what makes San Francisco great and sets us apart from other cities.

Off-Leash Benefits

For Dogs:

• Socialization - A well socialized dog is a well behaved one!

• Exercise - Many popular breeds, such as retrievers and spaniels, require substantial amounts of exercise to be on their best behavior!

• Need - Dogs are social animals by nature. To deny them the opportunity to play with other members of their species is to deprive them of a basic need.

For the Two-Legged Companions:

• Human Socialization - Humans benefit from the community and friendships established with other walkers.

• Family Outdoor Enjoyment - The whole family, including its four-legged members, can lead active and healthier lives while experiencing the joy of outdoors and beauty of our natural environment. Such family activities encourage children to appreciate responsible pet supervision as well.

• Access for the Elderly and Disabled- For some, walking a dog on leash is an impossibility. The availability of off-leash areas enables such people to have dogs and experience all of the benefits of dog ownership.

• Contagion of Play - Humans, studies show, catch the joy of play and obtain great enjoyment from watching dogs run and play.

• Exercise -Allows humans to walk or run with their dogs and contributes to physical health.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 429    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** na Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Nov,21,2013 14:11:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is an unfair restriction on dogs off leash areas. It is not keeping with the original agreement when the land was turned over. It will place a tremendous extra burden on city parks. The dogs need this space. This land is for multiuse and all to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 430    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,21,2013 17:50:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA was created in 1972 to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" for the people of the Bay Area. Congress stated that the purpose of the creation was to "assure the preservation of open space ... to provide public access along the waterfront, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available to the region."

Maximum extent possible and available to the region,how could you revise this now?

Our dogs are part of our family and enjoy the few open areas that they can run and enjoy the parks. Please do not limit the use of these areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 431    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,21,2013 18:06:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern,

It is vital to have off-leash dog areas in the San Francisco bay area. A place for dogs to play, run, socialize, and get exercise is lost in so many places, and the fact that places like Fort Funston and Ocean Beach are havens for this is what makes San Francisco so special and dog friendly. I am from Arizona, where the leash laws are extremely strict and dog are confined to smelly and crowded dog runs. It is critical for the dog walkers, as well as health and happiness of the dogs and owners. Please reconsider this proposal and keep off leash areas open.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 432    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,21,2013 21:01:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Friends,

I've read the documents with a particular focus on Fort Funston where I have walked my dog for nearly 20 years. As your report shows, the vast majority of users (60% or higher) of Fort Funston are dog walkers and the number of adverse incidents related to dog walking are minimal (less than 2% of reported incidents).

I agree with some limitations on where dog-walking can occur but would like to see as much area as possible to continue to be open to off-leash dog-walking. And, it is very important that there be some kind of loop from the parking lot through the areas of the park that are allowed to be off-leash, rather than some very limited fenced-in area. Please, NO fences!

I also agree with setting limits on the number of dogs one person can walk, with permits required for numbers above those limits.

One thing missing from the report and recommendations in over 1,000 pages is any recommendation for finding ways for users of the parks to be part of the overall solution. I would encourage you to solicit a citizen-advisory team for each park that can help implement, improve, and manage whatever the final policies are for each park.

Thank you for your work and please, please, please, keep as much of Fort Funston open to off-leash dog-walking as possible.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	433	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,21,2013 23:08:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't take our dog walking area away. It's saved my health both mentally and physically. There are no areas in Daly City where we can walk safely and without a leash.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	434	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san jose, CA 95135 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,21,2013 23:33:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My understanding is that GGNRA was given to you to manage for the recreation of the people. How is this executing your function? It seems to me you have gone off the tracks and lost sight of what your purpose actually is.				

---

I think you either do your job or else you should lose it. Both your job and the management of the areas currently given to you.

Keep dog access to these areas, it is the right thing to do.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	435	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 00:15:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Comments specific to Pedro Point Headlands: This plan's preferred alternative B is not the best option. NPS draws its conclusions by stating that dogs on leash in areas other than Multi use coastal trail would have an impact on red legged frogs, garter snakes and Mission blue Butterflies. None of these species exist in this area and there are no bodies of water anywhere on the site as mentioned in the plan. The NPS analysis of the preferred alternative is highly flawed due to this non-existent impact on these endangered species.

Additionally, the vegetation is very dense on this site so it is almost impossible for dogs to wander off trail if not on leash (which they would be) on all the proposed trails thus they would have virtually no impact on vegetation and would have no access to the restoration areas which are very steep areas.

There is also multiple hiking parks managed by the county within the city of Pacifica (i.e. San Pedro Valley County Park) where dogs are not allowed at all so an alternative is needed where people can walk their dogs on longer trails as reported overwhelmingly by previous public comments.

Because of the very low impact where no endangered species are at risk and the need within the city of Pacifica for more dog walking trails Alternative E is the best option- -allowing on leash dogs on all existing and PLT proposed trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 436    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** As a voting SF citizen with a dog and a family I strongly urge Alternative A on Fort Funston, and its equivalent for the other sites in question. This entire process feels like solutions in search of a problem, and forcing local families with well-mannered dogs (and responsible handlers) to walk leash-only is unfair to both the residents and their animals. This is very un-San Francisco.

Ward Evans  
1677 16th Ave  
SF, CA 94122

---

**Correspondence ID:** 437    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** GGNRA is an urban park serving a large community that loves the outdoors and nature. Banning people and/or dogs means less places people can exercise - which is good for people, dogs and the health of the community.

---

We need pristine areas - but they are places like Yosemite not right next to a city of 4 million people.

Please please preserve our dog walking areas. Its a vital part of our city and one of the reasons so many people love the Bay Area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 438    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 07:51:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Seriously, what are you doing? I mean, I really, really don't understand. You heard the public comment - - the fury - - the resulted from the publication of your plan the last time. And instead of listening to what the people who actually use these areas with their dogs need, you've instead tightened the plan to be even more restrictive. Since when does a plover have more rights than a human or a dog? I really have no idea how you can think that this plan is a good idea, in a city that reveres and celebrates its dogs and the responsible people who love them. I walk on Ocean Beach with my dog nearly every morning, and you know how many other dogs we see during the hour we're there? About four - - all of them regulars. Know how many fisherman we see, who are far more disruptive to the wildlife? About a dozen. And surfers? On good surf days, several dozen, at least.

My guess is that the people putting this plan together don't have dogs. Otherwise, you would realize that your perceptions about dogs and their impact are all wrong. Please be reasonable. Please open yourselves to actually listening to what the citizens of this city want. Our beaches were given to your care on the PROMISE that they would remain recreational spaces, which we need so badly in a city this tight and small. Keep your promise, please. After all, you are the one who made it.

Jenny Johnston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 439    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Menlo Park, CA 94025  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 08:25:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the changes planned for Fort Funston. It is a currently a lovely place for SF area dog owners to spend time with their dogs and it should remain that way.

You have done a poor job of informing Fort Funston users of your proposed changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 440    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

---

**Correspondence:** The natural resources in the GGNRA are systematically being destroyed by dog owners dog walkers activity likes pensilulity  
Trail edges reviewed - dog droppings in plain sight or in plastic bags left for someone else to pick up.  
Dogs chasing wildlife - i.e., birds persons, etc.  
National Park ideas on regulations seem fair for all - however, law to administer the plans police citizens who need policing seems deficient  
A solution soon - hopefully.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 441 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** It took us 20 years to save for our house - we couldn't have a dog in a rental. We live 5 blocks from the beach now and adopted a dog 2 months ago. NOW THIS!! Does not help the community who lives here. We live on Lawton near Ocean Beach in SF. In the two months I've walked my dog on the beach everyday I have NEVER seen a dog chase a bird. This is ridiculous!! We can live harmoniously if we give it a chance!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 442 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** As a residence of San Francisco for 30 years, I have been using Fort Funston & Crissy Feild as my main areas of excercise.  
With my dog! off leash.  
it keeps us healthy, happy and involved in the world around us.  
Please keep this venue open to me & my community!  
Sherri Franklin  
1041 Kansas St.  
S.F. Ca 94107

---

**Correspondence ID:** 443 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA Unknown  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** My dog and I are frequent users of Crissy Field and Baker Beach. We enjoy the beaches and respect other users. I prefer Alternative A for Baker Beach and Crissy Field. I vote for limiting the number of dogs a dogwalker can walk. I also vote for on-leash at East Beach parking lot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 444 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of the outer Richmond and a regular jogger on Ocean Beach. I am disappointed to see you have proposed allowing off leash dogs on the northern end of the beach. I personally have stopped using this part of the beach because of off leash Pitt Bulls. It is also now more than ever difficult to jog ocean beach without stepping in dog poop. The off leash area should not be in the northern area which is more heavily used by city dwellers and tourist. Off leash should be limited to the southern end.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 445 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I live 2 blocks from Ocean Beach. I walk along the shore from Lincoln south to Slout Blvd. I observe the snowy plover habitat I stay away from the birds. But people their pets have the right to use Ocean Beach, Ft. Funston other GGNRA areas.

We need to keep the off-leash dog areas on Ocean Beach Ft. Funston. We need to expand the boundaries not limit them. These are City Parks, not "National" Parks like Yosemite Pt. Reyes. We want to keep access to San Francisco beaches open for people dogs to use on a daily basis. I don't want to have to drive using more carbon to get to an approved dog off leash area. Look at that environmental impact too!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 446 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** A. Dogs do not impact the Snowy Plover at Ocean Beach. In fact the Snowy Plover mates in Utah and migrates here for food. They are still here. There numbers may be lower, but because This is a city, not because of he dogs

B. GGNRA Rangers are not properly trained to enforce this. Hence the TASER of a dog walker in San Mateo

C. This direty influenes my Property value. I will gather a local class action law suit. against The GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 447 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Still too limited for off leash at Fort Funston. Fort Funston is heaven on earth for dog people and their dogs. Alternative F gives no direct off leash access from parking lot next to admin buildings. If forces us to go up and around with dogs on leash to the Funston Beach Trail (south) There is



a social trail that goes by bushes that could be FORMALIZED as an actual new trail "ROLA"! I go down to the beach below the olympic club, because ladder trail dangerous

---

**Correspondence ID:** 448    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** You are not sincere in your efforts to keep parks in the spirit in which they were given.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 449    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA Unknown  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** After reviewing the range of alternatives, including the preferred alternative, I support Alternative A.  
All other alternatives failed to consider the impact limiting off-leash activity in our Natl. Recreation areas. If space is limited, more off leash dogs, walkers, and owners will be forced together creating increased conflict of dogs and people. The space limitation will cause an increase in dog fights and stress which leads to unwanted animal behavior. Off leash walking creates happy, healthy, and well adjusted dogs. Also it fosters happy athletic owners.  
GGNRA is a recreation area, and as such providing an area for people to run, play, and picnic with their pets is an asset. Implementing any alternative other than A will be costly and time consuming. Increased regulation will only increase dollars spent.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 450    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave the off-leash areas as they are now. So many dogs, including mine, are benefiting from being off-leash and humans benefit too, by getting outdoors to walk their dogs. As for Ocean Beach, snowy plovers have the whole beach, and dogs just have a small section.  
Thanks,  
Barbara LaFleur

---

**Correspondence ID:** 451    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA Unknown  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

---

**Correspondence:** Please leave the beach and fort funston off leash like it is.  
For the health of dogs and people.  
I was diagnosed with a cancer at age 35 years old and I rescued a dog that saved me.  
She is my joy to live everyday just seeing her running and chasing, playing wiht other dogs.  
Dogs on leash are more agresive and can't use their energy.  
We train and control our dogs to do not chase birds and respect environment.  
We are responsible people.  
My dog saved me and I want to fight for her now for her freedom and the respect of the nature and park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 452    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** My wife and I are San Francisco residents in the Marina District. We have a 2-year-old Australian shepherd named Bear. She is an active pup who needs daily exercise to be healthy. The problem is that my wife and I both work full time and cannot be home during the day to walk her properly. We are grateful that Bear is able to run and play off leash at the Crissy Field Beach "Dog Run" - with out this exercise with a professional dog walker, Bear would be terribly unhappy - and on a personal note, we as her owners would be equally unhappy.

I am writing today to let you know that there is a very personal impact at risk here. We live in a city that we love and one of the reasons is the amount of recreational space afforded to us. Bear is part of our family and deserves to utilize that space as well. It is critical that the GGNRA allow dogs off leash in recreational areas because that is what we use them for - exercise, play, and overall health and wellness.

Thank you,

Alex Livingston and Amanda Livingston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 453    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA

I've been walking my dogs at fort Funston and Crissy beach for 35 years. I've seen no problems. Both places are very popular. I think I've seen maybe three rangers on my walks all these years. Now you want to spend millions of dollars to get rid of me! Why? The sand has covered all your stupid fences. You have to bulldoze the sand the keep the paths passable. If you want an empty parking lot, ban dogs. Maybe that's what you want. It's been a wonderful place for people and their dogs and children. No child has been hurt up there. Children get hurt by dogs in their own homes wiht irresponsible dog owners who don't walk their dogs on GGNRA land. By taking away land you make areas more crowded and you will have trouble.

Sent from my iPad

Doreen Malaspina

2 Glenview Dr.

San Francisco, Ca

94131

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	454	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,02,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	One more thing: let dogs run on Oakwood Valley Trail and on Muir Beach!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	455	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,02,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Science has shown that dogs help reduce stress in humans. They have been an important part of society for hundreds of years. A happy dog is a well exercised dog that has access to off leash areas to run. Changing the current rules will make this far more difficult. Please allow us to continue to access the beautiful off-leash areas with our dogs. There is significant human impact if they are reduced.</p> <p>Dogs break down social barriers and allow community to come together. Please preserve the off leash spaces to allow us to continue as a positive, healthy community.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	456	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Cerrito, CA 94530 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,02,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Just because you the, GGNRA, have the power to take away does not mean you should use that power to be unfair to the people and dogs in S.F. and the bay area!!!!!! We can all get along and have for many years until you the GGNRA got power crazy and thought you could come in and take away the joy and happiness of many many people dogs Give us back our 1% !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p>				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	457	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,02,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	<p>Dear GGNRA -</p> <p>My dog Zoe and I go to the beach every day. Zoe swims and I play in the sand. Our Family has lived in San Francisco for sixty five years. Our dogs do not chase birds or bother people.</p> <p>We want to keep going to the beach so our dog can swim and I can play while the whole family is together.</p> <p>Thank you -</p> <p>Alexander Rohan ODriscoll</p>				

---

Age 3  
Son of  
Anne ODriscoll  
49 Ord Court  
San Francisco CA  
94114

---

**Correspondence ID:** 458    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** I use the beach every day with my son and two dogs.  
We live 4 blocks from Ocean Beach.

I really don't feel that dogs are doing any damage to the Beach and think it is absolutely crazy to not let  
families in my neighborhood be able to use it any more. (Most people in the area have a family dog.)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 459    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** GGNRA is an urban Recreation Area. The parklands that are managed by NPS have  
had access for dogs and their guardians and provide critically needed open space for city dwellers to  
exercise and recreate with their dogs. Until now San Francisco has been a relatively dog friendly city  
and I strongly want to retain the current dog access policies and the already very limited off leash access  
areas that we have. We chose to buy a home and live in district 1 outer richmond primarily because of the  
dog policies and open space access. Alternative A - no change in policy or local action to return  
management to the city are the only alternatives that look reasonable, and yes, I did read all of the  
alternatives!

Beth Pruitt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 460    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Regarding:

Sutro Heights Park -

Please allow dogs off leash and on leash in all areas of this small park - this is a neighborhood park and is  
well maintained by the public neighbors - we need this area for neighborliness -

No humans have been harmed by the dogs in this neighborhood -

San Francisco is the area that sets trends

Beverly Shifman

Home Owner  
588 47R ave - /Anza St

---

**Correspondence ID:** 461 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA Unknown  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** I won property in San Francisco Anza/47th Ave  
I always vote -  
Sutro Park - Fort Funston - Crissy Field  
I want to be able to walk my dog on voice control - please  
I had a ticket for "walking" a dog 15 years old and due for euthanasia in a week - by a CRAZY, power hungry park ranger at Sutro Park yrs ago!!!  
Wanted to arrest me for not having id  
Please keep our dogs are part of the park picture  
B. Shulman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 462 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Families with dogs need outside space to enjoy in the city. This shared space has worked great for many years. Why punish dog lovers by taking this away?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 463 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** San Francisco is an open minded progressive city. That is what makes it great. Allowing people to enjoy the outdoor off-leash areas of Crissy Field is essential to create safe, socialized pets in this city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 464 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** As you well know, your proposed restriction will not only harm many of us who responsibly enjoy Crissy Field with our dogs, it will also negatively impact the smaller dog parks which will be crowded and uncomfortable for dogs who have not been allowed to run.

---

It is not too late to act fairly and honorably. Will you?

Barbara Stuart  
2736 Filbert St.  
SF CA 94123

---

**Correspondence ID:** 465 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs are hunting animals they have to be able to run outside. If they are kept inside the house all day their instincts will be frustrated. They will become neurotic, and growl and snap at people. They have to have a place to run free. There also have to be some rules about where dogs have to be on a leash, and about where they can't go; to protect wildlife. See the following opinion paper for more details

---

**Correspondence ID:** 466 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA Unknown  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Walking my dog off leash, throwing her a ball, watching her swim and play with other dogs fills my soul and makes living in a city doable. Without off leash areas this city would lose a lot of appeal. Dog walking is one of my favorite recreational activities, it is simply not the same on a leash. We are becoming more isolated having a place to stand with a group of people and share the joys of watching our dogs play & run is important socialization for people & dogs. Dogs keep some people from depression and going crazy, dogs need a place to run.

My 96 yr old mom has a dog, she can not walk it on leash, she goes & sits on a bench enjoys the park or beach while her dog runs. She lives alone, this is important to her.

Kay Tsenin 139 Skite St. SF Ca.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 467 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA Unknown  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Save our beaches. Muir Beach

Fort Funston, Crissy Field

Freedom for no leashes (NO)!

Freedom for Beaches!

My 3 yellow labs love beaches

---

**Correspondence ID:** 468 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pennngrove, CA 94951  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** My dog is my training partner. I seldom visit parks unless I can bring him along. Please consider that very many people have companion dogs and want to enjoy natural areas together. It is fine to have some fragile areas off limits to dogs but there should be ample opportunity for dogs on leash and even off leash  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 469 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** 1. No changes!

2. We are an urban park, we co-existed!!

3. The snowy plovers are threatened by mercury

4. SF Board of supervisor say no!

no. no. no. no

---

**Correspondence ID:** 470 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA lands are within and adjacent to the urban landscape of San Francisco, where pollution and other urban factors directly impact the health of the environment. Dog use of the areas has minimal impact compared to other GGNRA-sanctioned activities, such as the building and maintenance of commercial buildings on the land - the Beach Hut, parking lots, East Beach bathrooms cafes - where visitors tourists are encouraged to visit. Singling out dog walkers, who are often residents of the area and who walk or drive shorter distances to the parks, is misguided. Further the much of the vegetation at Fort Funston and the few areas where dogs are now allowed is not indigenous could even be considered weeds a hazard to the environment. I'm fine w/ sharing spaces - perhaps limitations (and better signage) as to when dogs may be allowed in certain areas (to accommodate the Snowy Plovers on Ocean Beach for example), but shutting off Fort Funston and other areas of the GGNRA to dogs to the extent of the GGNRA "Dog management plan" is misguided and using my federal tax dollars for an effort that directly impacts my (and my dog's) quality of life in San Francisco is short sighted and anti-community. Instead, better signage, reasonable rules such as limiting the # of dogs per person, better education of the park rangers, and input/funds from the private sector specifically to support park-dog co-habitation would promote more good well in the community while providing for conservation efforts. I would suggest a fund-raising campaign (such as your initial Chrissy Field restoration campaign) to fund dog use preservation efforts - like the installation of dog fountains, dog-only fenced areas, doggie bags disposal staff. See Oregon Seattle (and even Point Isabel in the East Ry) as examples.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 471 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Whether there are designated off leash /or on leash areas of the GGNRA land or not people need to let their dogs run play off leash. If there are not large designated areas for responsible pet owners to take their dogs off leash your going to have a lot of rule breakers out there. If the areas are clearly marked with appropriate signs there will definitely be more compliance. I know which areas we are allowed on leash which makes me assume all other areas are safe to be off leash. I would be very angry to receive a ticket/fine in one of these many confusing unmarked trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 472    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** As a responsible professional dog walker who regularly takes out small groups (no more than 6/@ one time) my business depends on there being safe places to walk dogs on and off leash. There NEEDS to be a designated off leash area where voice controlled dogs can run play. I would like to see a large chunk of each off these proposed areas include some kind of clearly signed space that would be safe for dog owners walkers a like to let their furry loved ones run free.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 473    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 13:07:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please allow dogs to be on some trails and/or open park space. Most dog owners interested in this issue, contrary to misinformed public opinion, are very responsible for their pets and love the outdoors and have a high respect for wildlife and preserving their ecosystems by keeping their dogs on trails or designated dog area. Thank you for considering this!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 474    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** In Re: Rancho: We do not feel like you are hearing us. We have commented & commented & your compromise is a postage stamp sized dog park, we want to continue to walk & hike wiht our dogs in a larg off leash area. You ask for specifics, however, there are no street signs out there to describe an area. Give us back off leash from the creek @ Farallone to the spine just past San Pedro MT Rd up to the neighborhoods & streets of Montara. The no change is from when you took over & we had off leash everywhere. The frogs thrived w/ dogs already. Are you going to have on leash kids to keep



them out of the creek catching frogs & tadpoles? Since you have taken over we have had more illegal campers, a huge fire, overgrown foliage hmpiring trail access & the pampass grass, that was almost under control, is everywhere! ATVs & motorcycles are still on the trails, I can see their headlights & hear their motors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 475 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Been a dog walker on Montara Mtn for 25 years. The proposed "ON LEASH" blue area is to big.  
Please consider making that area smaller or by hours.  
We are retired & are on the mtn every day between 8-9:30 AM. Our dogs have been off leash & on the trails for years, never having a confrontation.  
Please consider making the "Blue Area" in Rancho Corral smaller or by days, maybe Sat & Sun only.  
21D  
Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 476 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in Montara for over 16 years and have walked my dogs on the Rancho Corral de Tierra lands for the entire time. On our daily walks we have noted that the predominant use of this area are dog walkers, who prefer "off leash" use. There are a few hikers & a few bicyclists - but the dominant use has ben dog owners - I purchased my home with the intent of using the area in my retirement to enjoy the surroundings (with my dog). We have a unique environment, low density population with lots of open space, we need to establish an off leash zone!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 477 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not like the dog park situated along Tamarind St. I would like to keep the area quiet.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 478 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** 1. High energy dogs need to have opportunities to run around, supervised by their owners.  
2. The ROLA area is much too small to be effective.  
3. Given the vastness of the Rancho area, surely dogs and their owners can share in the wealth of the area along with bikers, horse riders, and walkers.  
4. The general, non-dog walking public have multiple options to walk and enjoy our scenic coast and parks, whereas, dog owners are so very limited in where they can enjoy walks with their dogs.  
5. Most dogs and their owners are considerate  
6. Offer training classes for dogs/owners?  
7. Could a considerate owner/trained dog get a badge, or something that could be worn, to allow for off leash walking?  
8. I am, unfortunately, not able to run with my dog, due to my physical condition/aging. Please don't restrict an important quality of life, for me and my dog, by not allowing me to walk my dog unleashed. This assumes that I leash my dog whenever meeting up with walkers without dogs, or contact with unfamiliar dogs.  
9. I moved to Montara because of the open areas where I could walk my dog freely  
10. I know there have been some dangerous incidents involving dogs - often these involve a particular breed (eg. Pit Bulls). Similarly, there have been dangerous incidents involving children. The incidence is very low compared to all children and dogs. We do not ban children from parks because of bad behavior of a very few children. Similarly, it does not seem right to ban dogs based on bad behavior of a tiny minority of dogs/owners.  
11. The Plan Objectives seem to not address the needs of the Montara community who have successfully co-habited with wildlife and vegetation, while walking their dogs off leash on our beautiful trails.  
Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 479    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** The ROLA on Tamarind in Montara is not a good idea. It would seriously degrade the neighborhood. The area will not support additional traffic. Tamarind is the only street to walk next to GGNRA open space on easily accessed roadway. Strollers etc. The space should be made more natural.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 480    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037-0595  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Qualifications: me; 20 year walking-the-dog person who prefers "off" leash standard. Moved to Montara 16 years ago. When mountain lions, coyotes, skunks and raccoons are on leash; then, I will leash my dog. You won't catch me, I practice respectable civil disobedience. What ever you go with...I will go with what I do. I do respect the farm, other people, horses, the ranch, etc.  
Thank you for this venue.  
DAZ

---

**Correspondence ID:** 481 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Please provide trails to get to Rancho ROLA for more off leash exercise for dogs. I have a service animal who is on leash all day with me and needs space to exercise off leash to be calm enough to do his job for me. The current proposed ROLA in Montara is TOO SMALL to exercise an 80 lb dog.

I moved to Montara so I could exercise him and myself in the open space here without getting in my vehicle. Most of my neighbors moved here for the same reasons. Please don't ruin our neighborhood and force us all to move. We need a reasonable amount of open space to exercise dogs off leash (2 miles at least).

There are more trails here you could make off leash and still accommodate non-dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 482 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Regarding Rancho Corral Tierra,  
So very sad dissapointed that the "best" proposal - has so little off leash space - This has been taken from us - Lived here for many years, helped maintain clean it over the years, now I see it being taken away - This is the last area on the coast for free dog walking - No more "dog beaches" no more free running - Please, please lets have a fair compromise - not just a small patch of land, but true open space for our dogs - The ROLA space proposed is so very very small - This is the last place here on the coast.

Please compromise don't take it all away - Leni Liakos

lliakos@yahoo.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 483 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 13:55:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi there, I am in favor of restricting the ability of people to walk their dogs off-leash around other people and animals.

It is more important that people feel safe, and are not attacked by dogs while out walking than it is to grant dog-owners the privilege to walk their dogs off-leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 484 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Michael Moore

urbanhound@gmail.com

Permit foe for commercial dog walker

QUESTION

S.F. MEETING

---

**Correspondence ID:** 485 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** palo alto, CA 94306  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 14:47:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been coming to Fort Funston for over a decade and it is my favorite place for dogs off leash and the amount of space makes it a wonderful retreat for dogs and humans alike. If you don't get along with one dog there is so much more space to retreat to. At any one time there are hundreds of dogs at Fort Funston, and suddenly limiting them to 10% o that space would be a travesty. Fort Funston's off leash dog area should stay just the size it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 486 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** belmont, CA 94002  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 15:40:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NO NO NO not another restricted area for dogs  
restrict cats a little and we can talk then  
Signed a proud dog owner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 487 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 15:42:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider closing GGNRA to dogs off leash. Close the east beach to dogs, keep the area around the large cypress trees and on the west side of the footbridge open! Everyone should have an opportunity to use the beaches, including voice controlled off leash dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 488 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francsico, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,22,2013 15:42:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Comment on Ocean Beach SPPA section:

GGNRA Dogplan/EIS Pg 920: The Document States:

During a long-term monitoring survey conducted from 1994 to 2006, 48 off-leash dogs were observed chasing western snowy plovers (Ward and Ablog 2006).

1. This Ward and Ablog citation is not applicable to SPPA since it is a study of Crissy Field WPA, not SPPA.
2. 48 dogs over a period of 12 years results in about 4 dogs a year. That seems pretty low impact

The law enforcement incident reports from 2008 through 2011 showed that there were 729 incidents reported for having a dog off leash within the Ocean Beach SPPA during the period (July 1 through May15) when dogs must be leashed.

1. This same data (Appendix G) shows the incidents of disturbing wildlife is very low or non-existent, most of the violations are related to leash law.
2. This same data (Appendix G) shows decreasing number of dog incidents from 2001-2006 before the new leash law 36 CFR 1.5, and then decreasing again From 2007-2011 after the new leash law 36 CFR 1.5
3. If compliance to current law is poor, why do think a ban of dogs altogether will be well complied with? Most people are very used to walking there dogs there now and will probably continue to do so since there are no other open space alternatives in the area

The document identifies SPPA as a moderate dog walking area. If thats that case than monitoring and citations could be used to enforce the leash laws.

In Chapter 3 of the EIS it states:

In November 2006 and July 2007, GGNRA adopted emergency regulatory provisions under 36 CFR 1.5, requiring on-leash dog walking when plovers are present (July 1 to May 15) in the Crissy Field WPA and Ocean Beach SPPA, and signs stating the seasonal restrictions were posted. A final seasonal protection rule, as detailed in the GGRNA Compendium (NPS 2009f, 31), was published on September 19, 2008.

This is at least a year after the US v Barley decision. The report claims disturbance of snowy plovers increased immediately following the decision in 2005 (This is not true according to your own data in Appendix G). What does that data show in recent years (2011, 2012, 2013)?

In Chapter 3 pg (252/253) of the EIS it states:

The NPS began western snowy plover surveys at Ocean Beach in 1988& The average number of plovers observed per survey during the winter was highest in the 1994-1995 survey period, at more than 54 plovers, and was lowest in 1999, at less than 13 plovers (NPS 2010b). The winter population of western snowy plovers was on average above 30 plovers per winter survey in 2002-2006 (NPS 2010b). Therefore, the numbers of western snowy plovers vary year to year based on a variety of factors, including conditions at other wintering sites, the width of the beach, the severity of storms, and other influences. &(NPS 2010b, 22).

It seems the population of these birds is variable form year to year with many other influences that dont

include dogs. I was on Ocean Beach in Late October and counted at least 50-60 snowy plovers in one small area. It appears the situation is improving and no action is necessary (Alternative A).

Each time an individual study is cited in this document, it says dogs may influence could disturb-nothing conclusive. It sounds pretty speculative to me.

The summary rational statement for Alternative A states:

&potentially limit their use of preferred habitat and interrupt roosting or foraging behavior, which causes birds to expend energy; frequent disturbance of this type affects fat reserves needed for migration and breeding.

I see these birds running around constantly expending energy when no dogs are present, would a brief encounter with a dog really matter? The expense of energy would be incremental.

In addition, frequent disturbance doesnt appear to be happening. I walk my dog every morning and evening on Ocean Beach. I see lots of snowy plovers and have never seen a dog go after any them. To me that would suggest disturbances are occasional at best.

Table 8 pg 246 indicates: Critical habitat has been designated for this species (Snowy Plover), but it does not occur in GGNRA. If Ocean Beach SPPA is not a critical habitat, then stable or increasing numbers of the birds overwintering implies no change to existing rules are needed.

#### Chapter 3 of the EIS Visitor Experience/Environmental Justice section

The document states: Some ethnic or low-income populations may be more negatively affected by off-leash dog walking that is a ridiculous and unscientific conclusion to reach from a random phone survey. They cite a roughly 7% dfference in response between two income groups. Due to the uncontrolled nature of the informal survey that would be well within the error band; especially if there are very few respondents in any of the income groups. They also cite 11% o respondents thought the dogs discouraged use of GGNA by disadvantaged groups. Thats is a meaningless and highly subjective, speculative statement.

The document states:

Latinos expressed the most concern&For example, dog owners assume that other people will like the owners dogs as much as they do; dog owners let their dogs approach other people without first asking their permission; and owners do not react to their dogs begging for other peoples food.

That is a completely absurd generalization. I, and many dog owners I know simply do not do that.

This entire section of the document seems to me like NPS is grasping at straws and trying to link dog walking with negative affects on low-income groups, minorities and other disadvantaged groups. I find this tactic deplorable and highly offensive

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	489	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,22,2013 15:54:01**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thousands of San Francisco residents visit these parks every day without incident and while I appreciate the NPS's desire to meet the needs of the American public that visits GGNRA, the unique nature of these urban parks requires flexibility in also meeting the needs of San Francisco residents, both human and canine. The evidence that dogs damage fragile wilderness areas is weak at best. Better posting of existing regulations is all that's needed to educate visitors with dogs and overwhelmingly responsible vast majority of dog owners will happily assist in politely enforcing the rules. The proposed plan, which dramatically reduces off-leash access for no apparent reason. The public comments overwhelmingly opposed this plan, which is a solution looking for a problem and should be discarded or heavily modified to reflect the needs of the community.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 490 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,22,2013 18:39:18**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am against any new restrictions on the area in which dogs and people can recreate together, both off and on leash. This plan will cut where people can walk off- and on-leash by 90% compared with where people can walk with dogs now. The GGNRA has ignored what the people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan and poorly thought out plan.

The GGNRA was created for the maintenance of needed URBAN recreational open space. That's why it's designated as a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. With the new dog management plan, the GGNRA is reneging on its promises to preserve and protect recreational access in region. The places like Fort Funston where people and dogs are free to recreate in a semi-natural environment are some for the safest and cleanest parks in the region because of the excellent care of the dog walking community.

There is no credible reason why people with dogs are not allowed to have adequate and reasonable space to walk their dogs in the vast 80,000 acres that comprise the GGNRA. Please do not impose these restriction on the people and dogs of the San Francisco Bay Area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 491 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Nov,22,2013 18:50:33**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For people who don't want to be around off-leashed dogs, there are a myriad of trails available in Marin (99% o GGNRA land) including Tennessee Valley Cove where you can go without crossing paths with a canine.

Muir Beach and Oakwood Valley have for decades been off-leash dog walking spots- long before they were owned by GGNRA.

To make people get in their cars, wait at a five minute one way stop light thru the tunnel to go to Rodeo is not environmentally the right thing to do.

We need to share our trails with all user groups, and yes that means people who responsibly walk their dogs off-leash. And for those who don't pick up poop, or can't control your dogs, we need enforcement not a total ban on the vast majority of dog owners who are responsible.

Why are you spending all this energy making sure people with dogs have to drive further than they normally would to simply do the everyday activity of walking their dogs off leash? (And why are you more concerned with creating more parking spaces for tourists than implementing more mass transit for tourists?)... If all the Ocean Beachers have to drive to Rodeo, and all the Marin people, how much daily carbon foot print will that add up to?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 492    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 21:11:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, I am writing to urge you to disallow unleashed pets on hiking trails in the GGNRA. These animals can become a threat to hikers, children, and other animals, and dog attacks on trails can easily become a major issue.

It is a small thing to leash a pet. It is a huge tragedy when an unleashed animal attacks and mauls a hiker, child, or pet.

Please do the right thing.

Respectfully,

Thom Morris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 493    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 21:13:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've lived in San Francisco for 7 years and have been a dog owner for only two. Alamo Square is our main park, but we (and I do mean myself and my dog) greatly enjoy the open spaces, other dogs, and their owners of Chrissy Field and Fort Funston. The benefits of having access to these areas are obvious: exercise, play, socialization.

Because living in the city comes with a specific set of challenges in its own right, having a dog in this urban area raises the need for these kinds of designated open spaces.

Also of valid merit is the fact that this plan pays no consideration to the impacts on the physical and mental health of both dogs and their owners if dog walking is this severely restricted.

While the need for more responsible pet guardianship is needed (namely, picking up after dogs), this plan is very short sighted and unjustly restrictive. This punishes responsible dog owners for the bad actions of a few irresponsible ones.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 494    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,22,2013 21:43:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support plan / map 10 E for Chrissy field.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 495    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Los Altos Hills, CA 94022  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 00:59:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

Thank you for all the work you have put into finding a good solution for Dog Management in Golden Gate Recreational Area.

As a citizen and resident of the Bay Area with a dog I have always enjoyed the closeness to nature and open spaces which we have available.

I strongly recommend Option E

Thank you

Zsuzsanna Molnar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 496    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,23,2013 08:49:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

To me what makes our area that we live in so unique is the vast amount of gorgeous hiking trails available to us. I work from home and break up the day by taking my dog on a hike each and every day. My German Shepherd runs up and down the hills, chasing bees and moths, etc. To think I might eventually have to have her on a leash at all times KILLS me. There are plenty of "no dog" trails already. I suggest that those who are annoyed by dogs use them.

When I moved to Marin in 1992 my neighbor clued me in to "the dog trail". He was referring to the Oakwood Trail. It has been known as the dog trail for years. Why on earth should it become a "tourist" trail? I suggest the non-dog people drive just a bit further and use the Tennessee Valley beach trail.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 497    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95117  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,23,2013 09:38:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I only rarely bring my dog up to the city but when I do he loves to be off leash at fort funston. It's beautiful and whimsical to see all the other dogs romping around and I have yet to see anyone acting irresponsibly in the several times I have been there. Please don't take this away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 498 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Millbrae, CA 94030

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,23,2013 14:28:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Changing the current dog plan at Crissy Field is needed because not having the dogs roam free during the mating/breeding period of the snowy plover was not being observed. Dogs on leash is generally not observed anyway and I saw no difference this summer during the mating/breeding window. Any plan that is implemented needs to be enforced starting with making sure dogs are on leash in the areas they are supposed to be. Around 5 or 6 pm people come out with their dogs and let them run free. Crissy Field, Sweeney Ridge, Ocean Beach. Restricting dogs completely in areas of sensitive wildlife habitat should take precedence. The only way to do this is to not allow dogs completely. Some dog owners let their dogs run free into the bushes regardless of the rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 499 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,23,2013 16:08:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Fort Funston is so important to my dogs and me! I have healthy, beautiful, well trained, licensed dogs who thrive on the exercise they get off leash at Fort Funston. When we are walking at Fort Funston we see maybe one visitor there without a dog per every 50 visitors. The vast majority of people who use the park do so because of the off-leash dog experience. Dog walkers by and large also keep the park clean and free of rubbish/dog waste. Please don't restrict the off leash areas that are so crucial to the health of our dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 500 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,23,2013 23:19:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a 34 year resident of San Francisco and have been a dog owner for 18 of those years. I am a home owner as well. I am writing to protest any changes proposed to restrict the current off leash dog rules at Ocean Beach, Crissy Field East Beach and especially Fort Funston. I am a regular user of these RECREATION areas with my dog(s) when I am not working. When I am working I have Professional dog walkers who take my dog, Rigby (and Nico prior to 2011), to both Crissy Field and Fort Funston FOUR DAYS A WEEK!

I am a very responsible dog owner who picks up after her dog and keeps him away from any areas that are marked for restoration. I know for certain that my walkers are equally respectful.

These Recreational areas are for the Citizens of San Francisco for their use and recreation and should remain as they are currently being used.

I feel quite strongly that any changes to the current use and rules would be a violation of the rights of the tax paying Citizens of San Francisco. These RECREATION areas are currently and happily being used by many a dog owner and their dogs. We all work hard and deserve the joyous play we have with our dog pets at these beautiful areas.....we need the play time to be balanced. Balance is important for dog owners AND their dogs. Dogs need off leash play in wide open spaces and owners NEED their time with their dogs in OUR CITY'S beautiful off leash areas.

I also want to emphasize that there are more dogs than kids in SF and that they have rights as well. PLUS, the dog walking industry is HUGE in SF and employs many, many residents who pay taxes on their businesses and provide a much needed service to hard working people here.

By changing the use of Crissy Field East Beach, Ocean Beach or Fort Funston would be hurting many businesses, dog owning residents and the dog population.

I implore the GGNRA to leave us all these areas as it has been and stop these disturbing plans to revoke our rights.

Sincerely,  
Patrice Catanio

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	501	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,24,2013 12:57:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am a responsible dog owner in San Francisco. It is absolutely necessary that we take our dog out every day to exercise, interact with other dogs, people, experiences. She has grown up in the city where she has been lucky enough to live near the wonderful Doboce park, however the daily routine must be broken by treats like beach days at Fort Funston with 1,000 of her closest friends or day hikes up in the Marin headlands. Say the word beach or dive in earshot of Barley and she starts salivating. She lives for the great out doors. Maybe its because we live in a typical 400sqft studio on the second floor in the lovely lower Haight neighborhood. Or maybe its because shes a dog and they love playing fetch and tug running around being a dog. We are responsible and respectful. We carry a backpack with extra poop bags, leashes treats water and toys. We are also not alone. I have never met a dog owner at any of the GGNRA parks who was irresponsible. We clean up after ourselves, pro actively prevent conflicts with our dogs and respect those who are not comfortable around our k9 friends. San Francisco offers so much to its residence but one thing lacking is clean open spaces. Now the plan is to restrict the best off leash dog ares. Why? Can someone explain this to Barley. Shes not going to understand why she cant play at

---

her favorite parks any more. Oh wait, She can be on a leash. Its almost the same, except that a well trained dog knows that while on a leash it is working. No pulling, No smelling that, No playing with that dog, no introducing yourself to that human. Dont get me wrong Barley loves walks but as soon as that leash clicks off there is an energy that cannot be matched. It's disappointing that one of the most open minded, coexisting citys in america is loosing its liberal attitude.

As I mentioned earlier, we take the pup to one of the local dog parks just about every day with the occasional weekend trips to the beach or hike up in the mountains. This new plan would essentially keep me restricted to dog parks such as Doboce, Dolores, Alamo Square and Corona Heights. So whats the big deal right? Other than Corona, none of these are fenced in and are surrounded by traffic. Luckily our dog is old enough to understand the boundaries of these parks, however as a puppy we were reluctant to let her off leash and the times she did step out of bounds were terrifying. Also these parks tend to be over crowded with people other dogs and homeless encampments. They show the wear and tear of use which the parks of the ggnra do not. We have to keep an eye out for our wondering pup making sure she doesn't get into the mud which is full of giarida, peoples pick-nicks or mess with the homeless. The only worry free area is fort funston where as soon as we park the dog had total freedom to play and i dont have to worry about anything except where Barley hides her ball. Pulling these parks from our go to's forces us to go for longer drives down to Santa Cruz or stick to the same old torn up local parks. its s shame anyone would limit this resource for absolutely no benefit to the community. Why did I move here?

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	502	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,24,2013 14:36:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Ladies and Gentlemen,				

I have commented previously. My comments are restricted to the Crissy Field Area because that is where I go with my dog.

With the exception of the "no change" map/plan, no other alternatives adequately accommodate the elderly or people with disabilities to walk and exercise their dogs off-leash:

1. Exclusion from all hard services to walk dogs off-leash - - the path.
2. Lack of convenient parking to access permitted off-leash areas.
- 3 Distance to walk to gain access to off-leash area.
4. The inclusion of areas that are either grass or soft sand - - surfaces which are difficult/impossible for handicapped or elderly to walk on.

It is disappointing that you have made no substantive changes since the last time I commented.

Margot S. Parke

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	503	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 19:23:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I generally support the new preferred alternative. I would like to see less areas with dogs (on leash or off leash) but I think this is a fair compromise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 504    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,24,2013 20:43:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

As a regular user of numerous GGNRA trails and beaches, I wholeheartedly support alternative A: No Action. My family and I rely on the GGNRA for many of our recreational needs, from hiking to surfing, and feel strongly that the space should also be available for off-leash dog recreation, as designated by current regulations.

Let us take Rodeo Beach as an example. We visit Rodeo Beach at least once a week, typically on a Sunday or Saturday. Some days it is warm, sunny, and crowded; other days it is cold, foggy, windy, and deserted. Yet no matter the weather, there is always at least a handful of dog owners throwing balls for their dogs to run and catch. If the beach is crowded, the dog owners tend to move towards the southern part of the beach where there are usually fewer people. If the beach is empty, they tend to make use of the whole thing. The point is that most dog owners are responsible when it comes to keeping their dogs under control so that they are a nuisance neither to the environment nor to other beach-goers. In fact, far from being a nuisance, one of the great joys of visiting Rodeo Beach is watching the dogs play with one another, run at full speed, jump into the waves, and enjoy the sort of freedom few other places can provide. I trust that the authors of the dog management plan have had the opportunity to witness this joyful phenomenon.

In reviewing the SEIS document, I was delighted to see that the off-leash regulations at Rodeo Beach would only be slightly changed by all but the most ruthless plan (Alternative D), to which of course I am fervently opposed. However, even those plans that are most generous to dog owners (Alternative B, C, E, and F) would simply redistribute the demand for off-leash dog areas in the Bay Area. This poses a serious problem. Dog owners who ordinarily use Crissy Field or Muir Beach will flock to Rodeo Beach, for example. Not only will this increase vehicle traffic over the Golden Gate bridge and through the Marin Headlands (which is only supported by two small roads, which are already congested with tourist traffic), but it will also risk turning Rodeo Beach into an over-used dog-park. That would be terrible for both dog-owners and other visitors. By giving dog-owners a greater variety of choices (as the current regulations provide), not only will their dogs be happier, but so will the other people who use the areas for a variety of recreational activities.

Moreover, the complexity of some of the Alternatives strikes me as wholly unenforceable. The current regulations at Tennessee Valley offer a good example. A few years ago, I met some friends there for a hike. We had a dog with us and were disappointed to find that dogs were not permitted on the Tennessee Valley trail (for understandable reasons, having to do with the effect of their "predatory scent" on the

wildlife). Off the parking lot, however, we noticed a sign for the Miwok trail, which does allow dogs. We enjoyed the trail very much, but eventually it dumped us back onto the Tennessee Valley trail about one third of the way from the parking lot. As we were walking back to our car, we were approached by a ranger, who was eager to give us a citation for walking our dog on the Tennessee Valley trail; but we explained that we took the Miwok trail without knowing that it would take us back to the the Tennessee Valley trail. Like most rangers, he was understanding and kindly let us go with a warning. Despite the excellent signage along those trails, there was no indication that the dog-friendly Miwok trail eventually turned into a trail on which dogs were forbidden.

The point of this story is that these new dog management rules- -which stipulate, for instance, that dogs must be on-leash on trail A, but can be off-leash on the south end of the beach, but cannot set foot on trail C- -will only frustrate dog owners and the already overextended rangers who will be charged with enforcing the new rules in addition to their other important duties. It would be much better to designate certain particularly fragile areas as off-limits to all dogs (as in the current policy) than it would be to negotiate the fine lines of the particular spaces where dogs are allowed under particular conditions (as in the various Alternative policies).

In conclusion, the GGNRA has been an invaluable resource for dog-owners who really do need spaces where their dogs can run free, which is a joyful form of recreation not only for the dogs and their owners, but for those who have the pleasure of watching them play. If the water is too frigid for us to jump right in, we can live vicariously through those delightful animals who fearlessly plunge through the waves after nothing more rewarding than an old tennis ball. It makes us all better people and better citizens, more generous with and more appreciative of those freedoms which we have been given.

Making the proposed changes to the GGNRA dog policy risks ruining that by, at best, forcing people to travel farther to other areas within the GGNRA, protecting the resources of some areas, while overtaxing those of others. It would, moreover, be sad to see all of the hard work that has gone into producing this 1,500 SEIS document wasted when it finally comes to be implemented and is found completely unenforceable due to its needless complexity.

Dog-owners are generally very responsible (having a dog is much like having a child, but without the college tuition). They tend (in my experience) to take particularly good care of these magnificent lands which have been made available to us; I often see them picking up loose trash along the beaches and trails, which inspires me and others to do the same. But, of course, it is only possible for them to do so if their dogs are allowed to be off-leash.

Thank you for taking the time to read and consider my comment.

Sincerely,  
B. Saltzman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	505	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 91422 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Nov,24,2013 21:35:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please save Fort Funston as a dog friendly area, where my dog can enjoy time walking free without leash, meet new friends. It is very important to have some areas where god could feel free.				

---

Sincerely,  
Tatyana

---

**Correspondence ID:** 506    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA Unknown  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Comment specific to Rancho Corral de tierra.  
Regarding the "Vicente Ridge" area.  
This area would be perfectly appropriate for Dog walking.  
The Looped trails are very desirable for spreading people out should seriously be considered for Dog walking  
Jim Sullivan  
Pacifica

---

**Correspondence ID:** 507    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,04,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** There is no valid reason to not allow dogs off leash in Rancho Corral de Tierra.  
Women feel more secure when walking with a dog on the trails.  
Michelle Obama is promoting healthy lifestyles for all Americans and walking with a dog encourages a healthy lifestyle.  
This is a RECREATIONAL AREA not a national park. Walking with dogs is a huge pleasure for a large amount of the local population.  
Banning dogs or keeping them on leash is an UNPOPULAR option with the MAJORITY of the local population.  
GGNRA does not own the land, they manage it for the people. The people do NOT want dogs banned or just on leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 508    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Unknown, UN Unknown  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** This comment is for the Homestead Fire Road in Homestead Valley.  
I support Preferred Alternative F - Dogs on Leash because:  
1. I am a resident of the area and use the trail frequently. I have been bitten by a dog on this trail and fear for my safety every time I see a dog on the trail. I have frequently been approached by barking/growling dogs not on-leash or under voice control.  
2. Commercial dog walkers use this trail and typically have 3-6 dogs not on leash and not under voice

---

control (dogs running loose and bothering people (other animals/vegetation). I have also been harassed by commercial dog walkers who feel they have control of the space and can do what ever they want.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 509    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** The plan should include access to trails from County View as today. This is along the built edge of Tamalpais Valley on two sides. Access trails exist (with the local Tam Valley Community) from Marin Avenue as well as County View. Current trails include Miwok access to Tennessee Valley Parking lot - again close to housing. Dogs (in family - not dog walkers) tend to behave on trails (versus wide open spaces). This is also a very social way for local Moms to hike walk dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 510    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA Unknown  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** GGNRA DOG MANAGEMENT AT MUIR BEACH - Comments

I have followed the GGNRA's efforts at Muir Beach to bring salmon back to the creek, and to restructure the beach and the parking lot. I have been to past meetings and I would like ot make some comments and suggestions concerning Muir Beach.

1. Many residents of Muir Beach and nearby areas walk on Muir Beach at least once a week, if not more. Many of us bring dogs because we enjoy walking their dogs off leash and we know that dogs need exercise in order to remain healthy. For many of us, it is not possible to exercise dogs unless they are of leash because we cannot run and the dogs need to run. My experience for the most part is that these dogs are under voice control, the owners are careful to pick up after their dogs, and many of us also pick up trash on the beach which comes directly from people visiting the beach or from the ocean where people have thrown it. Generally we try to come to the beach when it is not crowded.

2. It seems that the salmon have not returned to the creek, at least not yet. I was told by a park employee that it was doubtful that the salmon would ever return because they had been gone so long and because the creek still dries up in the winter. In any case, people represent a much greater hazard to the salmon than dogs do.

3. It is clear that the current goal of the GGNRA is to encourage use of the beach by tourists to the Bay Area and by residents who live in the nine Bay Area counties, but not necessarily Marin. If this goal is successful you must remember that these tourists may come to the beach only once or twice in a lifetime, while residents of Muir Beach and the surrounding areas often come at least twice a week or more. For example, I have been coming to Muir Beach with my dogs, my children and now my grandchildren for 49 years. We have enjoyed being at Muir Beach several thousand times as opposed to once or twice in a lifetime. Please do not forget the residents in your quest to appeal to tourists.

4. Most people who like to walk their dogs off leash will find another place to go if Muir Beach becomes a leash only area. This means that local residents who now walk to the beach will have to drive to another area. This is not a good choice for the environment. It also means that Muir Beach residents will have no place in their town where they can walk their dogs off leash.

5. My observation is that you are not considering possibilities for dog management at Muir Beach other than requiring that all dogs be leashed at all times. I would like you to consider one of the following



compromises so that the local residents feel heard and represented:

A. Allow dogs to be off leash on weekdays because the use of the beach is low on those days. Require leashes on weekends.

B. Allow dogs to be off leash until noon every day and leashed after noon. This alternative will give some weekend time to local residents who work elsewhere during the week.

C. Allow dogs off leash at all times except peak times during the summer months.

Like most residents I am sympathetic to much of what the GGNRA is trying to accomplish. However, I like to think that local residents and their needs are being considered as well.

Penelope Foster, Mill Valley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 511 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Marin County Dog Walking Area

1. People should be allowed on all GGNRA beaches
2. Dogs should be allowed on specific beaches.
3. No more than 3 dogs per walker
4. All dogs should be on leash /or obedient to command
5. Areas should be (must be) prominently signed
6. All rules MUST Be enforced!!!! This requires staff - paid or volunteer
7. It must be remembered that the animals vegetation native to the area is more important than all else
8. People are trespassers. Dogs are people's responsibility

---

**Correspondence ID:** 512 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,06,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** As a senior citizen and a dog rescuer I find it is very necessary to have a place to let dogs off leash - for their security and mine - more signage - trash boxes for poop and poop bags would make people aware that this should be done. All this if done would keep people from misunderstanding what should be common courtesy. This information at all areas should have been done years ago -

---

**Correspondence ID:** 513 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** The plan for Land's end shows no balance. It is highly travelled by people, so the addition of dogs should not pose significant additional disturbance. Why is there ZERO ROLA option here? Comment extends to Ft. Miley Baker Beach. No ROLA in this whole section??? Takes away a lot of existing ROLA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 514    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. At Crissy - Fence ROLA and charge a fee.  
Have a fee associated with SUP for dogwalkers- to help with maintenance of the ROLAs.  
2. No off leash! Safety for people (elderly and children) comes first  
3. No evidence of safety issue in SEIS - off leash has worked for over 40 years - when there issues with particular dogs/owners needs to be addressed individually.  
4. Dogs comes first  
They should be allowed  
to Run Chase Dogs and Balls  
in the water

---

**Correspondence ID:** 515    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Leave the entire airfield open to off-leash! It's sparsely used especially during the week.  
2. Consider taking the Presidio back from the Federal Gov't.  
3. Give it to the Presidio Trust  
4. Requiring leashes on the sand ladder at Ft. Funston is unsafe - its hard to keep my footing going down without a dog - Having a dog or 2 on leash pulling you is a serious safety issue  
5. People have been injured by dogs gone out of control. Owning a dog should be treated as a responsibility like driving a car.  
6. People have been injured by people gone out of control in our parks.  
7. No snowy plover from May 15-June 30 - we should at least be allowed on Ocean Beach then. We are not stupid or confused  
8. Paying heavy taxes in S.F, I expect to use our beautiful resources with my well trained voice commanded pet dog! OFF LEASH (for pooping required) (preferable)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 516    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. The fountains at Sutro Park need to be fixed!!! One fountain remains one was kidnapped by you guys! Bring back the fountains at Sutro Park/48th Anza resident  
2. Thank you GGNRA for all your work and good efforts on behalf of walkers, seniors, children, and all who enjoy beauty and safety. Jane.  
3. Consider weekday morning off-leash timed use at Baker Beach, on part of the beach. At times when visitor use on the beach is extremely low

---

4. Children love playing with dogs in the GGNRA
5. Consider off-leash timed use everywhere dogs are allowed.
6. We believe in wild places and support the Nat'l Park System. HOWEVER, we live in an urban environment! We have more dogs in SF than children! We also have 2 children and own a business in SF. Off-leash dog play is essential for well-socialized, SAFE dog ownership. Alternative A is the safest proposal that recognizes our urban environment and the popularity of dogs. All other alternatives significantly impact people, families, safe recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 517    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Fewer conflicts with dogs than with ill-behaved people. Focus NPS resources on enforcing other things!  
2. How about those dog owners who don't pick up after their dog poops  
3. Restricting dog access & off-leash will PUSH DOGS even more into SF, and will make the NPS an EVEN WORSE NEIGHBOR  
4. How can I get exercise w/ my dog on leash. Running throwing the ball is healthy for both of us!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 518    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Having access to off leash areas creates community for dogs people. Happy, healthy people their companions keep San Francisco a world-class city! Take it back!  
2. This isn't Yosemite! It's a big city. Please don't take our recreation away!!  
3. I've worked hard in training my dog. Keeping her cooped up wouldn't be good for her or me!  
4. Recreation area. Not a park. The initial mandate for GGNRA includes dogs. We are paying attention.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 519    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** I moved from the east coast to SF for many reasons. One of the main reasons is the beautiful parks and open space. There's nothing else like it in the country. I live in an extremely small condo. I need to use the parks to keep my sanity. My dog is at home alone most of the day. I only want to go to parks spaces that allow dogs. Please keep as many areas open for people like me to enjoy with our dogs! It's a huge part of our daily life.  
I'm also concerned about the time, resources, and money that it will take from GGNRA to implement these new proposals. I think the time, resources, money can be better utilized on other important issues. Keep the parks open for ALL of us to enjoy! We already pay a HIGH price to live here!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 520 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. My well-trained, voice command dogs don't cause any harm to the land. People, out of control kids, park police horses cause more messes.  
2. These are urban parks. Please allow urban use. Including recreation for residents and their pets.  
3. Weekends holidays - after 9:30 dogs should be on leash on Crissy Field beach  
4. As a visitor to the area I have been delighted to see how well the dogs and their people interact. Off-leash areas could be a model for human interaction.  
5. THIS IS NOT Yosemite it is A Nat'l Recreation Area Not A PARK!  
6. Sutro Heights Park - Bring back trash cans to the parapet area (volunteers pick up trash there) bench near bird bath

---

**Correspondence ID:** 521 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Let the dogs roam free!!  
2. Alternative A is the Best for an urban parkland. Let the people and their pets enjoy this land in our city. Do what you want with parks away from the city. Leave our city alone.  
3. The City Beach is for the people to recreate with their children dogs.  
4. Leave the scarce voice control areas for urban recreation of city dwellers with their dogs. We need a place for exercise for health & happiness - an exercised dog = healthy, friendly dogs  
dogs need more exercise than just walking!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 522 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Dogs are ok. Horses should be banned because the poop on the beach and nobody cleans it up.  
2. See below, but, add in SF  
3. Snowy Plover mates in UTAH dogs do not influence this  
4. GGNRA cannot mange and is not trained to enforce this. That is why dog walkers are being TASED  
5 .Fort Funston - no regulation of dogs necessary

---

**Correspondence ID:** 523 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** 1. Let the dogs run free - it's an urban playground not Yosemite!  
2. I walk Crissy Field frequently my favorite thing is seeing the dogs running playing on the beach. Dogs should NOT have to be on leash at the ocean.  
3. This is so wrong!! Let our dogs run play ball in a few of the safe places to run w/out getting hit by cars!  
4. The sand ladder (Funston Beach North) to beach at Fort Funston is too steep  
5. Park should take actions to remedy this  
6. Everybody should be able to enjoy these places not just dog owners!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 524 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** 1. The preferred alternative is a huge take-away from the citizens of SF who have dogs. Where is the scientific justification, the evidence that supports this drastic reduction of areas where off-leash is allowed.  
2. Fort Funston - sunset trail should remain off leash as it is now  
3. Yes. Keep dogs on-leash in wildlife areas - including Ocean Beach. Dogs that chase birds and other wildlife are endangering a key resource in the GGNRA - a resource the park service is mandated to protect!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 525 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** 1. Preserving the area? Why don't we start w/ making people pick up their trash!? The picnics in the area is what is stretching land resources, not dogs off leash.  
2. Why would the second draft of the plan be so similar to the first?! and after overwhelming local support for off-leash recreation. And you took such a long time! Booo!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 526 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** 1. I am a birder and a dog owner who has visited Fort Funston for 2 decades. Question: why close area at FOOT of bluff when swallows are nesting? Dogs do not bother swallows, who are fast aerial. If anything is to be closed to people dogs, it should be the TOP of the bluffs, to avoid crumbling.  
Point (not about swallows, but about other species that nest in scrub): DOGS EXCLUDE FERAL CATS. If you get rid of dogs, you will have a cat problem, as in Golden Gate Park.

2. Fort Funston needs more garbage cans. Could dog owners help supply these and organize regular emptying?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 527    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Vision for Fort Funston (which includes continued off-leash dog walking):  
Reintroduce California quail  
After  
Enlisting dog owners to clear iceplant  
Enlisting dog owners to plant native scrub plants under supervision of CA native plant society  
Explicitly ban feeding ravens @ Ft. Funston with signage explaining that surplus ravens (supported by feeding) prey on baby quail  
Note that presence of dogs keeps away feral cats, which also prey on baby quail  
Enlist dog owners to keep dogs off new plantings  
When scrub is mature enough to provide cover for quail, reintroduce!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 528    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Alternative 7 seems well balanced to me for Chrissy Field, Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. We, as dog owners, need to share these spaces with non dog owners who enjoy the Beach.  
2. DITTO!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 529    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Ocean Beach is a sanctuary for humans and animals. Unfortunately this is not the case for the birds that over-winter here, as they are constantly being chased by off-leash dogs!!! Some of these species fly thousands of miles and need to rest and feed to be able to fly back to their breeding grounds. Instead, they are under constant stress, from dogs. Please restrict off-leash dog "walking" on Ocean Beach. Keep it a sanctuary for all! - Surfer/Beach-goer & San Francisco Native  
2. Sutro Heights Park  
1. check accuracy of alt F map - area not shaded as on-leash near parapet - could be included as on-leash (not a formal garden)  
2. Social trails (?) - SE corner - are there additional trails that should be considered designated? (G. Durgerian working with neighbors to improve trails)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 530    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Marin

1. Alternative A is the only way. People and dogs need space for play!
2. Agreed! Just like my kids need an urban playground, so do the dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 531 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** 1. Allow dogs on Baquiano Trail

2. Provide off-leash opps at Sweeny, Mori, Cattle Hill

3. Allow Dogs on Bluffs Trail at Mori to get to adjacent open space

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

5. Park Service is wrong group to be managing urban/highly-used parks

6. Off-leash Dog walk = healthy people = saving on medical care.

7. Off-leash dog walk is Good wholesome family fun for the whole family that everyone can afford.

8. I don't want to walk my dog where people are who don't like dogs, i.e. don't close minor connecting trails don't concentrate dog activity on major trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 532 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Dogs need off-leash like we need exercise, because that's what off-leash is: one of the only opportunities for dogs to get exercise. One of the only off-leash areas remaining is the Quarry (Vallemar, Pacifica), because it is private-owned and the owners understand the necessity for off-leash walking. When I was about 7, I remember that the committee tried to ban off-leash walking there. Unlike the GGNRA, they haven't tried again. They understand why they couldn't get the law through.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 533 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** Dogs need exercise just like we do. Imagine being told you can't go to the gym or told you can't do whatever you do for exercise. Also for some people their dogs are their lifes, their

children, and their family. They want everything for their beloved family and if their dogs aren't able to exercise, that could take away the happiness of their family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 534    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. There has been incredible stewardship by locals on Montara Mountain - you are punishing the responsible people who love and take care of their home.  
2. You keep taking  
3. Please expand off-leash dog walk, not take it away.  
4. Off-leash Dog walk = happy dog = happy people = happy society  
5. Promote humanity by promoting off-leash dog walk.  
6. Dogs are man's best friends for a reason. We need to treat them like our best friends.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 535    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Problems with the proposed Sweeney Ridge/Cattle Hill revision:  
-cuts off trail access from all of Vallemar  
-forces people in Vallemar to get in a car and drive a really long way around the Vallemar Hill range just to walk their dogs for a couple of hours.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 536    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Intro.  
1. Off-leash dog walking promotes happy/healthy lifestyle - promote that GGNRA Expand off-leash dog walking areas.  
2. Agree!!  
3. Misbehavior by a minority of dogwalkers should not deprive the rest of dogwalkers (non-commercial) of use of off leash areas. Instead enforce better the miscreants.  
4. Keep the 1% to be able to use off-leash areas as it has been for 30 years.  
5. THIS DOESN'T WORK!! I've never been to O.B. when there were shore birds when at least one dog hasn't chased some. The birds need energy/calories to migrate. They're declining in numbers. They were here first and really have nowhere else to go.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 537    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Ending off-leash dogwalking sets a dangerous precedence in regards to all of our other rights in the GGNRA  
2. I am in awe of the resources you have wasted employing yourselves to act as judge, jury and witness in a conversation to which you, the NPS, was/were invited to ONLY with the provision that you maintain the historical i.e. human use of the GGNRA areas including the walking of dogs off-leash.  
Shame on you. There are more single adult homes with dogs than families with children and no dogs in SF. Shame on you NPS. you are stealing urban areas for your jobs.  
3. You remind me of Eric Canton's congress poop!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 538    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** How would you react if a bigger animal chased your dog randomly, often, while it was trying to eat? Would you just tell the dog to be patient or would intervene to protect your pooch's health? BIRDS NEED SAFETY. Your dog DOES have alternatives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 539    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. Off-leash dog walk is what makes San Francisco great.  
2. Off-leash dog walk promotes healthy and happy lifestyle for both dogs and humans.  
3. Having to be on-leash all the time is inhumane  
4. Dogs need off-leash play to become well-socialized, i.e. SAFE. Dogs who are always on-leash develop forms of aggression. If we are a city of dog lovers (over 120,000 in SF) we must ensure they are well-socialized SAFE dogs. Alternative A. We are parents, voters and business owners in SF.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 540    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. We don't need dog mgmt we do need mgmt of the GGNRA leadership.  
This is not YOSE or YELL This is an urban park should be treated as such  
Scrap the plan  
2. Losing off-leash walking area at Crissy will have a great impact on both my health and that of my dog.  
We booth need to run free to stay healthy. We have no backyard so free recreation on public land is

---

critical to a healthy urban life. I have lived in SF for 50 years and value the urban diversity that recognizes the unique needs of our city people and dogs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 541 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. But in reality the shorebird population in SF is declining. Dogs have alternatives. Birds don't. The 5% is the part great for wildlife (but for dogs & other disturbances)  
2. Dogs and people (and wildlife) can co-exist peacefully and safely. The solution is better education of the public, park rangers and dog owners, not the whole sale/blanket limiting of the rights and traditional privileges of dog owners (and those who enjoy the company of dogs) on the <5% of GGNRA lands currently open to dogs. At Fort Funston ocean beach, the areas are naturally inaccessible to the very young (strollers), elderly handicapped. Unless GGNRA plans to pave over/build paved paths into these areas, dog use in these areas does not impact the part of the population who may have an issue with the dogs there. Again, 95% no dogs, and 5% dog use ok lands does not equal undue degradation of GGNRA lands (which are our tax payer lands, BTW).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 542 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** 1. SF shorebird numbers are declining  
Dogs are not endangered, and they do have more alternatives  
2. What else besides dogs is influencing shorebird decline. Why are picknickers/people who are noisy, disruptive and unable to manage their litter not being moved out of these areas too?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 543 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san carlos, CA 94070-2903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,25,2013 10:42:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose cutting back the off leash zone at Fort Funston. The entire coast is off limits except for this small area that is enjoyed by hundreds if not thousands of people each month.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 544 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,02,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other

---

**Correspondence:** 1. I have read the GGNR area documents, attended the public hearing and have not seen any scientific or even compelling other information that supports the severe restrictions of off-leash dog walking on our urban lands - crissy, funston, ocean beach.  
2. Alternatives B through F are too restrictive for an urban Recreation Area. We need areas for Off Leash exercise of our dogs preserve the recreation access rights of these city-open space areas for enjoyment by all - enforce better dog walking handling but don't BAN all!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 545 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,25,2013 14:03:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to advocate for your continued designation of areas where citizens can hike with dogs.

I live in the Muir Woods Park neighborhood and use the following areas on a daily basis, and ask that they be kept open for dog use:

- 1) The Miwok fire road between Panoramic Highway and Coyote Ridge. This trail is used extensively by hikers, bikers and dogs and everyone just seems to get along. I would suggest extending the area allowed by dogs to include the small steep stretch up to the top of Coyote Ridge on the Coyote Ridge Trail.
- 2) The area to the east of Four Corners including Homestead Hill is used extensively by local citizens to walk their dogs off leash. Please keep this open and available.
- 3) The Coastal Trail between Rodeo Beach and Muir Beach is the only extensive rigorous hiking trail open to dogs in GGNRA. Please keep it available.

Thank you.

Lenny Gucciardi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 546 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El granada, CA 94018  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,25,2013 14:19:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like walk with my on leash dogs on all the fire roads. Why do I have to be limited to certain sections of the fire roads? I never let my dogs off leash. Will there be signs at the top of hill clearly stating where I have to turn around? A larger problem are the dirt bikes that roam freely up the sides of the hill off the trails.  
I walk the dogs at the Rancho, at the end of Coral Reef.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 547 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,25,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't understand why you want to shrink the constituency that are actually using the park. I walk the oak valley trail every day and 98% o the people I run into have dogs. Do you think they will leave their dogs at home and continue to support the park? They won't and you will lose their support and they'll be forced onto the freeway just to hike. It's the one trail dogs can be on out of all the others. If people don't like dogs they can walk on any of the countless trails that don't allow them. There is public interest in dogs being well exercised and all dogs shouldn't have to suffer for a few bad apples. Not all dogs do well in dog parks and the oak valley trail is the only place in Tam Valley where human and dog can exercise together. When you work 50 hours in San Francisco with a commute as most of us do this kind of efficiency is needed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 548 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San FranciscoCA, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** SFUSD Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Nov,25,2013 20:29:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please let the people of San Francisco and their dogs continue to enjoy the beauty of our city with off leash walks. Our leashes are in hand if need. But, a playtime cannot be harnessed. How can you harness Joy? We are known as the city that knows "how". We should lead the nation in off leash acceptance. Let's continue to be a city that love it's city, it's walks and it's dogs. Please keep off leash safe.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 549 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94401

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,26,2013 12:12:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to urge you to stop the implementation of this new dog management plan. This plan will cut where people can walk off- and on-leash by 90% cmpared with where people can walk with dogs now. I am outraged about the "new" dog management plan, and the way the GGNRA ignored the will of the public,

I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.

There is no credible reason why people with dogs are not allowed to have adequate and reasonable space to walk their dogs in the vast 80,000 acres that comprise the GGNRA. Please take action to stop the GGNRA from imposing this radical plan on the San Francisco Bay Area.

I plan to write many government officials about this complete disregard for what the people of our democracy have stated is their wish. Please reconsider this terrible plan.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Joyce Schroeder

---

**Correspondence ID:** 550    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Ocean Beach Dog Walkers Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Nov,26,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Comment Disapproving the 2013 DEIS/SEIS Dog Management Plan

The GGNRA a Public Recreation Area is in a densely populated urban area of San Francisco , San Mateo, Marin Counties who's residents with dogs use the open space in its jurisdiction. Fort Funston is one of these recreational spaces that has had Off Leash with Voice Command & control with Dog Walking for over 50 years and should remain that way. I personally meet people in their 80's who have been coming to Fort Funston for 50 years while walking with our Four Pawed Friend. These areas have evolved over decades as Dog Friendly Recreation Areas that have been the first and best place for residents of these counties to bring their Dogs. This is because of the health benefits that both the Dogs and their Guardians receive from an outing to these Recreation Area's.

When the San Francisco Parks and Recreation thru the approval of Prop F in the 1970's gave these open space area's to the GGNRA it was understood that these area's would remain open to the popular recreation of off leash voice command dog walking.

The following Paragraphs contain information that refutes the GGNRA claims being used to drastically reduce or eliminate off leash dog walking in Fort Funston, Ocean Beach ,Fort Baker, Crissy Field, Montarea Beach and San Mateo County land. I implore you to read them along with my concluding comment at the end of this letter.

Thank you

,

Thomas Roop (13)  
Daly City CA  
November 26, 2013

\*\*\*\*\*

Where As:The GGNRA's Dog Management Plan/DEIS/SEIS asserts that the change in Dog Management Policy is essential to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The DMP/DEIS/SEIS is unlawful and must be set aside (thrown out) because:

Â” Where As:The enabling legislation and Memorandum of Understanding with SF require the GGNRA to exercise "sound principles of land use, planning and management."

Â” Where As: GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation, the Memorandum of Understanding with SF for this park property, and NPS Rules, Regulations and Policy because they have failed to perform "vital monitoring" which NPS considers an essential element of sound principles of land use, planning and management.

Â” Where As:GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources due to the presence of

dogs nor their guardians, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes.

Â“ Where As: Federal law requires site-specific, peer reviewed studies to justify and guide changes in management of National Park System resources.

Â“ Where As: The SEIS acknowledges the GGNRA has no such site-specific, peer reviewed studies for the impact of dogs and their guardians on water quality, vegetation, soils and wildlife in the GGNRA.

Â“ Where As: There are no plant species which are endangered or threatened on Federal or State registers that have designated "critical habitat" in the GGNRA. Displacing recreation to enhance the growth of any of these listed plants is not required by the ESA and violates the enabling legislation for the GGNRA. However, we see that GGNRA management has displaced recreational access to plant these plants with regularity, the most egregious location being Fort Funston.

Â“ Where As: The Monitoring Based Management Strategy is again a poison pill. This proposed compliance strategy has a measure of compliance that is totally subjective, with the GGNRA making all the decisions. Further, short or long term (permanent) closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA. It appears the language is designed to allow the GGNRA to make most or all of Fort Funston a native plant restoration/habitat, despite the fact that this is inconsistent with the enabling legislation and MOU with SF.

Â“ Where As: Federal Law prohibits agency actions which are arbitrary, capricious and an abuse of discretion. Accordingly, this agency action, findings and conclusions should be set aside as prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 706 (2)A.

#### A brief post WWII history of Fort Funston (aka Doggie Disneyland)

Where As: Post WWII, Fort Funston (FF) was pretty much abandoned. In the 50's and early 60's, FF was a fabulous habitat - but not for wildlife. Rather, FF became a favorite hangout for seedy S.F. and Daly City gangs, drug dealers and users, sexual predators, off road recreation vehicle enthusiasts and a few off-leash dog walkers. Parents in nearby neighborhoods forbade their children from playing at FF due to its reputation for being unsafe. Tired of being harassed/harangued at other city parks, the dog community soon recognized the value in FF. It was clear that FF provided them an opportunity to recreate with their dogs off-leash in a beautiful seascape without any of the hassles presented at the other parks. No longer would they have to be inundated by the claims that they were infringing on the enjoyment of the city parks by adults and children who were afraid of dogs and complaints about dog waste.

Where As: Soon the word got out in the dog community and in the mid-late 60's FF realized a huge spike in the number of dogs and their human companions. It was these people who became the true custodians of Fort Funston. They were the ones who turned it into a real park. They took pride in their park. They kept it clean and safe. In fact, because of the significant presence of dogs and their humans, the criminal element soon left FF in search of a new refuge where they had control and would remain unchallenged. Many went to Golden Gate Park. Truth be told, the criminals were afraid of the dogs. And the dogs, being the good judge of people that they are, didn't like the criminals. Yes, it was because of the dogs, and only because of the dogs, that FF was now a VERY desirable park. This did not go unnoticed by the National Park Service.

Where As: When SF deeded FF in 1972 to the NPS/GGNRA, they inherited a spectacular park that was

safe and well taken care of by its true custodians - the dog community. In return, the GGNRA promised via its enabling legislation to respect the historical usage of FF which included off-leash dog walking. This promise was codified in the GGNRA 1979 Pet Policy which officially designated FF as an off-leash dog park. In the early 1990's a new management philosophy permeated the GGNRA where conservation would now trump everything else in this national recreation area. Most notably, it would trump recreation. In 2000, after several illegal closures at FF, Fort Funston Dog Walkers sued the GGNRA and won. In 2001 the GGNRA arbitrarily and capriciously wiped out 30 years of promises and promulgations and voided the 1979 Pet Policy (see Fort Funston Forum for details). This action was reversed in 2004 in Federal Court and then again in 2005 in Federal Appellate Court. The 1979 Pet Policy was reinstated as the law of the land and remains that way today (also see GGNRA Pet Policy History). Presently, we are embroiled in a process, i.e., the 2013 GGNRA Pet Management Policy SEIS, which assures us that the GGNRA will once again remove off-leash dog walking from all of its recreation/park spaces.

#### The GGNRA'S Proposed 2013 Dog Management Plan

Where As: It was at the conclusion of the latest legal battle wherein Federal Judge William Alsup reinstated the 1979 Pet Policy, over the objections of the GGNRA/NPS/DOI, that a statement was made by the Judge that became the impetus for initiation of the planned changes in Dog Management in 2006. The June 2005 decision by Judge Alsup cited in this SEIS noted that the court's action "in no way restricts the authority of the Superintendent to 'protect the resource,' including the protection of endangered and threatened species."

Where As: The GGNRA/NPS/DOI asserts that the change in Dog Management Policy (DMP) in this SEIS is intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. A Freedom of Information Request was made for the data, documents, and/or Staff Report which substantiated the GGNRA's claim that there was controversy over the dog policy, compromised visitor and employee safety and resource degradation which warranted the change in Dog Management Policy (DMP) and DEIS. The GGNRA's response merely stated: "The Staff Report and other documents you seek do not exist at this time". [emphasis added]

Where As: There is no mention in the DEIS or SEIS of the judge's additional admonition that "Congress has committed the proper balance of resource protections and recreation to the park professionals. Their judgments should be respected by the courts absent a violation of the law." [emphasis added]

Where As: The GGNRA has violated the law by ignoring the fundamental legal underpinnings provided by the enabling legislation, NPS Laws, Rules, Regulations and Policy. The GGNRA has demonstrably violated the enabling legislation and the Memorandum of Understanding with the City by failing to meet their requirement to utilize sound principles of land management.

Where As: The enabling legislation states specifically: "In the management of the recreation area, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall utilize the resources in a manner which will provide for recreation and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management."

Where As: The MOU with the City states: "The 1975 agreement for the lands transfer from the City of San Francisco to the NPS states that the National Park Service, acting through the General Superintendent, agrees to utilize the resources of GGNRA in a manner that will provide for recreational and educational opportunities consistent with sound principals of land use, planning and management.."

Where As: The National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 established the sound principles for

land use, planning and management. This Act provided the framework for fully integrating natural resource monitoring and other science activities into the management processes of the National Park System. The Act charges the Secretary of the Interior to "continually improve the ability of the National Park Service to provide state-of-the-art management, protection, and interpretation of and research on the resources of the National Park System", and to "assure the full and proper utilization of the results of scientific studies for park management decisions." Section 5934 of the Act requires the Secretary of the Interior to develop a program of "inventory and monitoring of National Park System resources to establish baseline information and to provide information on the long-term trends in the condition of National Park System resources."

Where As: NPS policy specifically states: "Natural resource monitoring provides site specific information needed to understand and identify change in complex, variable, and imperfectly understood natural systems and to determine whether observed changes are within natural levels of variability or may be indicators of unwanted human influences."

Where As: In short, site-specific, peer reviewed studies are required to justify and guide changes in management of National Park System resources. Clearly, the failure of GGNRA management to conduct any consistent monitoring or study of the resources in the GGNRA is a violation of Federal law. This SEIS highlights the fact that GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation for this park property. GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes.

Where As: In fact, the DEIS asserted dogs negatively affect water quality in the GGNRA. Those assertions have been omitted in the SEIS with the following explanation on page 28:

Where As: "Although water quality monitoring currently occurs at GGNRA, no site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at the GGNRA sites to document impacts to water quality specifically from dogs. It is also difficult to discern what is causing an impact to water quality, especially in a large metropolitan area where water quality may already be degraded. The literature review found very few investigations or peer-reviewed, scientific studies that document the isolated effects dogs have on water quality in recreational settings. Water quality has therefore been dismissed as a resource topic in this document due to lack of literature."

Further, the SEIS on pages 373 and 376, admits the following:

Where As: "Site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have not been conducted at the GGNRA sites for the sole purpose of documenting impacts to vegetation or soils from dogs.... Very few site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at GGNRA for the purpose of documenting impacts to wildlife as a result of dogs."

Where As: Without the site-specific, peer reviewed studies, the GGNRA is left to argue that potential damage will be done should they fail to change the DMP. This is not sufficient to justify a change in the DMP by the standards set by the NPS itself.

Where As: The GGNRA has also embarked on a mission to create native plant habitats where no habitat previously existed. GGNRA management alleges this is a part of their obligation to "preserve" the park for future enjoyment, however, this is NOT what they are doing. When you read the overview for Fort Funston (in our full Comment text), it is abundantly clear that they are creating these native plant habitats,



and in doing so they are destroying parts of the park that existed long before the GGNRA took control. This process is not preserving anything. Additionally, this is in violation of their authorizing directive, as they insist establishment of native plant areas requires the exclusion of humans from the site, eliminating all recreational activity in the area. Essentially the GGNRA is creating habitats adjacent to heavily used recreational areas, and then subsequently utilizing the habitat as a means to eliminate the recreational area.

Where As: If you read the Affected Environment section carefully, you will learn that there are no plant species which are endangered or threatened on Federal or State registers that have designated "critical habitat" in the GGNRA. Based upon the ESA and the enabling legislation for the GGNRA, it is a violation of the law to displace recreation to enhance the growth of any of these listed plants in the GGNRA. However, we see that GGNRA management has displaced recreational access to plant these plants with regularity, the most egregious location being Fort Funston.

Dr. Suzanne Valente

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Conclusion:

In light of the fact that there is no substantial evidence that there are any endangered birds or plants at Fort Funston. I demand that the People's Public Land in the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco and being Maintained by the NPS thru the Golden Gate National Recreation Area forever stay open and free range for Voice Command Off Leash Dog Walking. Therefore I reject Plans A,B,C,D,E,F in the current one foot thick DEIS-SEIS Plan which is to be withdrawn because it is shallow of any truth that proves that dogs are the menace to the land that the NPS/GGNRA would like us to believe!!!.

The NPS should make a permanent policy of the 1979-1980 Dog Management Policy Plan with full access to Off Leash Dog Walking under voice Command as it is now. This would also include a more progressive attitude in the maintenance of Fort Funston, IE repair or replace boxes for bags for litter pick-up, trash cans at all entrances and the north Sunset trail. The clearing of sand off paved roads, fence repair , the clearing of sand off stairs, the repair of south staircase to Fort Funston Beach and a more pro-active friendly attitude by the Rangers interaction with Dog Walkers!

All of this can be accomplished by ratifying The 1979 Pet Policy and making this plan permanent and open Ocean Beach south of Staircase 21 all the way to and through Fort Funston further south to and through Pacifica and through Montara Beach and all Beach's south under the GGNRA's jurisdiction to off leash voice controlled dog walking.

Thank You  
Thomas Roop (13)  
Daly City CA  
November 26, 2013

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	551	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,27,2013 00:11:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We are a young family, living in Bernal Heights, and one of our favorite family outings is to take our terrier Chip, for a walk on the beach at Fort Fun and Crissy Field - sometimes both in the same weekend.

I understand the need for conservation, and caring for the environment - we own an electric car, and have solar thermal and photovoltaic panels on the roof of our house. But this GGNRA's proposal goes too far in an urban area like San Francisco. In my opinion, it doesn't address the following points:

1. Part of the GGNRA's founding charter was to preserve recreation for the residents of San Francisco, not to maintain a "backcountry experience" akin to a national park.
2. Off-leash dog walking is already prohibited on 99% of GGNRA land, providing ample space for people who prefer not to mix with off-leash dogs.
3. The vast majority of San Franciscans who enjoy these areas are walking their dogs. The proposals will prevent a large number of people taking recreation, but don't provide any clear benefit, other than to harmonize the rules with those of wilderness area national parks.

I commented on the original proposals and I was very disappointed that the GGNRA didn't go further in their revision, following the volume of feedback they received. I hope the GGNRA can remember their mandate, listen more closely and better serve the residents of San Francisco, by revising these plans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 552    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,27,2013 00:12:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This plan will cut where people can walk off- and on-leash by 90% compared with where people can walk with dogs now. It is going to create a huge impact on the Bay Area, which we simply can't afford.

I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.

The GGNRA was created in 1972 for the maintenance of needed recreational open space, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. That's why it's designated as a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. With the new dog management plan, the GGNRA is reneging on its promises to preserve and protect recreational access to the GGNRA.

There is no credible reason why people with dogs are not allowed to have adequate and reasonable space to walk their dogs in the vast 80,000 acres that comprise the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 553    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,19,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** November 12, 2013

The Superintendent

GGNRA

Fort Mason Center Bldg.201

San Francisco 94123

To: The Superintendent

From: Elaine Anderson

Re: Dog Management

This discussion has gone on for years now, and I urge you to make a decision, establish a rule, and then enforce it. I personally believe that dog owners make extravagant demands, and I don't believe that even the best behaved animals are entirely under control.

I also believe ardently in the democratic process, but this issue has gone on far too long and at considerable expense of money and time. I admire, respect, and am grateful for GGNRA, have been a long time supporter, and wish you good fortune.

n.b. We receive duplicate mailings, one to Ward Anderson and the other to Elaine Anderson. Please send one mailing to both names at the same address. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 554    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94402  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,21,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Building 201, Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123

Attention: Dog management

Dear Superintendent Dean,

Let me first introduce myself. My name is Alan Brooks and I am 82 years of age and currently reside in San Mateo where I have lived since 1978. My history in San Francisco begins in 1946 where I attended Polytechnic High School, graduated and subsequently I served in the United States Coast Guard during the Korean War. After military service I attended City College of San Francisco and San Jose State College. I was employed by the San Francisco Unified School District as a secondary school teacher. Later I joined the Faculty of City College of San Francisco where I taught art until my retirement in 1992. I am writing to express my opposition to any alternative plan under consideration by the GGNRA that restricts Fort Funston acreage and the beaches of San Francisco from full off-leash dog access. I have two large athletic dogs that require space to exercise. They are trained, well behaved and under voice control. I have run dogs at Fort Funston for over 2 decades and have never experienced a conflict with any person nor dog.

I have been walking my dogs off-leash on San Francisco beaches for more than 40 years; initially on Ocean Beach from the Cliff House to the Zoo and when that was taken away I moved over to Fort Funston.

As a point of interest, I should mention that I am a volunteer at the San Francisco Maritime Park and have

provided maintenance and crew service on the scow schooner, Alma, for nearly 15 years. In addition let me emphasize again that I am unalterably opposed to restricting off-leash dog walking from all the San Francisco beach areas and Fort Funston. And finally I must mention that I have noticed a recent decline in maintenance at Fort Funston. The crumbling roads are now disappearing under large drifts of sand being blown over the roads. Many fences have fallen down the cliffs or are being buried by sand and the signage has deteriorated or is missing. Respectfully,

Alan Brooks  
1216 Palm Avenue  
San Mateo, CA 94402

---

**Correspondence ID:** 555    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,13,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** I would appreciate it if you would allow off leash dog walking @ Rancho Corral de Tierra because:  
1. off leash is the dominant use @ this site  
2. this is a low density population area where bicyclists/walkers of dogs can take alternate trails if they wish to converse with nature privately  
3. locals keep the area clean & maintain the area by removing trash & keeping trails clean  
4. out of towners trash the area & then feral cats/racoons are more damaging than dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 556    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,27,2013 09:49:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have walked my dogs off lead under voice command on Stinson, Muir and other GGNRA lands for years. This exercise is essential to their health and mine. The GGNRA's plan to limit by over 90% the lands on which dogs can be walked is unreasonable and massively unpopular, and the GGNRA has pushed forward this plan despite overwhelming public comments against it, totally ignoring the public's wishes. The Supplemental Plan does not address many of the criticisms made in public comments on the Draft, despite being required to do so. They have ignored both the people and the Board of Supervisors. 40% of households have dogs which will not get inadequate exercise and be denied access to Public Land.

The 1980 GGNRA General Management Plan offered a realistic view of the GGNRA. It acknowledged that much of the GGNRA, especially in San Francisco and southern Marin, is man-created landscapes, and called for managing Ocean Beach and Fort Funston to continue to accommodate relatively high use levels with a commitment to intensive maintenance in order to retain the appearance of a natural landscape. The new 2011 GGNRA Draft Management plan flies in the face of this 1980 plan. It's intention is to turn previously accessible land into "nature zones" for "back country types of visitor experience". There are millions of acres of park land available for this kind of experience in the US, but the GGNRA lands are

close to urban centers where families and their dogs need access for exercise, not a remote back country experience.

Respond to public comments (instead of ignoring them) and change the plan to include dogs on GGNRA lands, and recognize dog walking as a valid use of these lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 557    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,27,2013 16:11:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in Favor of Map 16-A for off leash at Fort Funston.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 558    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,27,2013 20:48:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My roomates, our dogs, our friends, their dogs and i go to noriega sands and fort funston often because of the dog friendly nature of the areas. Everyone there is so happy about having a place where we can all enjoy nature together. we are all very careful about our impact because we treasure having these places to frequent so close and convenient to where we live. I think it is unfair to ban dogs or restrict access to these public places for dogs and their owners. Pets in the city already have a raw deal because of the lack of places to run and play. WE DESPERATELY NEED OFF LEASH AREAS FOR OUR DOGS TO RUN AND EXERCISE.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 559    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,28,2013 10:37:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a 5th generation family of four with a dog, please continue to allow dogs at Fort Funston and the beach below it. My family and children (9 & 12) adore taking the dog for a run and swim with them.

Also I can see absolutely no logical reason to not allow dogs on the beach north of the main parking lot and south of the no dogs beach at Ft. Point. It is a great spot where my kids can play with our family dog and play in the water while the dog swims.

We have always had a dog that likes to swim in our family and we thoroughly enjoy access to the beach.

As a dog owner, we are compulsive about cleaning up after our dog and in fact clean up any dog mess we may find while on a walk in our neighborhood. We find this helps foster good will and it just plan the polite and right thing to do.

The majority of people who take their dog to a public area are respectful Don't let a few ruin it for all.

Please let the dogs swim!

Thank you,

Lisa Craib McMillan  
Ed McMillan  
Raymond McMillan  
Thea McMillan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 560    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,28,2013 10:58:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't require leashes for dogs just because they are dogs. They need a history of bad behavior first.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 561    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacific, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,28,2013 11:09:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been walking my dogs 2-3 times per week for over 20 years on Milagra ridge. I live in a development bordering the ridge. In all that time I have never seen any interaction between dogs (on leash or off) which has resulted in any contact closer than 100 feet (usually the wildlife spot the dogs and me and move off at their leisure). In fact, I see many of the animals in my development foraging, so it would seem that they have acclimated to the proximity of both domestic animals and people. I would maintain that continued walking on leash on all Milagra ridge trails would be advisable and not detrimental to anything I have seen over the years. In fact, during the day, off leash along the fire trail and road from the ridge to the High School would not seem to be a problem as I rarely (perhaps once per year) see any wildlife anytime later than 2 hours after dawn or two before dusk. Both the deer and coyotes seem to spend most of their daylight time well away from these trails during the day. I would suggest that signs be posted warning owners of small dogs that they should be cautious during dawn and dusk walks (even with dogs on leash), particularly at Muscle Rock where attacks of coyotes are not uncommon even on large dogs during the early morning. Incidentally, you should add "poster at park" to your How did you hear about this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 562    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,28,2013 11:20:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** The GRNA is meant to be enjoyed by all citizens. Dog owners included. Dogs are a significant and critically important element of American culture and society in general.

The NPS GRNA plan Alternative A should be the continued course forward, Alternative F preferred by NPS is overstating and the issue. Dogs are not running wild owners are responsible and additional government action is not required.

As a tax paying citizen we expect and will settle for nothing less than full use of the resources we support and fund.

The NPS verbiage here in these summary remarks, "compromising", "not be available for enjoyment by future generations", "increased public expectations", "compromise visitor and employee safety".... these are examples of NPS EIS authors embellishing with the purpose of their specific agenda.

The public demands and will get full use of GGNRA resource. Alternative should is more than sufficient and the NPS needs no further intervention.

Politically and financially the NPS GGNRA should better focus their limited resources on more important and pressing matters than restricting the public from the enjoyment of this public resources.

A plan/EIS is needed because Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA or park) resources and values, as defined by the park's enabling legislation and the National Park Service (NPS) Organic Act, could be compromised to the extent that, without action, those resources and values in some areas of the park might not be available for enjoyment by future generations. Additionally, a dog management policy inconsistent with NPS regulations and increased public expectations for use of the park for dog recreation have resulted in controversy, litigation, and compromised visitor and employee safety, affecting visitor experience and resulting in resource degradation. The conflicts will likely escalate if not addressed in a comprehensive plan/EIS.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	563	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110
-----------------	-------------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Nov,29,2013 13:26:52
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I want to encourage you to increase the park areas where dogs are permitted on leash. Many of us with canine companions who we love and want to be with, are now barred from use of many park areas if accompanied by our dogs. We are responsible about cleaning up after our dogs, and keeping them on leash to minimize the impact to the environment.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	564	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94107
-----------------	-------------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Nov,29,2013 13:42:47
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	The parks should be left as an off leash area for dogs to exercise. I have never heard any complaintts the dogs are well taken care off
------------------------	---

---

There are so few unleash optional are areas to walk dogs  
I don't thinks there any reasons to close these areas for dugs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 565 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,29,2013 14:10:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the reduction of off-leash areas for dogs throughout the GGNRA. With the number of canines in the SF area, they need to be able to run off-leash. There is enough space for everyone. Please do not reduce it any further.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 566 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,30,2013 13:29:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have trouble with the GGNRA's preferred alternative plan in that it severely limits and affects the off leash dog walking area at Fort Funston. It is simply too restrictive and goes too far.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 567 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,30,2013 16:25:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't change the dog walking rules and regulations.

---

Dogs NEED to run. Many dogs NEED to swim. Dogs NEED to socialize (by running together, playing together, etc.)

Dogs NEED to be off leash. [as an SF resident, there simply is not enough space for dogs to run off leash!]

I suspect that this change in policy may be racially motivated. In my experience, Chinese people do not like dogs and are often afraid of dogs. With such a large Chinese population now in SF (and a mayor of Chinese decent) .. I suspect that this change in dog policy is racially motivated and supported by dog haters. This is at least something to consider.

Can't the city and the governing bodies of the land and common areas spend money and time on much more important issues than changing the dog leash policies!!! Come on.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 568 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,30,2013 17:36:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and San Franciscan, I am concerned about the limited off leash areas this plan proposes. As a city which already has more dogs than kids, we are very lucky to have the number of off leash areas we currently have. Having such off leash areas allows friendly co-habitation by providing easy access to exercise pets.

If there are concerns about enforcement of existing policies, then a reasonable first step is to make sure those policies are clearly communicated. I have been very confused about which areas of Ft. Funston are considered "off path" for humans (who are heavier and more disruptive to their environment than any almost any other animal). If there are concerns about protecting the park, then enforcement of existing restrictions is a reasonable first step. Instead of spending money on a plan, the GGNRA could be making money by fining violators to existing restrictions.

I would like to continue to have access for my dog, but also want to make sure that the park is preserved so the park will still be there for future generations of dogs and dog owners, which does require compromise. Please consider keeping a similar level of off leash areas available for exercising dogs as we have today, even if new locations are identified as options.

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment.

Jessica Johnson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 569    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,01,2013 10:39:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not limit any of the current off leash dog areas. I am a city dweller in a studio apartment, like so many others I know, and we need open space where our dogs can exercise and play free!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 570    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Jose, CA 95111  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,01,2013 11:44:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep all park areas accessible to dogs - I am a tax-paying, law-abiding dog owner and we should have equal access to all areas. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 571    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,01,2013 16:39:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to object strongly to the proposed ban on off-lease dogs on the Oakwood Trail and Muir Beach. As a 35 year resident of Tam Valley and a dog owner for all of those years, I have abided by the restrictions on all other trails because of these two areas that are made available.

Of the hundreds of trails in Marin County, please leave these two spots for dogs to run.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 572    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Jose, CA 95124

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,01,2013 17:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a long time Bay Area resident, I find the proposed dog restrictions in your plan to be deeply disturbing, particularly the elimination of off-leash dog areas. As a rule, good citizens who own dogs keep their animals in control and clean up after them at all times, without exception. There are, of course, bad citizens who own dogs, but these people should not be regarded as the model visitors of GGNRA lands. Just as you wouldn't expect all visitors to deface monuments and leave their trash behind, I ask you that you dismiss the flawed view that dogs off leash equate to an uncontrolled environmental impact. Most importantly, in this country we love dogs. And dog owners need to be able to access natural settings with their companions with off-leash areas for recreation. In my opinion it would be a cowardly and quintessentially un-American act to further restrict the already limited areas for on-leash and off-leash dog access. Please recognize our freedoms and scrap the proposed dog restrictions.

Jess Rabourn  
(415) 637-4774

---

**Correspondence ID:** 573    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** BusinessWorks Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Dec,01,2013 18:20:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I object to the proposed new leash law/regulation proposed for Muir Beach and Oakwood Valley. For the past 30 years I have walked these areas, first with my own dog, and now with my friend's dogs. These beaches have always been considered "dog friendly" and have allowed dogs to run freely and socialize without the hinderance of being leashed. This is a concept long held in Carmel, California. Residents there have learned to control their dogs, clean up after them, and dispose of waste in containers provided. It is a joy to us to see dogs capering freely and playing in the ocean waves and shores. If dog owners can learn the proper etiquette, clean up, and learn to voice control their dogs, then they are not a problem. If time is going to be needed to enforce the leash law, it could easily be adjusted to citing owners who do not respect proper animal control and cleanup. Please reconsider this new proposal. Well-behaved animals deserve to run free too! Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 574    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,01,2013 19:38:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** San Francisco is one of the most exceptional cities in the world for many reasons, one of those being the near-unparalleled off-leash access dog owners enjoy in many of the outdoor recreational areas that abound here. Every time I visit other cities and towns in the bay area, I am reminded how lucky we are and, more importantly, how unlucky the people and dogs of other communities must feel. Most dogs cannot achieve the sort of exercise they need as a fundamental part of staying healthy and happy merely by walking on a leash, no matter how far or fast they are walked when accompanied by a human. Some receive adequate exercise if they accompany a person running, but that seldom happens for most dogs. The only way for our canine companions to achieve physical and psychological fulfillment is to allow dogs to run free, the way they have for hundreds of thousands of years. Another, probably more important matter, is the socialization of dogs, both with other dogs as well as humans. Dogs who spend their whole lives on leash tend to be more aggressive and skittish around dogs and humans, leading to attacks and injury for innocent humans and canines. Fundamentally changing the off-leash allowances that residents have enjoyed for years will significantly impact the population of San Francisco in many ways, almost all of them negative. The current off-leash areas provide what I and many others, including the Supervisors, believe to be an equitable sharing of our open space between those with four legged companions and those without. I urge you to reconsider the changes being discussed. Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 575    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,01,2013 20:17:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I writing with strong opposition to the implementation of the proposed restrictions for on and off leash dog recreation in the GGNRA. As a resident of Marin County and formerly of San Francisco, I have frequently enjoyed the off leash dog access available at Stinson Beach, Muir Beach, Alta Fire Road, Rodeo Beach, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach and Crissy Field. Using these areas with my dog bring incredible joy and happiness to both of us. I understand that the primary purpose of these lands is to provide public use and enjoyment. These areas are frequently used by dogs and humans together and I can honestly say I never witnessed or experienced a harmful dog-related incident in the GGNRA. These areas have been used for dog recreation going back decades and I do not understand what the impetus is to change them now and curtail dog access.

I urge you to consider leaving the current dog access in place as is. The amount of money required to enforce additional dog bans should instead be spent on upgrading the antiquated facilities at the beaches. During the previous commentary on this project, the public was overwhelmingly in favor of not adding additional restrictions on dog access in the GGNRA. That is still the case today. Please follow the charter of the GGNRA and keep dog access available to your fellow citizens.

Sincerely,

Anthony Brown

---

**Correspondence ID:** 576 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,01,2013 22:42:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a native Californian and have seen in my life, the continuous loss of freedom, space, beauty, orchards, forests, lakes etc., given over to others to determine our destiny.

The dogs are family members and feel very much like humans. They bring us company and joy, even if we don't own one, which I do not. I love to see them happily cavorting about spreading joy and love.

Their joy becomes my joy. They add to the environment, in any venue, wilderness or civilization.

Does everyone have to be a prisoner to satisfy some obsessive people and their fears?

The original Californian did not have these compulsions to control life and others.

This is primarily why everyone loved California and decided to move here..... and then change it. They are slowly removing the elements which made the area what they love. They are vacuuming the essence out of Marin and California.

I firmly oppose forcing the dogs to be on a leash in the wilderness where life is spontaneous and poetic. Marin was not "sterile" but is becoming so. I want to share my life with animals , birds, fish, reptiles, bugs and people. I don't want to be sheltered from the creatures placed on the planet to live and teach us and vice, versa.

Sincerely, Jean Mastagni

---

**Correspondence ID:** 577 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 06:01:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a life long resident of West Marin and a recent resident to Muir Beach, I strongly oppose the leash law. Quality of life for owners and their dogs depends on the ability for a dog to be able to run free on the beach; This is one of the primary reasons I moved to muir beach.. For the ability to walk my dog unleashed on a beach. When dogs are leashed they become more aggressive as they become more protective of their owners, and unleashed dogs have the opportunity to be properly socialized with other members of their species. Both the private areas in Stinson Beach and all of Bolinas have no leash laws. If you make Muir Beach into a leash dog region, of course the owners of the dog will simply migrate to little beach.

This area is a bit of a sanctuary for residents and it seems incredibly unfair to have that protective very small beach encroached upon by tourists when the main beach is made specifically for visitor recreation. in addition there is danger to both dog and owner alike migrating from the main beach to little beach... if you add the treat of an unleashed area you will surely encourage migration and very likely, potential injury to visitors and their dogs.

Due to the mandates of the coastal zone much for coastal region has given priority to visitors... please

---

consider residents requests to enjoy our beach, walk our dogs off leash without the additional visitors who would significantly change The neighborhood feel of little beach.. What a shame that would be.

Respectfully, Lesa Kramer  
Lesla Kdig

---

**Correspondence ID:** 578    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** MILL VALLEY, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 07:56:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Muir Beach is the ONLY area within GGNRA, other than Rodeo Beach, where dogs may be exercised off-leash under the existing regulations. I disagree with changing the regulations to prohibit off-leash dogs from Muir Beach for the following reasons:

- 1) Although protection of the beach environment is important, there is little evidence that off-leash dogs in this very small area of beach have a significant adverse impact on the population of sea-birds and marine life in the GGNRA in general.
- 2) Closing Muir Beach to off leash dogs may displace some of those dogs to Rodeo causing increased traffic on the roads leading to Rodeo, itself with adverse environmental effects.
- 3) A vocal minority of dog haters should not dictate policy to the general public.
- 4) Nuisance dogs are occasionally a problem. These animals adversely effect the beach going experience for both those visitors with and without dogs. Rather enforce a leash-only rule, GGNRA should step up enforcement of policing the existing rules to remove nuisance dogs and cite their owners from.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 579    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,02,2013 11:31:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly opposed any measures that would further restrict dogs in the GGNRA. We are already highly restricted in where we can go and there are very few places dogs are allowed off leash. The open space is for all of us, and many are dog owners.

There has been a lot of construction in the Rodeo Beach area of the GGNRA. Huge parking lots and widened roads are far more impactful than dogs. These giant parking lots are not needed and the open space is critical to my well being and that of my dog. There is no evidence that dogs have an adverse impact on the natural area.

Please do not further restrict dog access to the GGNRA. I would support adding more trails that allow dogs off leash.

Thank you for your attention.

Norma Brach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 580    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 11:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Begging you to actually care, and ready this please. For years, I was one of those people frustrated by dog lovers. Constantly dodging friendly dogs coming up to me, dodging the poop bags left on the trails. Then, I got a dog, and after two years, finally got comfortable enough to hike with her off leash. And I observed something interesting. Frankly, the dog owners in this county are more considerate, and dogs better behaved, than most parents and their little kids (and I can say this, because I have kids).

I keep my dog under control, and I pick up her poop and dispose of the bags. I don't find myself accosted by other dogs. You know who does threaten me? Bikers with no sense of speed control and horseback riders who seem to think the trails only belong to them. So, why are you banning only dogs???

The places we are currently prohibited from taking our dogs off leash greatly outweigh those where we are permitted. Can't we compromise please? Throw us a bone (no pun intended), and let us keep Oakwood Valley Trail and Muir Beach.

Thank you,  
Susan Burns

---

**Correspondence ID:** 581    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 13:34:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to encourage you to stick with Alternative A at least on just a few of the trails I hike and run every day with my dogs. You must realize that this NRA is surrounded by residential areas - much more so than most other National Parks. An accommodation needs to be made for those of us living here. we have limited alternatives due to the fact that most of the land surrounding us is parkland. I understand your desire for consistency in your regulations across all the National Parks, but that doesn't take into consideration our specific situation. Added to this is the fact that this is California and, at the risk of making a gross generalization, we are very active outside. I take my dogs (2) to Oakwood up to Alta and back down at least three days a week, two more days on Miwok from Tennessee Valley - up and back. These trails are heavily used by other dog owners. The off leash trails are by far the most enjoyable. Not only do my dogs like being off leash - but I get to be off-leash too. Leashes restrict both parties. A final point - my fellow dog owners and I are regular patrons of the Park. "The purpose of GGNRA is to offer national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population while preserving and interpreting its outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values." By restricting our use of the park by eliminating our ability to enjoy it with our dogs, you are contradicting your stated purpose. I have enjoyed these trails, this Park, for the 18 years I've lived here, it is discriminatory and unjust for you to change the rules at this point.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 582    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 15:19:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose GGNRA's plan to take away public access to parkland for folks with dogs off-leash. I do not even own a dog and I think this is a terrible idea. The dogs and their owners are by and large very responsible and I don't think they should be discriminated against. The dogs need a place to run and play off-leash and those are shrinking rapidly. Please don't add to the decline of our fair Bay Area by restricting off-leash areas in GGRNA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 583    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 16:36:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not reduce the space where our dogs can run free and consider increasing the size of voice-control for dogs.

I am a San Francisco voter and I have a dog. I have had multiple dogs over the course of the 23 years I've lived in San Francisco. I have never had a dog that chased birds, much less caught them or caused any damage to wildlife or plants.

I use the off leash areas at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and Crissy Field regularly, at least twice per month and often more. My dogwalker also takes my dog to Crissy Field every weekday morning. I also use the San Mateo and Marin county recreation areas offleash. In fact, if those places became on-leash areas, or worse yet, closed to dogs, I would not use them nearly so often.

From my experience, there isn't enough off leash space now and the areas get crowded and messy because of it. My dogs are much better behaved and more friendly to adults and children because they regularly run and get tired out.

For each of the maps, the voice control areas should be as large as possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 584    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 16:47:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my strong support for requiring dogs at Muir Beach be on leashes. I don't care too much about the Oakwood Valley Trail but off leash dogs have had a negative impact on visits to Muir Beach as well as damaging the habitats of native plants and animals. Dog owners too often refuse to take responsibility for their pets and should not be allowed to let their dogs off-leash at Muir Beach. I would hope the requirement is aggressively enforced if it is put into effect. Stiff fines please!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 585    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 18:53:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in the Castro with my dog Buddy and am very much opposed to this plan. Buddy is very much the highlight of my life, and in fact has helped me overcome depression and addiction. One of the draw backs with living with a dog in the city is that I don't have a backyard for him to go out and play in. And most of the dog parks in my area are very small and not big enough for him to get enough exercise - and he wont chase balls if there are other bigger dogs around (the guy is 20 lbs so fairly small).

This is where big parks like Fort Funston enter into our life. I take Buddy there 3-4 times a week in order for him to get enough exercise he needs, and be able to enjoy the beauty of a true San Francisco park. I can go on an actual hike with him off leash so he gets plenty of exercise and socializing time. We are very respectful of the park and marked areas where dogs and humans are not allowed and see most other dog owners doing the same.

Please please please don't cut back on one of the very few areas when I can actually go and enjoy quality time with my dog in the city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 586 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 22:29:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am not a dog owner. In some ways, I'm not even a "dog person." I hope you consider my comment in this light.

I am opposed to the new proposed rules to the extent they disallow dogs, or limit dogs to leash-only handling on certain trails.

I like to hike and I do so at least once a week. I am often on the trails with dog owners, or surrounded by dogs. It's outdoors; it's nature; dogs are natural there. I actually like to see dogs and talk to owners about the dog's breed or the dog's name. It makes us interact - - not demand to experience nature on our own terms or in a bubble.

I do NOT like dogs at restaurants or Target stores, but on a trail?? sure! Banning dogs or having them leash-only is excessive. To the extent the proposed rule is just a shortcut, so the enforcement agency can avoid assessing situation (to see if the dog was controlled or if someone is overreacting), then this new proposed rule will not withstand a challenge. (it's sort of lazy, really).

Don't ban the dogs; don't demand a blanket "leash only" status. Let's enjoy dogs out enjoying nature. And remember, I'm not even a "dog person"!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 587 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94707  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 23:34:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** I believe the highest amount of environmental protection is preferable over all other alternatives. I am a dog lover and have been a dog owner. There are plenty of places where a dog can be taken off-leash as well as on-leash without having to shift more public land over to dog-friendly use.

Dogs impact others in numerous ways. First, one is far less likely to observe wildlife when a dog is present. I have seen bobcats, coyotes, owls, etc. in many of these areas and I certainly notice the lack thereof when I am with a dog.

Beyond that, it is the dog owners that are really to blame for poor dog management. If an area is designated on-leash, it is more often than not that only a few yards in, many people take their dogs off-leash.

Numerous times I have witnessed dogs chasing wild animals (e.g., rabbits, birds). The dogs' good-natured play could be trampling nests and/or young and the dogs' presence can deter wild animals from foraging for food.

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

Naturally, if folks are eating, dogs will often come to beg for food or snatch food away. While the owners apologize and laugh about it, I have packed my food in for the picnic and I am not so amused.

While I understand the desire to have one's loving companion along for walks in nature, I do not believe this outweighs the rights of humans and wild creatures to also have the right to a dog-free environment. The bulk of the areas need to be closed off to dogs and the signage must be clear regarding which areas are open and what degree of freedom is allowed. Signage should also attempt to educate dog owners so they understand why so many of us can love dogs but not want them to have open access to parklands.

Much of this leads to the bigger issue of enforcement. This, I think, is also a big potential money-maker for the state. Expensive tickets for violating the agreements should be levied to help pay for the increased need for policing. It is a win-win to do this. The parks either make money or the problem improves sufficiently to require less enforcement. (Parks might also post a convenient and obvious phone number to report violations.)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	588	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94122 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Dec,03,2013 09:46:03
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I bought my home close to the beach so that I could easily walk from my house - -- with my dog- --and enjoy the ocean. It gives me peace and helps me de-stress. Walk to the beach....not drive. I live on 43rd and Lawton and now you want to ban dogs from that area. My dog doesn't bother the birds or people. Mostly I see the people bothering the birds are you going to ban us next? Please leave Ocean Beach alone!
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	589	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America
-----------------	---

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,03,2013 12:03:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly OPPOSE the GGNRA Dog Management Policy. Based on its own admission, the GGNRA has not studies or data to back up the claim that dogs inhibit visitor safety or the natural resources of the recreation area. The proposed policy is based solely on anecdotal evidence. This is extremely poor public policy.

Furthermore, the policy attempts to expand the authority of the GGNRA beyond what was contemplated in the enabling legislation of 1972. In 1972, San Francisco voters agreed to include certain parks owned by the city and county of San Francisco in the GGNRA AS LONG AS the areas retained historical recreation access INCLUDING dogs being off-leash. Not only does this policy seek to restrict the historical recreation access but it also seeks to expand the authority of the GGNRA to decide to close off the areas too all types of recreation. This is NOT what San Francisco voters agreed to in 1972 and should not be allowed today.

The opportunity to allow dogs to go off-leash in certain areas of San Francisco is one of the few opportunities we have as San Franciscans to commune with a diverse set of neighbors. Dog lovers come in all shapes, sizes, colors, ethnicities, and belief systems. Our city is divided in so many ways- - none of this matters at the dog parks where neighbors come together as one and dogs roam free.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 590 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Marin City, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,03,2013 13:23:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I absolutely love walking with my dog off leash. I am so surprised when I run into a pack of dogs that are all off leash with a dog walker. All the dogs are really well behaved.

I would hate to see a law that would not allow us to walk without leash.

Please don't pass this.

I would be very unhappy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 591 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,03,2013 13:40:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support the ban on dogs and off-leash dog walking at the Racho Corral de Tierra location. I run or bike through that area at least four or five days a week and cannot remember a day when I was not harassed by a dog that is offleash. While there are a few responsible pet owners who have trained their dogs to be under voice control or have them on a leash, the vast majority ignore the leash rules and allow their pets to interfere and threaten humans who are in the area.

It has gotten so bad that I do not feel comfortable bringing my children, ages 7 and 4, to that location.

They have been harassed and almost bitten numerous times. When I nicely ask the dog owners to please

---

keep their dogs on a leash, I am mostly ignored and occasionally threatened or verbally abused by the dog owner. This is not a tenable situation. I believe the choice has to be framed as to whether dog enjoyment of the open space is more important than human enjoyment of the open space. Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 592    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** physician Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Dec,03,2013 15:50:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support limiting the areas of off-leash dog use. This is a public health issue as well as an environmental issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 593    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,03,2013 17:47:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to strongly SUPPORT any restrictive action GGNRA wants to place on off leash dog walking.

My children and family are constantly harassed by off leash dogs in our neighborhood as well as other parks around the City. In Golden Gate park, Crissy Field, Dolores, Precita Park - off leash dogs are constantly coming up to my kids and licking and sniffing them. When you are a 3 foot child, a dog coming up to you and sticking his/her nose in you face is INTRUSIVE. (I don't let my kids lick other people, I don't let my kids defecate in the streets)

Now I am actually a dog-lover - however, I think actual PEOPLE should have more personal freedom than animals. If a dog owner is not willing/able to control his/her dog (and shows no interest in doing so) then their dogs should be ON-leash.

I understand this is an environmental issue - but I think it is a human issue as well. Just because the cost of living and housing shortage is driving families out of the city doesn't mean our future generation of CHILDREN are less important than ANIMALS.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 594    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,03,2013 18:09:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the new restrictions and amendments that require dog's to be leashed at Fort Funston.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 595    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,03,2013 18:15:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. This Plan calls for dramatically limiting dog access on federal lands in San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin Counties. In San Francisco, the Plan restrict dog access at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Ocean Beach, among other properties. I oppose thee restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 596    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,03,2013 22:43:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose this misguided plan.

These are urban parks, greatly used by responsible pet owners. Forcing these voters into other parks is not a solution.

San Francisco pet owners tend to support their parks and conservation organization. You seem to be squandering this support, when it could be enlisted for volunteers and monetary support.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 597    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,04,2013 07:50:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep Fort Funston available for dogs to run around freely. We rescued a chihuahua from SPCA and our dog walker takes him out to run freely in Fort Funston and Ocean beach. Our dog has anxiety issues but the exposure and play with other small dogs have helped him a lot. We paid for his license in San Francisco, I believe the city should make concessions for San Francisco dogs. You can require the big, unruly, aggressive dogs to be on leashes. Dog guardians should be responsible in managing their own dogs. Reasonable rules of play for dogs and guardians should be posted. We don't like irresponsible dog owners also who let their dogs hurt other dogs. Please consult SPCA a and credible and trained dog walkers. They would know what's best for us and the dogs.

Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 598    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,04,2013 10:55:05

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am the owner of two dogs and I frequent Fort Funston on a daily basis. San Francisco is a location in the world where there is an abundance of dogs and a need for off leash areas where the dogs can get exercise and their human companions get an opportunity to run along their side.

There are multiple environmental impacts on every portion of our country; however, that doesn't mean we are shutting down refineries and seeking alternative fuels any faster - production is up and although people are utilizing the electric car market it is not enough to have a large scale environmental impact and this is where the environment is impacted, not by dogs running through the jungle at Funston.

While I understand there is a vibrant ecology at Fort Funston, I also know that dogs are a part of our natural ecological environment and this particular part of the world is very important to owners and others who visit the site. There are other parts where the dogs do not wander which is not squandered by anyone's ability to visit and study.

I oppose closing of these parks for their current use and will continue to oppose as they are currently being utilized in a very positive and useful manner.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	599	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,04,2013 15:20:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	General Comments:				

1. Cited studies are generally older data from 1996 to ~2008, do not adequately assess the impact of the late 2006 and 2007 Rule requiring leashes from Jul-May (36 CFR 1.5). There is no reference to the change in snowy plover populations from 2006-2013. In addition the EIS state there are many non-dog factors that effect the number of plovers overwintering in Ocean Beach SPPA, so you dont even know what affect if any are due to dogs. Banning dogs from the beach is a heavy-handed attempt to fix a perceived problem.
2. Cited studies use terms like may affect and possible disturbance from dogs. Thats not very conclusive.
3. I see more small children chasing birds than dogs. It would appear they are a bigger threat. Are you going to try and ban them too?
4. Document states the need for a clear and enforceable plan. NPS preferred alternative F, includes many differences based on area. Thats not very clear. Also, the NPS has already demonstrated enforceability problems now. How is changing to alternative F going to fix that? You still have the same resources; therefore alternative F does not meet this need.
5. Ocean Beach SPPA is in an urban environment and is not designated as a critical habitat for snowy plovers. Those of us who live in urban environments need access to our nearest open spaces to walk our dogs. It is absurd to try and create pristine wildlife preserve conditions in an urban space. The projects sited by the EIS at Point Reyes and Bolinas Lagoon should greatly enhance the snowy plover population eliminating the need for any changes in Ocean Beach.
6. At Ocean beach SPPA, you probably have bigger problems from teens and homeless hanging around the dunes at night then you have from walking dogs.
7. The EIS states that nearly all the snowy plovers survived the initial effects of the Cosco Busan oil spill and were still alive 2 years later. If they can survive that, they probably can survive the occasional chase by a dog (which I still havent seen actually happen)
8. The entry sign posted at the Noriega entrance to SPPA suggest keeping dogs at the shoreline to avoid

snowy plovers. That is where I see 99% of the dogs anyway; only people seem to hang out around the dunes. It appears no change to the current state is needed since most dogs are not running around the dunes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 600    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** daly city, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,04,2013 15:55:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE do not allow professional dog walkers into any GGNRA areas.

in the past six months I have been bitten by an OFF LEASH dog being walked by a completely inattentive dog walker, at least 12 OFF LEASH dogs, none of which responded to any voice control. the dog who bit me, hole in the jeans and 6 puncture wounds, a truly vicious dog.

and also in the past six months, i was knocked to the ground, on the beach, by several OFF LEASH large dogs, running out of any control, a pack of at least 10, dog walker had no voice control whatsoever.

thank you for your consideration and let's get these professional dog walkers out of the GGNRA areas!

seniors are especially vulnerable to these irresponsible dog walkers!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 601    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,04,2013 16:44:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am disappointed by the lack of consideration of the local recreational use by dog owners and the city's history of access for voice-command recreation of residents, visitors and their dogs. The EIS does not give scientific evidence nor data that off leash access by dogs to these recreational areas is driving these proposed changes. We chose to live in San Francisco because of the dog friendly parks and voice-command access to places like ocean beach, fort funston, baker beach, crissy field and especially the lands end trail as well as on leash access in Sutro Park and the rest of Ocean Beach. There are many instances of alternate rules for local parklands and seashore areas managed by NPS and the need for "uniform and consistent rules" is a weak argument that only suggests an inconsistent ability of rangers to be knowledgeable in their local park areas, this is a vital ability in managing a non-wilderness, urban recreation area like SF bay area parks. I support maintaining the access that dog owners now enjoy, do not punish the owners and walkers of well behaved dogs for a few bad examples among the 150,000 dog owners in San Francisco!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 602    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,04,2013 16:49:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Gentlemen: Please leave us the open space we have enjoyed for decades for responsible off leash dog walking. The GGNRA is an urban park and should be managed in a way to accommodate urban recreational activities.

We have walked our various dogs off leash daily for more than 20 years, mostly at Crissy Field and Baker Beach, and have never witnessed a serious incident caused by an off leash dog.

Don and Colleen Kieselhorst

---

**Correspondence ID:** 603    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,04,2013 17:02:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I own a home here in San Francisco and have a dog that we rescued from a shelter and like to walk and hike with each week. I'm very concerned with the proposed plan to dramatically reduce where people can walk and hike with their dogs on GGNRA lands, including: banning dogs from the vast majority of Fort Funston, the East Beach at Crissy Field, and most of Ocean Beach; limiting off-leash dog walking in Marin County to Rodeo Beach; and prohibiting off-leash dog walking anywhere on GGNRA land in San Mateo County. Families with dogs should have equal access to all GGNRA lands. Please reconsider your intention to restrict my family's access. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 604    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,04,2013 17:42:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Balancing the needs of the community as a whole and dog owners in particular is a very difficult task. Finding the balance between creating an environmentally sound policy while also ensuring availability of off leash areas is very important to a significant number of Bay Area residents, including me. I've lived in San Francisco for 25 years. Having had access to Fort Funston and several other areas that are part of the national park system and GGRC, I think it is vital to the community to keep the current off leash areas available to everybody. In terms of percentage of off leash areas vs. more severely restricted areas, it already feels very restrictive.

Please consider my comments as a vote toward the least restrictive policy (the one currently in place).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 605    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,05,2013 00:22:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We live 1/4 mile from areas affected by this plan, and strongly oppose it. Here are some of our reasons:

The GGNRA's first "dog management" was roundly criticized 3 to 1 in public comments against it and

---

opposed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Yet almost three years later, the GGNRA has now released a new plan that is identical to the original with insignificant, meaningless changes.

The plan does not offer any evidence to support the need for such a drastic change in usage. The plan fails to manage the GGNRA for the recreational needs of the people of the Bay Area, in direct contradiction to its reason-to-be as described in the legislation that created it.

The Plan will severely cut where people with dogs, who have walked in the GGNRA for decades, will be able to walk in the future, without offering any evidence to support the need for such drastic change in usage.

The Plan fails to manage the GGNRA for the recreational needs of the people of the Bay Area, in direct contradiction to its reason-to-be as described in the legislation that created it.

The Plan wrongly acts as if the GGNRA is a remote wilderness, when it is actually located within and adjacent to a large city, with its services and environment inextricably intertwined with those of the cities that surround it.

Recreation is the reason the GGNRA was created, and it must continue to be its guiding principle.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 606    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,05,2013 16:34:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service;

I would like to comment on the draft plan in connection with the dog walking access both in the Mill Valley Area and at Crissy Field.

I have noticed that the "off leash" areas in your plan are very restricted. When I spoke to a park service employee at the open house, she explained that there were 2 main reasons for this; 1) people are not using the parks because of dogs and 2) there are environmental considerations in areas such as Alta in the Headlands. My comments will be both personal and not and are innumerable as follows:

1) There are PLENTY of areas in the park where dogs are not allowed, more so than areas where dogs are allowed. People with dogs need to compromise so perhaps people with our dogs need to compromise.

2) I have a dog who needs to RUN. I live in Mill Valley and I take him to Alta frequently. He is 4 years old and a leash walk would just not do. He is under voice control and rarely ventures far from the road. I cannot take him to the dog park because he is not fixed and he loves to go in the water. So the dog park means altercations with other dogs and a muddy and/or smelly dog when I get home. Rodeo and Stinson Beach are too far a drive on a regular basis.

3) I believe one of the options is to have part of Oak Valley off leash. This seems strange to me as there is so much wildlife in that valley. I understand that there is the endangered butterfly on Alta but not ALL of Alta. Is there a way to fence off the areas that are particularly vulnerable? Also is there proof that dogs on Alta are endangering the butterfly? That is such a large area - keep dogs just on Alta and not on the surrounding hills. Also, no dogs are allowed in much of the headlands - there is no need to deny access to all of the Headlands - or make them all leash required.

4) As far as people and dogs.... what about having times when dogs are not allowed? For example between 12 and 3 in the afternoon or something. That way if people REALLY want to go hiking without dogs they have that option.

5) I would imagine that the problem is not dogs per se but the number of dogs. Being a dog person myself I am often bothered by the number of dogs that dog walkers are walking on Alta. I would suggest limiting the number of dogs that are allowed to 3-4.

6) My suggestion about times for dogs and times for people could be particularly useful at Crissy Field.



Why not have afternoons for one and mornings for the other? That way everyone gets their needs met.

7. I have been walking dogs in Marin for years and I think the poop problem has improved greatly. It used to be a real mess but I rarely see poop left around anymore. People are awake and responsible and especially if bags and canisters are provided at the beginning of each trail.

8. I think it would be a tragedy to implement the rules put forth by the Park Service. One of the reasons I live in Marin and have not moved to Sonoma County is because there are so many public lands where I can walk my dog. I understand that with an increase in people sometimes there needs to be an increase in management but don't take away all of our dog walking leash free privileges.

9. Muir Beach is another area you are considering closing off to dogs. I would suggest that there be a dog area and a no dog area. Beaches without dogs are like peanut butter with our jelly. Even without a dog I would miss seeing dogs at Muir Beach.

10. Let's find a way of cooperation not restriction. It would be a real shame and tragedy to enforce the rules you all are suggesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 607    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,05,2013 22:05:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't allow such an act to happen and have dogs, even humans restricted from areas such as Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and especially Fort Funston. My dog looks forward to Fort Funston the most. Miles away, he senses the smells and notices the way to Fort Funston and howls of happiness pour out. Minutes turn into hours and the hours seem like an eternity of heaven for my dog Koa when he's off running, freely enjoying the weather, wind, soil, smells, dogs, flowers, ocean, water and even other people. Let there be freedom for our dogs, let's not let this happen.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 608    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 07:20:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I applaud the National Park System for revisiting their rules on dogs in their parks.

I am a dog owner, who walks my dogs on leash. I look in dismay at signs in parks saying "Dogs on Leash" where dogs are running all over the place off leash, which creates a threat to dogs on leash. I know the park budget is tight, but without enforcement (and tickets given), this rule is not respected.

I would like to see "no dogs" in fragile areas, such as beaches and wildlife nesting areas, and restored planting areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 609    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** daly city, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 07:59:27

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are still significant ways in which the new rules fall short of protecting wildlife:

They do not require fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas.

They allow commercial dog walking with permits, for up to six dogs.

They dont set numerical compliance goals. The first draft of the EIS required a fixed percentage (such as 75%) f dog owners to comply with the rules, or tougher regulatory measures would automatically kick in. We are concerned that without fixed compliance targets, the new rules will not be enforced.

Even with these shortcomings, the new rules will be a significant step forward for ensuring the park is accessible and enjoyable by a wide variety of visitors - families with young kids, seniors, joggers and (yes) birders.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 610 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 09:29:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the new NPS policies in Golden Gate National Recreation Area on dog management and want strong enforcement as well as visible fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 611 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94705

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Ms. Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 09:54:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a member, dog owner, and I support the new rules. I would like to see fenced areas for off-leash dogs but in no way should dogs be allowed to chase or kill wild life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 612 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oceanside, CA 92057

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 10:00:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs, like people are visitors to the GGNRA lands. We have codified behavior standards for people. Let there be standards for does as well. Of course, the dogs' owners or guardians will have to be held responsible. Designate off leash areas away from where children play, where wildlife breeds/nests/and roosts, and fence them off. Pay for the fencing by fees against the users. Establish dog free zones/trails. Require dogs to be on leash elsewhere.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 613 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 11:33:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As former dog owners, my wife and I know the joys of dog ownership. But letting dogs run free in sensitive wildlife or scenic areas is not one of them. The proposed rules seem to us to be sensible and non-threatening. They are the minimum that should be enforced.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 614    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94709  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 12:09:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to support your proposed dog management plan for GGNRA lands - even though I believe it needs to go MUCH FURTHER in protecting wildlife, birds, vegetation, and people from the impacts of dogs.

I am a dog and animal-lover, but for that very reason, I think GGNRA (and other agencies!) need much strong policies regarding dog management in open spaces and parks. The very things that dogs love to do (run, play, chase, pounce, attack, dig, jump, defecate, etc.) are the same things that decimate sensitive wildlife populations, injure or kill a whole array of species (sensitive or not), threaten personal space and safety (particularly for seniors and children), and produce pollution and litter issues for people.

The proposed policies represent an improvement over the status quo in several important ways. They prohibit dogs from some key areas such as Ocean Beach south of Sloat Avenue, and the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area. They also require dogs to be leashed in some areas where they are currently allowed off-leash, such as the Ocean Beach Snowy Plover area. Overall, the new rules will provide more opportunities for people to picnic, hike or view wildlife without dogs running around.

However, there are still significant ways in which the new rules fall short of protecting wildlife:

- \* They do not require fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas.
- \* They allow commercial dog walking with permits, for up to six dogs.
- \* They don't set numerical compliance goals. The first draft of the EIS required a fixed percentage (such as 75%) of dog owners to comply with the rules, or tougher regulatory measures would automatically kick in. We are concerned that without fixed compliance targets, the new rules will not be enforced.

The roots of these problems need to be addressed, specifically:

- \* There are not enough dog-free trails in the San Francisco section of the GGNRA. It is hard for visitors to find a place to have a quiet, dog-free nature experience.
- \* Off-leash areas are not set off clearly enough from other parts of the GGNRA, so it is not clear to dog owners where pets need to stay on-leash. All off-leash areas should be enclosed by fencing.
- \* Some dog owners can't sufficiently control their dogs. In off-leash areas, dogs are supposed to be under voice control. But many dogs aren't well-trained enough to respond to their owner at moments of excitement. Several recent, horrific incidents of dogs killing goslings, and another dog killing a gull while its owner stood by ("great training for duck hunting"), are reminders of how abusive of the rules some

dog owners are - and these owners create such severe problems that GGNRA DOES need to make rules more stringent, and enforce them rigorously.

\* The number of commercial dog walkers with multiple dogs continues to grow. Its hard for anyone to control five or six off-leash dogs.

\* Enforcement is lax. Non-compliance has been the status quo. During 2007/08, for instance, only 27 percent of dogs in the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area were on leash as required by the rules.

Even with these shortcomings, the new rules will be a significant step forward for ensuring the park is accessible and enjoyable by a wide variety of visitors - families with young kids, seniors, joggers and (yes) birders.

The new rules still provide plenty of opportunity for responsible owners to spend outdoor time with their dogs! As the San Francisco Chronicle stated in a recent editorial, "Dogs deserve a place in the outdoors, and so does everyone else. It makes sense to share this scarce space without letting one group [dog owners] take over."

Please pass the proposed plan, and work to further strengthen and enforce dog management rules for the future protection of people, wildlife and our precious open spaces.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 615    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 13:54:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am sad to see how loud and insistent is the dog owner rights community. Dog walking, running, playing really should be restricted to limited areas in parks maintained by towns and cities. I'm not a dog hater or dog owner hater, just a person who enjoys going to a special place to appreciate the landscape, the quiet, a bit of native plants, birds and other animals which manage to survive in a diminished and diminishing condition. NPS is one of the great guardians of what is left of our natural landscape.

Professional dog-walking is definitely not to be supported by GGNRA. These are for profit businesses supported by public funds. They in no way enhance the various missions of the parks.

It seems as if dog-ownership in the Bay Area is growing. But dog-owners have to find other places besides GGNRA to walk their dogs. In and around the towns and cities of the Bay Area, not to mention the streets, there are countless parks where dogs and their owners can walk. In SF particularly there is the huge Golden Gate Park available to dog owners.

Please, Please keep the impact of pets to a minimum on the public lands you guard for us today and in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 616    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Portland, OR 97202  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 15:26:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Don't fuckin do it! we need off leash parks. How would you feel if you were stuck in a house all day and then when you were able to go outside you only had about 3 feet worth of freedom? Not very good i presume.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 617 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 15:30:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm writing to support the more stringent rules on dog use in the GGNRA.

I believe there should be more dog-free trails in the San Francisco section of the GGNRA. When walking through the GGNRA, it's an everyday event to have an off-leash dog run up to you. Owners usually "control" their dogs by yelling at them. This creates an unpleasant experience for the non-dog-walking user of the park.

Off-leash areas should be set off clearly enough from other parts of the GGNRA, so it is clear to dog owners where pets need to stay on-leash. All off-leash areas should be enclosed by fencing or natural barriers.

I believe that enforcement of the existing rules should be stricter.

Dog owners don't understand the impact that their dogs have on wildlife. When dogs chase shorebirds, for example, they not only have the potential to catch and kill them (as one did last year to two goslings). They also are, demonstrably, halting the bird's necessary foraging activities. The birds have nowhere else to go to forage and roost. The dogs do.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 618 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94703  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,06,2013 19:03:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the new dog draft management plan for the Golden Gate Recreation Area.

I think there need to be separate areas for off-leash dogs, dogs on leash, and dog-free areas.

I am concerned about the natural environment and wildlife in our parks, particularly the nesting birds that are defenseless against dogs. There is a difference between natural predators, which are to be expected, and the increasing number of domestic dogs that are brought by humans. I think we need to pay attention to the balance of nature, and preserve the little we have left.

I am also concerned about the safety of children and people who are not comfortable around dogs. They have a right to enjoy areas of the park free of being barked at or jumped on by dogs.

I think it is not enough to require that dogs be "under voice control." I often witness people walking several dogs who are not able to control all of them at once, even when they are supposed to do so. I think

that leash laws need to be enforced, and when there are numerous violations further restrictions need to kick in.

I also think there need to be some kind of barriers around off-leash areas so that the dogs cannot go into other areas.

I enjoy our parks and natural areas. I like to take family and children to explore the wonders of nature. I understand that some people enjoy being accompanied by their dogs. I think there is enough space for all of us. But it will take planning, rules, and enforcement to make it work.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 619    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** ross, CA 94957  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,06,2013 20:46:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please rethink this truly horrific and incredibly poorly thought out plan. Specifically, please consider that:

1) Dogs are biologically wired to retrieve objects from water. Retrieving an object from the water while on a leash = death by drowning. Being banned from retrieving objects from the water = no point in being alive. So the upshot of this plan is that compassionate dog owners should euthanize their animals.

2) People with dogs generally love the outdoors and nature and are normally staunch defenders of the environment. Presenting them with a proposal this outrageously hostile to dogs turns natural supporters of environment causes and the park service into avowed enemies. The political ramifications of this utter idiocy will have a negative effect on fundraising for environmental causes, and on congress' willingness to fund the park service, for decades.

3) This will go to court. Count on it. You can not tell people to get off their own land and expect not to be sued. Lawyers fees will run into the millions of dollars and will come out of your budget. These dollars should be used to fulfill your mission, not to enrich lawyers.

I honestly believe that the authors of this plan should be fired and fined for this breathtaking waste of taxpayer dollars (in effect a massive theft of dollars from environmental causes). The GGNRA's mission is to administer a Recreation Area located in a major population center, not to turn one into a wilderness area. For the amount of money the GGNRA has already spent on this, THOUSANDS OF ACRES OF LAND COULD HAVE BEEN PURCHASED AND PROTECTED FOREVER. Instead you gave us this stinking pile of \*\*\*\*.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 620    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,07,2013 06:18:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I write in support of the GGNRA dog management plan, as far as it goes. I am a dog owner, and I believe people should be allowed to walk their dogs in a sane manner, respectful of other people. This is not the case for many off-leash dogs, especially for professional dog-walkers, who are often seen (I live in the Presidio) walking 10 - 12 dogs at a time.

---

The main problem I see going forward is enforcement. Even regulations presently in place are not enforced, and are therefore ignored.

The cities involved simply need more numerous satisfactory areas where dogs can run free. It's a problem. There isn't space for wildlife. It's a big problem. Too many people. Why aren't we discussing that?

Thank you.

Sarah Hummingbird

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	621	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,07,2013 08:32:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern:				

I am a dog lover and soon-to-be dog owner, but I support the new GGNRA dog management policies that protect wildlife. I have little interest in ensuring SF residents a "dog-free" nature experience, as I've read touted by many of the policy supporters, but I do think it is vital to balance space for leashed dogs and their owners with areas that are sensitive to canine activity (e.g., plover nesting areas). I would like to see these new policies strictly enforced, but also support more fencing/barriers around "off leash" areas, providing dogs with space to romp AND protecting critical habitat areas.

Sincerely,  
Christopher Reiger  
498 Carl Street, #5

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	622	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,07,2013 13:30:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

I cite the following reasons to save off leash dog walking in the GGNRA:

he Golden Gate National Recreation Area has spent millions of dollars trying to severely cut and in many places entirely ban where people have been walking their dogs for decades in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties.

Â· The GGNRA's first "dog management" was roundly criticized 3 to 1 in public comments against it and opposed by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Yet almost three years later, the GGNRA has now released a new plan that is identical to the original with insignificant, meaningless changes.

Â· The plan does not offer any evidence to support the need for such a drastic change in usage. The plan fails to manage the GGNRA for the recreational needs of the people of the Bay Area, in direct

contradiction to its reason-to-be as described in the legislation that created it.

Â· The Plan will severely cut where people with dogs, who have walked in the GGNRA for decades, will be able to walk in the future, without offering any evidence to support the need for such drastic change in usage.

Â· The Plan fails to manage the GGNRA for the recreational needs of the people of the Bay Area, in direct contradiction to its reason-to-be as described in the legislation that created it.

Â· The Plan wrongly acts as if the GGNRA is a remote wilderness, when it is actually located within and adjacent to a large city, with its services and environment inextricably intertwined with those of the cities that surround it.

Â· Recreation is the reason the GGNRA was created, and it must continue to be its guiding principle

Please reconsider the proposal.

Thanks,  
Vigyan Ahirwar

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	623	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Richmond, CA 94805 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,07,2013 17:21:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I take my dog to a designated dog park such as Point Isabel to run free dogs in a National Park should be on a leash				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	624	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	California Native Plant Society Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,07,2013 19:03:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a member of many environmental groups, (Audubon, Save the Bay,Point Blue,etc.) I was a volunteer plant restorer before the Presidio was part of GGNRA and did bird counts for Point Reyes Bird Observatory along the shoreline in the Presidio. At age eighty I still continue to visit the Presidio at least once a month. I have seen the damage dogs off leash can do to the beach,native plant areas, and bird resting,nesting and feeding. I feel that uncontrolled dogs are a threat to children and the elderly. I certainly do not believe that dogs should be off leash in the Presidio. There should be a limit on the number of dogs that a person can walk . Three should be the maximum.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	625	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,08,2013 01:56:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There are way too many dogs in San Francisco that it's creating a lot of conflict. Dog walkers have little to no respect for other people and create and unpleasant park experience for many people without dogs. I appreciate your effort to create a space for people who want to have a different				

---



park experience. A national park should not be a dog park, it should be a place to enjoy, cherish and learn about nature.

Please increase the amount of area that is dog free (no dogs allowed) beyond what is proposed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 626 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA, CA 94706

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,08,2013 12:20:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For the most part I support the new rules being proposed for the GGNRA. It is important that the new rules protect wildlife. Please include fences or natural barriers around off-leash areas and strict enforcement of leash laws. I do believe it is possible for all to enjoy the GGNRA. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 627 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,08,2013 18:26:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support the GGNRA's efforts to improve dog management through this plan. It represents essential (though small) steps forward toward balancing the recreation opportunities for dogs and dog owners with EVERYONE ELSE. I am continually frustrated by the unreasonable reactions of dog owners to any efforts to limit access to free-roaming dogs, while at the same time repeatedly failing to control their dogs and prevent them from harming other visitors to the park, including children, and wildlife. It is the National Park Service's duty to protect both wildlife and recreation opportunities, but it cannot do this effectively without placing limits on dogs and dog owners, and ENFORCING those rules. I am hopeful that the GGNRA will adopt this management plan and enforce these rules.

It might be helpful if there was an 'app' (or other easily-accessible method) for reporting dog-wildlife or dog-visitor conflicts (or any kind of problems visitors might want to report). My sense is that the NPS knows of only a small fraction of these incidents, and if these data could be collected in a way that provided wider access to their frequency, locations, and seriousness might provide additional support for efforts to manage dogs. It might also provide a better sense of how many people are unhappy about and willing to report these incidents, and thus how many people would support dog management efforts.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 628 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,08,2013 20:53:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the plan to cut the number of areas where people can walk their dogs off leash. This greatly reduces the recreation opportunities for those of us who live in small apartments with no yards -those of us who can't afford to own our own open space. The ability to enjoy this open space and allow dogs off leash is a freedom that we as tax payers should be afforded to enjoy the recreation areas that are for all of us. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 629    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 22:15:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This proposal in not based on scientific data nor is it peer reviewed.

San Francisco is an active city and our canines deserve exercise just like the rest of the city residents!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 630    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94502  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,08,2013 23:10:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft dog management plan. The proposed rules are an improvement but enforcement is the critical key. In order for all to share our urban park lands and to protect the wildlife in their habitat, clear boundaries (including fences) and enforcement are essential. Wildlife in particular needs our help if species are to survive and thrive for future generations. Please continue the stewardship that we have come to expect and rely upon for the good of preserving and nourishing our parks. We need it more than ever, now.  
Thank you.  
Carolyn West  
456 Centre Court  
Alameda, CA 94502

---

**Correspondence ID:** 631    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 08:46:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I want to strongly encourage the Park Service to create and ENFORCE regulations to ensure that wildlife and park visitors are protected from dogs in GGNRA.

I do not visit the San Francisco beaches of GGNRA often, but the last 2 times I have been there, I have been menaced by off-leash dogs and witnessed illegally off-leash dogs chasing shorebirds. I have seen a number of people with 10 or more dogs off leash and certainly not under control - presumably these people are professional dog walkers, and they should not be permitted to run their business in a National Park at the expense of other members of the public.

The current situation with respect to dogs is unpleasant and dangerous for non-dog owners and wildlife and needs to be remedied.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 632    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 09:15:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It may Concern.

I oppose the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. The plan proposes to either eliminate or severely limit dog-walking access in 21 locations in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo counties - including traditional off-leash areas like Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Marin Headlands, Mori Point, Muir Beach, Ocean Beach, and Rodeo Beach.

The GGNRA is located in a major urban area with minimal open space, so these restrictions will have a dramatic impact. We believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRA's original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan fails to do.

The document failed to provide substantial evidence to its claims that dog waste at Crissy Field is contributing to water quality issues. The document needs to provide localized monitoring and data to back up such claims, or else, if such data does not exist, it should remove the discussion of dog waste as an issue. Moreover, the document mischaracterized how much dog waste is left at Crissy Field; reading the document one has the impression that dog waste is left everywhere. I walk my dog weekly at Crissy Field and can attest that the grounds at Crissy Field are very clean and that dog owners who walk their dogs at Crissy Field are extremely responsible about picking up after their dogs. The document needs to more fairly characterize the amount of dog waste at Crissy Field, and therefore the issue of dog waste at Crissy Field.

Here are some specific comments about the plan:

â€ The document failed to properly characterize the urban setting of the GGNRA; reading the document one is left with the impression that the GGNRA is a wilderness area, and not the urban parklands of the San Francisco Bay region. The document should better characterize the general setting of the GGNRA, and the level of visitation to the GGNRA.

â€ The document's proposal to ban dogs on east beach does not consider access concerns, including restroom access and wheelchair access. The proposal should be modified taking into consideration the needs of all visitors.

â€ The document mischaracterizes the level of dog noise and does not properly characterize the soundscape at Crissy Field. The document should fully consider the soundscape at Crissy Field, which in my experience, walking my dog regularly at Crissy Field, may include (depending on day/time of day) construction noise, emergency vehicles, highway traffic, kids yelling, music, crowds, noise from equipment removing trees, etc.

â€ The document does not provide adequate data to support its claims that dog conflicts are a significant issue. In my experience walking my dog regularly at Crissy Field, I have very rarely witnessed dog conflicts; dogs are generally well trained/controlled. The experiences I almost always witness of dogs at Crissy are experiences of joy and contentment, and not conflict. The document should modify its discussion of dog conflicts to more accurately characterize the issue - which is largely a non-issue.

â€ The proposal to ban dogs on Crissy Field in order to protect wildlife/sensitive species is not consistent with the regular use of Crissy Field as an event space (e.g. for races/walks, Fleet Week, etc.). The document needs to be modified to present the impacts of dogs in proper context of all other uses of these same spaces.

â€ The document mischaracterizes dog's presence in the Wildlife Protection Area (beach at the west end of Crissy Field). In my experience, dog owners are very mindful of not allowing their dogs to enter the WPA, and even remind other dog owners who may inadvertently let their dogs in the WPA that dogs are not allowed during most of the year. The document needs to modify its characterization of dog presence in the WPA.

â€ The document fails to accurately or fully characterize the issue of potential disturbance to wildlife in the WPA. In my experience visiting Crissy Field regularly, there are many users of the WPA that disturb wildlife, including families picnicking, kids running around, kite-boarders, horses. Especially on a sunny weekend day, the WPA is often packed with people enjoying the beach. The document needs to be modified to more fully and accurately describe issues of potential wildlife disturbance at the WPA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 633    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 12:26:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The priorities should be 1) preservation and protection of resources (and particularly endangered species) and 2) human safety and comfort (including children and elderly). Dogs come after all of that. Off-leash has proven not to work, and monitoring is a great idea.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 634    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94607  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 12:50:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the Audubon Society's work to ensure that off-leash dogs don't overwhelm the wild residents of National Parks, particularly the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. While I enjoy dogs, and am sympathetic to their owners' desire to have a place to hike off leash, I am becoming more and more concerned about preserving areas for nesting and breeding where they need it, not where it is convenient for us.

Please continue to work to keep space for wild animals protected.

Thanks,  
Jessica Forbess

---

**Correspondence ID:** 635    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941212533  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to emphatically oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I believe the plan will have a negative impact on the residents of the City of San Francisco, as it proposes extremely restrictive policies about where we will be able to enjoy off-leash hiking, running and other recreation with our four-legged family members.

---

The purported goal of the plan is to provide a variety of visitor experience, improve visitor and employee safety, reduce conflicts between users, and protect natural habitats and cultural resources. There is no evidence or data, however, that shows the current laws regarding dogs in the GGNRA are insufficient or that show dogs that use the GGNRA with owners who abide by existing regulations are a source of conflict, interfere with the use of the GGNRA by others, or destroy habitats or cultural resources. I would posit that more damage has been done to the natural resources and landscape by the ill-advised and executed "Pacific Overlook" trail modification along Lincoln Blvd in the Presidio that resulted in massive washouts, destroyed the trail and undermined Lincoln Blvd necessitating what looks to be a repair project in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, than has ever, cumulatively been done by dogs with responsible guardians who abide by existing regulations.

This plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily ignores the needs of Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their canine companions. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others.

In my opinion, the GGNRA can accommodate both recreation and conservation. It was designed as an urban recreation area- -and it IS an URBAN recreation area- -not a pristine wilderness areas like Yosemite. In fact, the courts have repeatedly upheld the existing 1979 pet policy on the grounds it was consistent with both the fact and intent of the original mandate for recreation upon which the GGNRA was founded. The effort of some individuals and entities to turn the GGNRA into a National Park like Yosemite, rather than a national recreation area, is inconsistent not only with the daily needs and lives of SF's over 800,000 residents, but with prior court rulings.

Further, by my observation and in my experience, there are quite a number of restrictions on off-leash use of GGNRA land already in place, but enforcement seems to be the real issue. I fear that if these more restrictive regulations are enacted, it will only be the law-abiding dog owners who will suffer; the scofflaws won't care about the new restrictions- just as they don't follow existing regulations now.

The GGNRA draft management plan does not provide tangible evidence that justifies such drastic changes to over 30 years of healthy dog and human recreation under the 1979 Pet Policy. The Park Service should honor the original 1979 Pet Policy, respect dog-walking/hiking/running as legitimate recreation and recognize that there are hundreds of uninhabited miles along the California coastline for wildlife to thrive, while we San Franciscans and our pets have a 7 x 7 mile peninsula on which to recreate. In my experience, when people and their families walk with their pets, they are more open to meeting and engaging in a positive way with other people, usually via inquiries about their pets. If they can do this in their own backyard, without having to get in to a car and drive to another location, all the better because they get to know their neighbors. In the years we've had our dog, we've met more people and engaged in more pleasant conversations with strangers than I have ever experienced in all my years before owning a dog. I truly believe pets can bring out the best of humanity in us all.

Please do not adopt the proposed regulations, but rather, honor the 1979 Pet Policy and spend the resources that are being spent on adopting, revising and promoting the new plan on more fully enforcing existing regulations under the 1979 Pet Policy.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	636	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94602 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Springer Rescue Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 14:27:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am adamantly opposed to the proposed revised Dog Access plan for the GGRNA as it severely limits/diminishes off-leash access for dog owners. As far as dog access being labor-intensive, I don't know what our government expects when they severely limit this activity. The effect of this is to simply drive the same number of dog & owners to overuse what few places are left. You can't just decide to issue an edict for everyone to leash their dogs because it's a "problem" for you. If doesn't work that way; dogs need a certain amount of off-leash exercise, especially when young. It's as if you had management issues with out-of-control children and told parents to leash them.

As far as our organization goes, maintaining the current off-leash access would enable Springer owners to provide proper exercise for the younger Springer (under 5 yrs) as our breed is normally athletic and energetic. We are able to find excellent homes for Springers thru our rescue because of the easy and prolific access to on-leash & off-leash dog areas generally in the SF Bay Area. We are afraid the GGNRA revised plan may start a trend. And if off-leash dog areas are diminished, we are fearful we will see an uptick the number of Springers (and other dogs also) surrendered to rescue and shelters in the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 637    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 15:01:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to emphatically oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I believe the plan will have a negative impact on the residents of the City of San Francisco, as it proposes extremely restrictive policies about where we will be able to enjoy off-leash hiking, running and other recreation with our four-legged family members.

The purported goal of the plan is to provide a variety of visitor experience, improve visitor and employee safety, reduce conflicts between users, and protect natural habitats and cultural resources. There is no evidence or data, however, that shows the current laws regarding dogs in the GGNRA are insufficient or that show dogs that use the GGNRA with owners who abide by existing regulations are a source of conflict, interfere with the use of the GGNRA by others, or destroy habitats or cultural resources. I would posit that more damage has been done to the natural resources and landscape by the ill-advised and executed "Pacific Overlook" trail modification along Lincoln Blvd in the Presidio that resulted in massive washouts, destroyed the trail and undermined Lincoln Blvd necessitating what looks to be a repair project in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, than has ever, cumulatively been done by dogs with responsible guardians who abide by existing regulations.

This plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily ignores the needs of Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their canine companions. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others.

In my opinion, the GGNRA can accommodate both recreation and conservation. It was designed as an urban recreation area- -and it IS an URBAN recreation area- -not a pristine wilderness areas like Yosemite. In fact, the courts have repeatedly upheld the existing 1979 pet policy on the grounds it was consistent with both the fact and intent of the original mandate for recreation upon which the GGNRA

was founded. The effort of some individuals and entities to turn the GGNRA into a National Park like Yosemite, rather than a national recreation area, is inconsistent not only with the daily needs and lives of SF's over 800,000 residents, but with prior court rulings.

Further, by my observation and in my experience, there are quite a number of restrictions on off-leash use of GGNRA land already in place, but enforcement seems to be the real issue. I fear that if these more restrictive regulations are enacted, it will only be the law-abiding dog owners who will suffer; the scoflaws won't care about the new restrictions- just as they don't follow existing regulations now.

The GGNRA draft management plan does not provide tangible evidence that justifies such drastic changes to over 30 years of healthy dog and human recreation under the 1979 Pet Policy. The Park Service should honor the original 1979 Pet Policy, respect dog-walking/hiking/running as legitimate recreation and recognize that there are hundreds of uninhabited miles along the California coastline for wildlife to thrive, while we San Franciscans and our pets have a 7 x 7 mile peninsula on which to recreate. In my experience, when people and their families walk with their pets, they are more open to meeting and engaging in a positive way with other people, usually via inquiries about their pets. If they can do this in their own backyard, without having to get in to a car and drive to another location, all the better because they get to know their neighbors. In the years we've had our dog, we've met more people and engaged in more pleasant conversations with strangers than I have ever experienced in all my years before owning a dog. I truly believe pets can bring out the best of humanity in us all.

Please do not adopt the proposed regulations, but rather, honor the 1979 Pet Policy and spend the resources that are being spent on adopting, revising and promoting the new plan on more fully enforcing existing regulations under the 1979 Pet Policy.

Thank you for your time and consideration

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	638	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,09,2013 17:41:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS,				

I feel that your plan isn't legitimate because there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site specific study completed and there is no data to support ANY of their assertions about the supposed harm that dogs are causing. Without vital monitoring, the SEIS is a sham and the NPS doesn't have any justification for a proposed draconian change from the 1979 Pet Policy of the GGNRA.

Please reconsider this egregious dog management plan. I moved here to be able to enjoy the 80,000 acres of supposed public, recreational open space within the GGNRA. I got a dog because this was such a great place to hike and play outdoors. I would not own a dog if I lived in a restricted area (like a city). Our daily hike is the highlight of our day - we do nothing that would possibly have a negative impact on what we consider our very precious recreational open space. Dog walking is NOT a crime!!! Please do not penalize us for enjoying our very precious public recreational acreage.

Thank you for reconsidering.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	639	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 18:44:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** TO whom it may concern:

I am writing to strongly oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I believe the plan will have a negative impact on the residents of the City of San Francisco, as it proposes extremely restrictive policies about where we will be able to enjoy off-leash hiking, running and other recreation with our dogs.

The plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily ignores the needs of Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their dogs. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others.

The GGNRA can accommodate both recreation and conservation. It is an URBAN recreation area- -not a pristine wilderness areas like Yosemite. The attempt to turn the GGNRA into a National Park like Yosemite, rather than a national recreation area, is inconsistent not only with the daily needs and lives of SF's over 800,000 residents, but with the original bylaws and intent of the GGNRA itself.

Please do not adopt the proposed regulations. They will hurt our urban city more than help by far. Please honor the 1979 Pet Policy and use the resources for park restoration and public space improvements.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 640    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,09,2013 20:37:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I sure hope I'm submitting my comments to the right place.  
I so want my voice to be heard and don't want my plea to fall off the desk onto the floor.  
I never had the joy of a dog growing up; got my first dog when I was 50 and am so so SO happy I learned of the pleasure therein.  
That first dog helped me through my father's death. My dad lived in S. San Francisco and when I went to visit him, I brought my dog and afterward we enjoyed a walk on the beach at Fort Funston. It was what made the visit tolerable- watching my dog run on the beach afterward. I grew to love that beach and still visit it regularly with my current dog, even though my dad is no longer on this earth.  
I think non-dog-owners can't appreciate the joy of watching one's dog run on the beach. I just can't keep up with her on a leash to provide this kind of unmitigated pleasure.  
I beg you to leave some off leash aread off leash(specifically/especially the National Park Fort Funston ) for the joy and sanity of hundreds of us dog lovers and their dogs.  
Thank you,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 641    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 06:57:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please extend the public comment period. With the government shutdown and the holidays, there has not been sufficient time to make the public aware of the plan or for the public to provide comments.

Thank you for considering my request.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 642    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 08:19:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello. I am an avid hiker in our local parks, both here in Oakland and also in Marin and San Francisco. I have been hiking in them for the last 6 years that I have lived here. One of the main reasons I go out into our parks is that I take my two dogs for long walks.

Dogs are like my fellow Americans, they need lots of exercise, mental stimulation and particularly, nose stimulation. We have domesticated them and bred them into tiny incarnations of the wolf so they can live inside our homes. But it doesn't change their natural instincts to prowl a large territory. And I'm sorry, most Americans are not for running 20 miles a day so their pet can be properly exercised.

Instead, we have these wonderful parks where our pet canines can run to their hearts desire. I know how rare it is for dogs to be able to roam on beaches. My parents live in the Los Angeles area and there are very few places for the dogs to roam. As a result, dogs are often neurotic and crammed into small living areas where they drive people crazy barking. I listen to my mother all the time complaining about the dogs barking and carrying on in her area. Also the dog parks are crowded and over run.

Contrary to what a lot of people think, dogs who are crammed into these small dog parks often end up in aggressive situations. They are not all cut out to have such an overwhelming social experience. Dogs need to greet their fellow dog for short periods of social time and then able to move on. Our parks are ideal for this kind of exercise and social interaction.

I just recently went to Marin Headlands, to Fort Cronkite. There I played with my dogs in the surf, all the while remembering my recent friend who died of liver cancer. Ft. Cronkite was her favorite place to go on hikes. I am so lucky I was able to be with my very dear friends, my dogs who unconditionally love me and are always by my side.

I would hate for that resource to be taken away from the many Bay Area residents who have dogs. I think San Francisco has more dogs than children, that's a lot of people who would be denied access to our natural resources, the wonderful coastline we all share.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 643    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Merola Opera Program Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

---

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 11:18:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a resident of San Francisco and a dog owner, I must comment that changing the current allowances at dog parks with force three issues. One, a decrease in off-leash land with increase dog play in confined areas. If the idea is to decrease wear and tear of the areas, this will in fact increase wear and tear, poop piles and less natural states of terrain in the confined spaces. Two, the argument is that dog activity damages environmental terrain. Don't other animals as well? Will the next stop to net the foliage to keep birds and wildlife out as well? Please consider this argument as you redefine boundaries. Perhaps consider fencing off particularly delicate areas, rather than ban off-leash play from the entire space. Three, as a dog owner who moved to San Francisco with the off leash dog parks in mind, I would re-evaluate staying as it was a major reason we came to the city.

Please reconsider this decision. Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 644 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94609  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 12:06:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello - -

I strongly support the proposed changes with respect to dog restrictions in the GGNRA Dog Management Plan. While I love dogs, and have had them as pets in the past, I think it's essential to protect the little wildlife we still have in the Bay Area from being harassed or killed by dogs off-leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 645 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 13:53:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do NOT make stricter restrictions on the ability to bring our dogs on our walks in this beautiful city. Many people have dogs and most people like them. Why shouldn't they be allowed where humans are allowed? In my experience, people, not dogs, are the ones littering and destroying our parks. Why punish people who want to walk in the parks and not have to leave our dogs at home? Running around outside is one of the few pleasures a dog has. Why be so mean about this?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 646 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,10,2013 15:07:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The current dog management in place is restrictive enough. It's much more important to control problem dogs/owners than to punish people and dogs with overly restrictive policies. There are not that many dogs in these areas anyway. From your plan it looks like dogs will not be allowed on to the North end of Stinson Beach from the parking lot?

Don't you people have anything more constructive to do with your time than messing with our recreation in the backyard of our Neighborhoods? You are putting forward absurd policies.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 647    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,10,2013 16:10:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This comment is in regards to the Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for San Francisco.

I have been living in San Francisco for over 10 year and I am a dog owner. I spent many hours training my dog to make sure he responds well and immediately. My family, dog and I go on very regular, almost daily walks along Ocean Beach to enjoy the beautiful surroundings and to give our dog the exercise he needs to be a great canine citizen.

I urge you to keep the off-leash areas in San Francisco unchanged! It is vital for dogs to get a lot of exercise, especially living in a busy city where there is not a lot of space surrounding the houses for running and playing. I cannot imagine not being able to have our Aussie play fetch on the beaches anymore! That would be cruel and very sad for our whole family. My daughter is still young and she already loves spending time on the beach playing freely with our dog - and others!

The off-leash areas are well known to people living in San Francisco and anyone who doesn't enjoy dogs has plenty of space in other parts of the beaches that are on-leash.

I strongly urge you to consider the voice of the many dog owners in San Francisco. We live here, we pay taxes, we truly CARE about our city! I understand that there are many visitors but if you need to be careful then you should just be very clear about the off-leash beaches with signposts, in official guidebooks and websites etc. I strongly believe people should have a choice! People can choose to stay away from the beaches that allow dogs off-leash.

I agree that little parks need restricted off-leash areas because they are small and surrounded by streets and busy city life. But the beaches and also the trails around Land's End, Sutro Park are pure nature and dogs are as well. Do NOT restrict the off-leash areas, it's one of the few areas of freedom left in our big city!

I especially urge you to promote off-leash areas in the following beaches and trails:

Ocean Beach (Staircase 1-21, 21 seasonally) - proposal A

Land's End Trails - proposal A

Sutro Park - proposal A

Fort Funston - proposal A

Baker Beach - proposal A

Crissy Field - proposal A

Make a statement for the residents of San Francisco with their many dogs - a well exercised dog is the best guarantee for canines to be good citizens! Let our kids enjoy the freedom of free play with their dogs! Let us choose our beaches - if someone doesn't like dogs they will choose a on-leash area without a problem. Spacious off-leash areas are crucial for San Francisco, a city where there are so many dogs and

dog owners! Put up signs and clear notices to alert visitors that beaches have off-leash dogs instead of restricting our citizen rights!

Thank you,  
Jeannette

---

**Correspondence ID:** 648    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,10,2013 16:18:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in support of the NPS preferred alternative for Ocean Beach, but I would like to stress the importance of enforcing the law. Without enforcement there is no law, and that is the current state of Ocean Beach.

I regularly walk the entire length of Ocean Beach. Along the way I make a point of letting dog owners know about the leash requirements between Sloat and Stairwell 21, July 1st - May 15.

Problems I see there include off leash dog is chasing shorebirds and/or snowy plovers, defecating without the owner picking up after them, harassing people and/or small children, and harassing dogs that are on leash.

I never assume the dog owners are purposefully breaking the law when I approach them, but that is often the case. While many people simply don't know about the leash requirements, the majority of people I speak with do not comply once I have educated them. Most likely because they know there is no consequence to breaking this law.

I have walked the full length of Ocean Beach 72 times over the past year. I observed egregious amounts of non-compliance with the current laws, and I have never once seen a Park Ranger doing anything about it.

Any changes in the law will be purely symbolic unless they are actually enforced. Whether the current laws stay in place, or the preferred alternative is initiated, I urge the NPS to actually enforce the laws to protect natural resources and visitor experience.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 649    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,10,2013 16:40:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and resident of San Francisco, the banning of off leash dogs in the GGNRA concerns me. I am a frequent visitor to East Beach, Crissy Field but I frequently take him to Fort Funston as well. I really feel that all this is because of a few "bad" eggs and this will dramatically restrict where we can take our dogs on GGNRA lands. Less than 1% of all GGNRA space is open for off-leash dogs while there are concerns about environmental impacts of the dogs, it is not right to take away the little that us as dog owners do have.

---

I feel that the individual dog owners are responsible and clean up poop and watch their dogs. Perhaps we can put more restrictions on commercial "dog walkers" to limit the number of dogs per walker to ensure they are able to properly look out for their charges. It is really those who are not keeping control of their dogs which have the potential to cause damage or annoyance to tourists and the like. If we have more signs for on/off leash area restrictions. BY taking this away, we are no longer the dog loving city we tout ourselves to be. Let's not restrict our dogs. Let's enforce the rules that exist and have overall public education about this so we can continue to make our dogs happy and enjoy the beauty and wild freedoms of the Golden Gate National "Recreational" Areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 650    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 06:57:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose all management alternatives for park lands in Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo counties; the plan is deceptive and disregards the legislative mandate to "preserve for public use and enjoyment" and "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space". The plan effectively seeks to change the enabling legislation which is unlawful without an Act of Congress and also does not restore and maintain the recreational value agreed to when SF deeded Ocean Beach and Fort Funston to the US government.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 651    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 10:56:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Stop the GGNRA Dog Management Plan! San Francisco is a dog-friendly city and our pets deserve to have a place to roam off-leash. Fort Funston and Chrissy Field are two popular areas that people enjoy taking their dogs and have an opportunity to get exercise off-leash. It would be criminal to outlaw this freedom. Dog owners are tax payers too and our funds continue to support Golden Gate Parks and our liberties to walk our dogs off-leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 652    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 11:30:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in the Outer Mission and take my dog "Ringo" to Fort Funston almost every day to walk. Fort Funston is one of a very few public spaces near my home where I can take Ringo off-leash. I understand there are some concerns with allowing certain dogs off-leash (including safety and possible environmental impact). However, well-behaved dogs should be allowed off-leash. Not only does it allow the dog to interact freely with other dogs, it allows dogs to get a better range of motion and exercise than on-leash walking. This is very important to dogs like Ringo with joint and mobility issues. I oppose compliance based management. It would require well-behaved dogs to be on-leash without evidence of impact of non-compliance. I also oppose the Proposed Alternatives in the DEIS, including the

---

Preferred Alternative, because they are too restrictive. My almost daily walks at Fort Funston are beneficial to Ringo because he gets much-needed exercise and socialization and interaction with a variety of dogs and people. Fort Funston is one of my favorite places to walk Ringo because of the beautiful scenery and nature and the opportunity to interact with all types of people and dogs. I support off-leash walking in the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 653    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 12:49:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave Muir Beach alone!!!!I have been going there for 15 years and I have NEVER seen a problem. So why start a war between dog owners and beach goers. If anything..Allow dogs full off leash access for the morning- -say 5am to 11am...and then from 3pm on....So during a hot summer day when the beach is full- --never really- --the dogs would be on leash during the crowded times- --from June through September. The rest of the time...LEAVE IT ALONE PLEASE.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 654    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,11,2013 14:09:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you in advance for taking the time to read my letter. I am writing to plead for you to NOT approve nor proceed with the presently proposed GGNRA Dog Management Plan.

I moved to San Francisco a year and a half ago, amazed to discover an extraordinary city and its magnificent surrounding as well as a city that welcomes and celebrates dogs. A city that understands that if it treats its dog owning residents with respect, that they in turn would behave in no less a manner.

My daily off-leash walks with my dog, alternating between Land's End, Fort Funston and the Marin Headland Trails around Rodeo Beach are my exercise, my therapy, my church, my meditation, my vitamins. These easily accessed walks, keep me healthy, energized, and inspired.

I am enthralled by the beautiful nature I have the opportunity to immerse myself in. I am honored to share these mountains, forests, cliffs and beaches with hawks and pelicans, dolphins and sea lions, coyotes and deer. I am here, exploring, exercising and appreciating because of my dog. And not a day goes by that I do not give thanks for this immeasurable privilege.

~~~

The following paraphrases and reiterate some of the comments I have read and profoundly agree with regarding opposition to the proposed Plan:

\* "The GGNRA park lands in Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo counties are part of local communities where millions of people should be inclusively and actively encouraged to continue enjoying regular relaxation, exercise, and inspiration that make it one of the most valued and visited lands in America.â€œ"

\* "The new plan is not only a significant change from both the legislative mandate but also from the existing 1980 general management plan, which was highly supported by the public." â€

â€\* "The GGNRA is not the equivalent of the vast Yosemite wilderness and should not be misrepresented as an idealized 'backcountry'. Neighborhood trails and beaches should not be managed to artificially exclude people so that a select few have 'solitary' and narrowly defined recreational experiences and expect others to drive farther away and increase crowding in a few small 'diverse opportunity' areas."

~~~

I have not, nor can I explore the State and National Parks because they are already completely closed to dogs. The Coastal Trail, one of the very few GGNRA Marin Headland trails open for dog walking is proposed to now be off limits too. If I can't go with my dog, I won't go without my dog. The whole point of being out walking in nature is so we both benefit. Why would I leave him at home and go walk myself?

An example of a negative effect from closing off urban nature trails to people walking their dogs, is a gradual arrival and settling in of Squatters, contributing litter, human waste and a diminished sense of safety.

Another is that with less foot traffic of walkers with their dogs, wildlife (coyotes for instance), normally kept at bay, comfortably expand their territory. This increases the risk of contact, confrontation and injury with the fewer people using the trails.

A tired dog is a good dog.

A dog on leash never gets anywhere close to the amount of exercise that he does off-leash. On leash, dogs are restricted, less stimulated, they grow frustrated and angry, energy builds up and has nowhere to be released. Their behavior, in turn, can become reactive, impulsive, destructive and unpredictable.

I am a responsible dog owner with an extremely well behaved dog. In areas where there are plenty of people and picnics and kids, I choose to put my dog on leash. And in areas that are open and sparse, he walks freely, people who call to him are greeted happily and he in turn welcomes a friendly pat.

Instead of going backwards to match other cities in their restrictions and limited thinking, I wish that the GGNRA would continue to be the inclusive, trailblazer that San Francisco has always been. To do things better. To do things that have for years, clearly proven that they work and to build upon that.

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

To witness the joy of dogs running, bounding, playing and swimming with their owners, with other dogs and with other people and kids is incredible to behold.

We are astoundingly lucky to live in magnificent Northern California. In all the places and cities I've lived, I have never met so many conscious, responsible, respectful and aware people who greatly

appreciate how blessed we are to be here. Please enable us to continue to celebrate that, in our freedoms, in our healthy choices, in our cherishing and sharing of our beloved natural wonders, where we are all welcome with our very best canine friends by our sides.

Thank you kindly,  
Jennifer Saxon  
SAN FRANCISCO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 655    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,11,2013 14:18:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** GGNRA does not have the right to make changes for use of the lands 'given' it by San Francisco and Marin County. The terms were clear at the time the areas were turned over to GGNRA. We residents need to have access to these spaces for the recreational activities that have been permitted for years. If not for this access we would have to travel long distances. I have been walking with my dogs, who get their off-leash exercise at Fort Funston and Crissy Field for more than 20 years. I clearly remember when the renovation at Crissy took place how GGNRA assured us that we would continue to have access to the meadow and beach when it was done.

Were it not for my daily walks I doubt that I would now BE a 'senior citizen'. That is how important having access to GGNRA areas is for me.

Part of what makes Fort Funston a destination is the presence of dogs with their people. There is an inordinate presence of good will . . . people with smiles greeting each other and the dogs. People who don't have a dog come there for the vibe. It gets mention in national publications because of the dogs. Yet for the past seems like 20 years GGNRA has been resistant to our presence. Every bit of 'science' GGNRA has provided as a reason to prohibit dogs has been shown to be faulty. Case in point: "Shadows from dogs running above the cliffs frighten the cliff swallows." There are no shadows cast from above the cliffs. The sun rises in the East and sets in the West making it impossible. The ravens, now almost the only birds present, do harass all the other birds. There were once swallows, sparrows, finches, hawks, even occasionally great horned owls there. None were discouraged by dogs. Ravens, encouraged by misguided humans feeding them, have changed the bird populations. Yet there is no signage to prohibit the feeding of wildlife.

You can count this comment as one definitely opposed to all proposed changes by GGNRA to these areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 656    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,11,2013 18:55:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My dog Kermit is like a member of my family. She is a healthy active cattle dog mix, 4 years old, and just loves to run around at Ocean Beach and Fort Funston. She literally jumps out the car in pure joy when we park in the lots at Funston and Ocean Beach, barely able to contain her excitement.

Being a cattle dog, she never strays far from me, or her dog walker, who walks her 3 times a week at Fort Funston in the off-leash areas. I can't tell you how happy my dog makes me, and she is happy when she gets to exercise off-leash at many of our beautiful parks in the San Francisco area. She would be a



miserable dog if she had to stay on-leash at all times on our walks. Just like people need to have the freedom to exercise, so do dogs. They need to stay healthy and run. It helps to socialize them as well. Most dogs are well-behaved at Ocean beach and Fort Funston, and most owners are responsible. I always carry poop bags and pick up after my dog and her leash is at the ready, and if I ever sense an issue arising, I immediately put Kermit on her leash. This rarely happens.

There are a few dog owners and dogs that give the rest of us dog owners a bad name. I am a responsible dog owner, and so are many of my friends who are dog owners, including my wonderful dog walker. I hope that these strict leash laws are not put into place. I live and work in SF, I my pay local taxes, pay rent and give back to my community. I deserve to be able to take my dog to off-leash areas in SF, so we can play and be healthy together. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 657    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,12,2013 00:43:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The 'only' acceptable dog management plan is the 1979 Pet Policy which was affirmed as the legal and current law by Federal Court Judge Alsup in 2006. If the GGNRA cannot abide by their agreement they should turn over the land to an entity which can (e.g. Forest Service or BLM) or simply return it to the city of San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 658    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,12,2013 11:32:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please retain current off leash dog walking areas. They provide much fun and recreation for local families who have dogs. The current arrangement seems a fair division of areas where dogs are and are not permitted.

We do not need further restrictions on the four-legged members of our families. I love my dog, want to include her in as many activities as possible, and have worked very hard to train her to behave well in public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 659    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94111  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Oct,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** I am against this plan. Please reject it.

This plan is bad! Do not further restrict off leash dog walking in the GGNRA. There are already so many places that dog owners are restricted to go; this is unfair and will limit the ability of dog owners to enjoy the GGNRA which belongs to all of us.

I can see see that a part of Chrissy Field beach could be made as on-leash only, but further restrictions at

Fort Funston just seem mean-spirited and intended to punish dog owners. The restriction of dogs from Muir Beach is completely unacceptable. There are plenty of other wonderful beaches that do not allow dogs access all up & down the CA coast, and losing dog access to Muir Beach would be a tragic loss of one the few places that dog owners have in Marin to access the beach.

Please reject the current proposal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 660    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94707  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,14,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Other

**Correspondence:** I can understand both points of view on the matter of dogs running free on the beach at Crissy Field. Dogs are wonderful animals, and their joy at running free is wonderful to see. Their is obviously a great difference between this and exercising on even a long lead. At the same time, some frail people fear dogs, as do some children, and some people are allergic to them. I suggest that the best solution is the one adopted on Limantour beach at the Point Reyes National Seashore, where dogs are allowed to run free on the south part of the beach but not on the north part. I have often walked both parts of that beach, and the arrangement appears to work out well for everyone. This could very well be the best solution for Crissy Field.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 661    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Senior Services, past pres Bd of Directors (23 yrs)  
Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Dec,12,2013 12:41:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the \*entire\* GGNRA Dog Management Policy for the following reasons:

In 1972, my husband and I both voted to transfer our beaches and other properties owned by the City and County of San Francisco to the NPS to become the GGNRA because of the promises made to the voters that this new recreational area would retain historical recreational access, including off-leash recreation.

When congress established the GGNRA in 1972, they included two "specific provisions" unique to the GGNRA:

First, the park was established "to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning."

Second, the GGNRA statute imposes a unique limitation on NPS's discretionary power for "management of the recreation area" by providing that the "Secretary of Interior...shall utilize the resources in a manner which will provide for recreation and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management."

The GGNRA does not use sound principles of land use planning and management, or even follow their own rules and regulations.

The premise that dogs in the GGRNA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area is absurd. By their own admission, the GGNRA has no data or studies to support these claims. They ignore/omit all studies that contradict their desired outcome.

How can the GGNRA undertake a Dog Management Policy change as proposed in this SEIS without any evidence of monitoring or site specific studies (as required by federal law) as a means to identify the alleged impairment?! Anecdotal comments and the "potential" to damage the area just don't cut it.

Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Now called the Monitoring-based Management Strategy, the GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. THIS IS UNACCEPTABLE.

My preferred option is one the GGRNA deliberately omitted: THE ORIGINAL 1979 PET POLICY which was affirmed as legal and the current law of the land by Federal Judge William Alsup in 2005.

The only way the citizens of San Francisco can get the GGNRA to follow their own rules and regulations is by taking them to court, which has consistently ruled in favor of the citizens.

Why must ordinary citizens use their own resources to battle the limitless legal resources of the NPS because of the GGNRA's illegal actions and refusal to abide by the enabling legislation?

I am old, tired, broke; and am on my 4th dog since this battle began nearly 2 decades ago. Fourth dog will surely cross over the Rainbow Bridge before this entire BS is settled. I'm tired of writing letters, attending meetings, testifying in court, and submitting comments, but I will continue until I'm dead or until the GGRNA honors their promise to the citizens of San Francisco.

Enough already. Either codify the original 1979 Pet Policy with a Section Seven Special Regulation, or ... turn the lands over to another agency to manage as promised or the land reverts back to the City and County of San Francisco. No more DEIS, SEIS, Rulemaking, or comment periods when we all know you totally ignore the thousands who have responded to you and continue to pursue your own agenda of keeping people and animals out of the GGNRA.

NO on SEIS  
YES on 1979 Pet Policy

Most sincerely,

Jane Shepard  
1037 Portola Drive  
San Francisco, CA 94127-1225  
415.661.9255

Cc: Mayor Ed Lee  
SF Board of Supervisors

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi  
Congresswoman Jackie Spears  
Senator Diane Feinstein  
Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 662    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,12,2013 13:14:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Greetings,

My name is David Pellicciaro and I am writing in regards to dog policy in the GGNRA.

I've lived in Marin for 8 years, currently reside now in the East Bay. I walked our super excellent Corgi "Elvis" all his 14 year life, up to and including his very last day on earth this past June, off leash on all the great bay area beaches from Crissy Field to Muir Beach.

I cannot go without comment on the pending changes to this simple participation in our public parks. I support the No Action alternative to Muir Beach and I am for the enforcement of the 1979 pet policy. Further there is no legal or legitimate basis for the proposed regulation changes and further still no site specific studies have been done as required by law to support these changes. I find this is unacceptable and I am making my voice heard here. Please take it that we who feel like this feel strongly about this policy and will work to make substantive challenges to these proposed changes. Please do what you can do to make the policy reflect necessity and realistic application.

Sincere thanks for your consideration. David Pellicciaro

---

**Correspondence ID:** 663    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Lakewood, CO 80215  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,12,2013 14:23:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom this concerns,

Growing up along the Oregon coast as well as having a mother in animal control enforcement for Lincoln County, Oregon, I was well drilled in the reasoning of why dogs are contained on leashes on beaches and other recreational areas, such as national parks. I understand the impacts that pets and feral cats and dogs can have on a certain environment from personal studies and listening to first-hand experience. Unmanaged dogs can cause damage not only to wildlife but to other dogs and people. Improper disposal of animal waste can spread disease. Feral cats cause bird population decline. The list goes on but these are the main points and shall be explained further in this reading.

As a tourist of the San Francisco area, I found the beaches clean and managed well. Most dogs were leashed and though some dogs were not on leashes, they were managed through voice commands, were non-aggressive, and showed no behavioral issues. However, with wildlife (shorebirds for example) nearby and other people and dogs, voice commands can become inadequate if a conflict arises. A complete guideline for citizens and visitors should be outlined and available. All in all, I agree with the

draft management plan for dogs and cats for San Francisco and Marin counties.

Unmanaged animals should not be allowed in any recreational area or trail. One reason is safety (Foster, 2006). When there are large groups of people and dogs, aggression from one animal toward another dog and/or human can result in injuries. Unmanaged animals without proper training and control may have more aggression and can play roughly, resulting in fights and injuries. They may also scare children and a parent or another adult may injure the dog, even if the dog did not physically harm the child.

Another point is wildlife. Dogs disrupt areas that are habitat, mostly nesting sites for birds. Unmanaged dogs can do even more damage to the environment. Birds are the most harassed animal species, shorebirds in particular. Shorebirds do not nest in trees; preferred nesting sites are in sand dunes and grasses above tidal areas. Dogs will walk over nests, chase birds, kill adult birds, exhaust the bird's energy resulting in death, and frighten nesting birds to the point of those birds not going back to the nesting site. If there are chicks or eggs present, death of the young will occur. A prime example is the Western Snowy Plover (*Charadrius nivosus nivosus*) (Foster 2006). This bird is protected under the Endangered Species Act and as such, disruption from dogs can lead to large fines for the owner and possible destruction of the dog if the same problem of harassing or harming of federally protected animals is a common occurrence. Dogs may also attack small mammals, amphibians, or reptiles which can be found in recreational parks and trails (National Park Service).

Some people may argue that dogs don't cause that much damage to wildlife. The protection of wildlife on beaches and in parks is not an isolated thought. Many studies agree that dogs have a large impact to wildlife. As with San Francisco and Marin counties, many places in Australia (as an example) have implicated similar rulings for leash laws on their recreational areas (Parks Victoria). The State of Oregon has extensive regulations to leash laws (Parks and Rec. of Oregon).

Plants can also become affected by the presence of unmanaged dogs. Dog fur can carry seeds for great distances. This can bring in invasive species. When travelling with a dog across state lines, no one thinks to brush the animal for seeds. Keeping the dog in certain areas and controlled by the owner lowers the risk of the spread of invasive plants (Parks and Rec. of Oregon). Also, dogs cause excessive damage to the top soil and plants with behavioral digging or running. Sensitive plants and plants with shallow roots may become uprooted due to this form of damage.

Lastly, health is a concern (Foster 2006). Fecal and urine waste can carry pathogens (bacterial, viral, parasitic) that may affect visitors and other animals. The leading cause of illness is from contaminated water. Exposure to contaminated water from dog waste can result in fever, nausea, gastroenteritis as well as flu-like symptoms. It is well documented that areas with unmanaged and unleashed dogs show a poorer water quality than areas with strong leash laws. A state law already prohibits dogs on public swimming beaches for health reasons. A stricter policy will keep recreational areas even cleaner.

Feral cats and cat colonies are also mentioned. The largest concern is feral cat and bird interactions (Winter; Wallace 2006). However, the plan does not go into detail about what can be done to ensure nonissues with cats nor discuss further into cat colonies. Cat colonies should be kept clean for health reasons as well as the spread of rodents that can carry disease (mice species have been found feeding on food the cats do not eat) and insect pests (such as cockroaches) (Winter; Wallace 2006).

Unmanaged and uncontrolled animals should be taken care of by animal control or park management accordingly. Proof of a dog license should be available and ready to present if the need arises.

For the well being of a dog of any breed, off-leash walking and play is necessary. Better socializing for the animal and greater exercise lead to less aggression and pent up energy. Socializing for dog owners and overall responsible dog ownership can lead to positive human interaction. However, regulations must be in place to ensure that things do not get out of hand. The draft plan has provided a set of regulations as well as a list where dogs can go and areas that prohibits dogs. It must be enforced so both people, dog owners and the dogs can benefit from the recreational areas of San Francisco and Marin counties.

Sincerely,  
Faith N.S. Wall

## References:

Foster, Lisa K. "Dogs on the Beach: A Review of Regulations and issues Affecting Dog Beaches in California." May 2006. California Research Bureau. <[www.library.ca.gov/crb/06/06/06-006.pdf](http://www.library.ca.gov/crb/06/06/06-006.pdf)>.

Winter, Linda. Wallace, George E. "Impacts of Feral and Free-Ranging Cats on Bird Species of Conservation Concern." May 2006. American Bird Conservancy. <[www.abcbirds.org/newsandreports/NFWF.pdf](http://www.abcbirds.org/newsandreports/NFWF.pdf)>.

Discussion Paper. "Dog Walking Activities in the Mornington Peninsula National Park." September 2012. Parks Victoria. <[parkweb.vic.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_0005/546278/Dog-Walking-Discussion-Paper\\_Sept\\_2012](http://parkweb.vic.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_0005/546278/Dog-Walking-Discussion-Paper_Sept_2012)>.

National Park Service. "Parameters and Scope of Negotiated Rulemaking Discussion." <[www.parkplanning.nps.gov](http://www.parkplanning.nps.gov)>.

Parks and Recreation for the City of Portland, OR. "Dogs & off-leash Programs." <[www.portlandoregon.gov/parks/39526#cid\\_91738](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/parks/39526#cid_91738)>.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	664	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,12,2013 16:48:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern,				

This is the brief letter that will be followed with a more detailed critique of the proposed 'dog management plan.' My main objection, echoed by many others with whom we have discussed these matters, is that many if not most of the trails already existing in the area have leach laws or prohibit dogs. There are a few, some very little used, where our dogs can go either on leach or off leach under voice command. This privilege is essential to the dog's health as well as our way of life- including enjoyment of the trails, forests and open spaces.

In those few places, it would be a major blow if dogs were not allowed or had to be on leach. In addition, the vast majority of dog owners are extremely responsible and dogs we encounter are very well behaved- friendly, responsive to commands, stay on trails and pose no threat to wildlife, homeowners or the land. Thus, we see no solid or valid reasons to make these changes- and see many detriments to the local population as well as our dogs. In the 10 years I have been using the trails, I have never had a problem- and there has been no harm to the environment or the population.

Thus, I strongly urge you to reconsider this plan- in light of the very few places where dogs are permitted on trails- and in certain places, where they can be off leach under voice control. We and many others feel very impassioned about this issue, and again, see no legitimate reasons for these changes. I will review the plan again and would appreciate hearing of any rationale for prohibiting or restricting dog access- when they desparately need the trails- and in the vast majority of instances, do not interfere with nature or the city.

Thank you,  
Glenn Fleisch, Ph.D.  
415-384-0144

---

**Correspondence ID:** 665    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,12,2013 17:21:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm a responsible dog owner and all around nature lover, born and raised in Northern California. One of the many things I enjoy outdoors is the ability to walk my dog off leash. It's therapeutic for me and wonderful physical and mental stimulation for her. While I understand the concerns the GGNRA may have regarding dogs, I would like to express that I'm a huge advocate of allowing well trained dogs to enjoy the wonderful gifts that God has bestowed upon us in the form of all the trails, beaches, etc that we have at our disposal in Marin. I clean up after my dog on EVERY outing as any responsible pet owner should.

Please please don't take away the few places we have left.

Thank you

-Dave Vega  
caring nature lover and responsible dog owner advocate

---

**Correspondence ID:** 666    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,12,2013 22:35:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Your proposed restrictions to dog walking at Ft Funston and other areas within the GGNRA will greatly impact my life and the life of my dogs. It's the only place we can for daily exercise. We have been enjoying this park for 15 years and have been actively involved in the monthly clean ups. Having large dogs it is important for their mental and physical health to be able it runoff leash. We enjoy the acreage at Funston where there is enough space to interact with other dogs should we choose but most importantly we can enjoy walks alone and not have to feel like we are at a dog park.

Please reconsider you plan.

Laura Sweet

17 Fieldcrest Dr  
Daly City CA 94015

---

**Correspondence ID:** 667    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Ocean Beach Dog Walkers Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Dec,13,2013 01:59:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To The GGNRA Superintendent : Frank Dean

From: Thomas Roop  
Daly City CA  
San Mateo County

December 13, 2013

Subject: Opposition to the Entire Dog Management Plan 2013 SEIS

Mr. Dean, Please find my comments along with an attachment Wheres The Proof?

As a current Dog Walker at Fort Funston:

I am opposed to the entire 2013 SEIS GGNRA Dog Management Policy for the following reasons:

When congress established the GGNRA in 1972, they included two "specific provisions" unique to the GGNRA:

First, the park was established "to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning."

Second, the GGNRA statute imposes a unique limitation on NPS's discretionary power for "management of the recreation area" by providing that the "Secretary of Interior...shall utilize the resources in a manner which will provide for recreation and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management."

The GGNRA does not use sound principles of land use planning and management, or even follow their own rules and regulations.

The premise that dogs in the GGRNA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area is absurd. By their own admission, the GGNRA has no data or studies to support these claims. They ignore/omit all studies that contradict their desired outcome.

How can the GGNRA undertake a Dog Management Policy change as proposed in this SEIS without any evidence of monitoring or site specific studies (as required by federal law) as a means to identify the alleged impairment?! Anecdotal comments and the "potential" to damage the area just don't cut it.

Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Now called the Monitoring-based Management Strategy, the GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of



compliance are subjective. Short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

My preferred option is one the GGRNA deliberately omitted: the original 1979 Pet Policy which was affirmed as legal and the current law of the land by Federal Judge William Alsup in 2005.

The only way the citizens of San Francisco can get the GGNRA to follow their own rules and regulations is by taking them to court, which has consistently ruled in favor of the citizens.

Why must ordinary citizens use their own resources to battle the limitless legal resources of the NPS because of the GGNRA's illegal actions and refusal to abide by the enabling legislation?

I am old, tired, broke; and am on my 4th dog since this battle began nearly 2 decades ago. Fourth dog will surely cross over the Rainbow Bridge before this entire BS is settled. I'm tired of writing letters, attending meetings, testifying in court, and submitting comments, but I will continue until I'm dead or until the GGRNA honors their promise to the citizens of San Francisco.

Enough already. Either codify the original 1979 Pet Policy with a Section Seven Special Regulation, or ... turn the lands over to another agency to manage as promised ... or the land reverts back to the City and County of San Francisco. No more DEIS, SEIS, Rulemaking, or comment periods when we all know you totally ignore the thousands who have responded to you and continue to pursue your own agenda of keeping people and animals out of the GGNRA.

NO on SEIS

YES on 1979 Pet Policy

Thomas Roop  
Daly City CA  
San Mateo County

\*\*\*\*\*

First Attachment: Where is the Proof : Where are the Sight Specific Studies:

It has been seven years since and the public has still not seen anything that proves that the DEIS/SEIS Dog Management Plan is based on any site specific studies that prove there is even a problem with People recreating on GGNRA land with their Dogs.

It is now December 12, 2013 and there still has been no Proof or Evidence provided to Dr. Valente's request to provide the data, documents, and/or Staff Report which substantiated the GGNRA's claim that there was controversy over the dog policy, compromised visitor and employee safety and resource degradation which warranted the change in DMP and DEIS.

In 2006 when the plan to change the Dog Management Policy(DMP)/DEIS was announced on the Federal Register, Dr. Suzanne Valente made a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to provide the data,

documents, and/or Staff Report which substantiated the GGNRA's claim that there was controversy over the dog policy, compromised visitor and employee safety and resource degradation which warranted the change in DMP and DEIS. The GGNRA's response merely stated: "The Staff Report and other documents you seek do not exist at this time". [emphasis added]

An appeal from Dr. Valente to the Department of the Interior regarding this FOIA request elicited the following response (after several correspondences from Dr. Valente): "Since the Department has not made a determination on your appeal within the time limits set in the FOIA, you may seek judicial review under 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(4)(B). However, we hope that you will delay filing the lawsuit so that the Department can thoroughly review the issues in your appeal and make a determination. We appreciate your patience to this point and the Department will make every effort to reach a decision on your appeal as soon as possible." This letter is dated August 8, 2006. A written response to the appeal was received by Dr. Valente almost five years from the date of the original request. The Department of Interior again confirmed there were no documents to substantiate the need for a change in the DMP and this DEIS/SEIS.

The lack of data or any documentation to support the assertions used as justification to proceed with this Environmental Review violates Federal Law as it renders this agency action arbitrary, capricious and an abuse of discretion. Accordingly, this agency action, findings and conclusions should be set aside as prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 706 (2)A.

Why is it significant that other Recreation Areas perform annual monitoring of resources and the GGNRA does not? Why is monitoring so important? As stated in an NPS publication, "Monitoring the Condition of Natural Resources in US National Parks"

([http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/docs/Monitoring\\_Park\\_Condition.pdf](http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/docs/Monitoring_Park_Condition.pdf)) the purpose of monitoring is as follows:

"The overall purpose of natural resource monitoring in parks is to develop scientifically sound information on the current status and long term trends in the composition, structure, and function of park ecosystems, and to determine how well current management practices are sustaining those ecosystems. Use of monitoring information will increase confidence in manager's decisions and improve their ability to manage park resources, and will allow managers to confront and mitigate threats to the park and operate more effectively in legal and political arenas."

Additionally, a review of NPS online resources reveals that there is an entire infrastructure set up to guide and facilitate NPS properties in their monitoring duties, "Vital Signs Monitoring" (<http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/index.cfm>)

A subsection of the aforementioned web site (Program Goals) discusses the goals of park monitoring:

"Natural resource monitoring provides site-specific information needed to understand and identify change in complex, variable, and imperfectly understood natural systems and to determine whether observed changes are within natural levels of variability or may be indicators of unwanted human influences. Thus, monitoring provides a basis for understanding and identifying meaningful change in natural systems characterized by complexity, variability, and surprises. Monitoring data help to define the normal limits of natural variation in park resources and provide a basis for understanding observed changes; monitoring results may also be used to determine what constitutes impairment and to identify the need to initiate or change management practices." [emphasis added]

Further exploration of the NPS "Vital Signs Monitoring" Resources Online (see

<http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/ProgramGoals.cfm>) reveals that National Park managers are directed by federal law and National Park Service policies and guidance to know the status and trends in the condition of natural resources under their stewardship in order to fulfill the NPS mission of conserving parks unimpaired (see "Summary of Laws, Policies and Guidance" at <http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/LawsPolicy.cfm>).

More recently, the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 established the framework for fully integrating natural resource monitoring and other science activities into the management processes of the National Park System. The Act charges the Secretary of the Interior to "continually improve the ability of the National Park Service to provide state-of-the-art management, protection, and interpretation of and research on the resources of the National Park System", and to "assure the full and proper utilization of the results of scientific studies for park management decisions." Section 5934 of the Act requires the Secretary of the Interior to develop a program of "inventory and monitoring of National Park System resources to establish baseline information and to provide information on the long-term trends in the condition of National Park System resources." Clearly, the failure of GGNRA management to conduct any consistent monitoring of the resources of the GGNRA is a violation of Federal law.

The more fundamental problem this SEIS highlights is the fact that GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation for this park property. GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes. It seems impossible that GGNRA management would undertake a Dog Management Policy change as proposed in this SEIS without any evidence of monitoring or site specific studies as a means to identify the alleged impairment.

No on SEIS

Yes on 1979 Pet Policy

Thomas Roop  
Daly City CA  
San Mateo CO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 668    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,13,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to urge you to stop the Golden Gate National Recreation Area from implementing your new dog management plan. This plan will cut where people can walk off- and on-leash by 90% compared with where people can walk with dogs now. It is going to create a huge impact on the Bay Area, which we simply cant afford.

I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. GGNRA ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.

The GGNRA was created in 1972 for the maintenance of needed recreational open space, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. That's why it's designated as a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. With the new dog management plan, the GGNRA is reneging on your promises to preserve and protect recreational access to the GGNRA.

There is no credible reason why people with dogs are not allowed to have adequate and reasonable space to walk their dogs in the vast 80,000 acres that comprise the GGNRA.

Suggestion: to preserve access and the impacted off-leash areas, consider user fees, whether at the entrances or an annual fee. Dog owners are responsible and resourceful and will be happy to support the GGNRA in preserving and maintaining the CURRENT off-leash status of Ft. Funston, areas of Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, Stinson, etc.

Tim Rebbert  
211 Theresa Street  
SF Ca 94112

daily/weekly visitor to Ft. Funston since 1999- - with my dogs!!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	669	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,13,2013 11:07:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to urge you to stop the Golden Gate National Recreation Area from implementing your new dog management plan. This plan will cut where people can walk off- and on-leash by 90% compared with where people can walk with dogs now. It is going to create a huge impact on the Bay Area, which we simply can't afford. I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. GGNRA ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.				

The GGNRA was created in 1972 for the maintenance of needed recreational open space, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. That's why it's designated as a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. With the new dog management plan, the GGNRA is reneging on your promises to preserve and protect recreational access to the GGNRA.

There is no credible reason why people with dogs are not allowed to have adequate and reasonable space to walk their dogs in the vast 80,000 acres that comprise the GGNRA.

---

Suggestion: to preserve access and the impacted off-leash areas, consider user fees, whether at the entrances or an annual fee. Dog owners are responsible and resourceful and will be happy to support the GGNRA in preserving and maintaining the CURRENT off-leash status of Ft. Funston, areas of Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, Stinson, etc.

Patrick Cunningham 1365 Bernal Ave. Burlingame, Ca 94110

---

**Correspondence ID:** 670    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,13,2013 11:09:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** we need to keep the free off-leash areas for dogs (esp. at Ocean Beach, Fort Funston and Baker Beach) for families, health of dogs and dogs being good canine citizens.

Please choose alternative A in all plans.

Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 671    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,13,2013 12:06:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly disapprove of the proposed plan, particularly as it relates to Fort Funston.

The proposal is FAR TOO restrictive with regards to off leash areas at Fort Funston.

The proposal limits off leash dog walking to two relatively small, overused areas on the bluff which are the least attractive sites in all of Fort Funston and to the beach, which is excellent but difficult to access for elderly dog and disabled dog owners due to the steep, sandy trails which must be negotiated to reach the beach.

I would strongly urge the Park Service to keep all areas not currently restricted at Fort Funston AS IS.

Keep in mind that walking dogs on a leash isn't terribly fun for either the dog OR the owner. Off leash walking is very enjoyable for both. Fort Funston is probably the best place to walk a dog in the entire Bay Area. It is a precious and irreplaceable resource for dog owners. It would be a crushing loss if off leash dog walking were restricted to the preferred plan.

Re "Mixed Use" and sharing of the facility: I use Fort Funston at least twice a week. By my estimate, at least 90 % (robably more like 95 %) f all users of Fort Funston are people walking their dogs. Horse riders NEVER use Fort Funston proper (they stay in the slumped land and the beach to the South of Fort Funston). Hang gliders are active perhaps 5% o the time (if that)and are there in small numbers.

For all intents and purposes, Fort Funston is, in practice and by long history, a destination OFF LEASH

---

DOG PARK. I urge you to keep in as such and not eviscerate it by placing draconian restrictions on off leash use.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 672    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** concord, CA 94520  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,13,2013 12:12:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ft Funston and other areas that allow off leash dog and other play are very important to the well being of the owners, the friends of and the very pets that are allowed to play there. Responsible owners and dog walkers have been successfully using Ft Funston for years to the mutual enjoyment of pet owners and the casual visitor. There is no benefit to the proposed change and it will harm many.

Grant Thompson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 673    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,13,2013 12:54:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please review this whole plan to dramatically decrease where people like myself can walk with our dogs on GGNRA lands. My husband and I moved to San Francisco from London, UK last year and one of the main reasons we were so excited to move was due to the dog-friendly nature of the city and amazing off-leash walking areas. We specifically love to go to Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and Baker Beach and have encountered nothing but happy dogs and responsible dog-owners on our many walks over the past year.  
I think if you spent any time on these recreational areas and saw the amazing communities of dog-owners and fresh air-loving dogs, there's no way this plan would go ahead.  
I'm sure there are more dog-LOVERS in this city than dog-haters so I just don't get it. Take Fort Funston for example. At the moment the beach is loved by hundreds of us dog-owners but it's a) not the most accessible beach in the world for other recreational uses and b) the sand isn't the most attractive either - being generally black! It would be a real shame to take away those who love and use this beach for it to then hardly get enjoyed at all.  
I've never encountered anyone who doesn't love seeing a dog running around chasing balls on a beach and as far as a I can tell, this city is full of very responsible owners who pick up their dog's mess and have their pets under voice control at all times.  
Thanks for taking the time to read this. I'm now off out to take my mini Schauzer to his favourite Fort Funston destination... hopefully a spot he can continue to enjoy for years to come.

Yours

Georgia Gould

---

**Correspondence ID:** 674    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Dec,13,2013 14:39:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I support all the changes made and support the new preferred alternative. Thank you for your hard work and for listening to the people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 675 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Dec,13,2013 17:57:23**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I vehemently oppose the proposed leash law for GGNRA. I live in Marin county and love that there are many opportunities to let my dog run freely in open spaces, parks, and on beaches. I have spent a great deal of time to train my dog to be obedient (recall) and well-socialized with other dogs. I feel that it would really restrict my dog's and my freedom if such a law was passed and thus ask that it will not be passed. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 676 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Dec,14,2013 12:38:58**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** The proposed restrictions on dog friendly spaces in Bay Area GGNRA sites is unacceptable. As a tax paying San Franciscan I oppose this document. California is already one of the most dog unfriendly states with some of the most restricted access rules in the nation (with both county, state & city ordinances). Up to now San Francisco is one of the more dog friendly cities in California. Surrounded by water, it would be a shame to restrict dogs, and by effect, its tax paying residents, from enjoying romping through our wonderful parks. Almost the entire California coastline is restricted in some way to dogs. It's the ocean! Let them play! Dogs that are allowed to exercise off leash are healthier, happier & better behaved. Their owners are healthier, too!

There are, of course, a small number of incidents between dogs, people, etc. this is inevitable in a populated area. However, the answer is not to punish the majority of tax paying citizens & their furry friends. It is unfair, and will place unnecessary burdens on city parks, streets, and animal shelters. Even on leash dog areas are inadequate. My dog is a water dog & would be tortured if walked along the beach without being allowed to go in! If there must be more restrictions on off leash areas then it cannot be excessive. I propose the main area in front of the East Parking lot be leash only, but from the lagoon on continue be off leash, until the West Side that is already off limits due to snowy plover nesting. We all have to share. We all love this place. Crissy field is amazing. The citizens helped transform it, it is ours to enjoy. Running, playing with my dog on the beach weekly is what keeps me sane & happy! Please don't take it away!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 677 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Dec,14,2013 15:36:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Michael Barti. I live at 61 Cazneau Ave in Sausalito. I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, Chrissy Field, Stinson Beach, Fort Funston and places in the Headlands.

I STRONGLY OPPOSE your plan to reduce the off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Your preferred plan is unreasonably restrictive. I haven't seen enough justification in the DEIS for major changes. There are plenty of places where dogs aren't allowed already. We shouldn't reduce them further.

I'm also opposed to a compliance-based management strategy. This punishes responsible dog owners for the actions of others. If the problem is owners who aren't complying, then the solution should be enforcing the rules and ticketing them instead of permanently closing areas to all dog owners.

One of the major reasons I live in Northern California for the access to the outdoors. I hike often and enjoy taking my dog with me, as do countless other responsible dog owners. Our voices should be heard and considered in any "plan." The Golden Gate National Recreation Area is about recreation (heck, it's in the name!) Why is enjoying these areas recreationally with our pets being outlawed?

I believe that you need to prove the assumptions in the DEIS before you consider such restrictive and draconian measures.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 678 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,15,2013 12:45:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to oppose the dog management plan currently being proposed on GGNRA lands - specifically for Ocean Beach, where I live and go every single day. I live at 48th and Lincoln, and chose this are to live in specifically because of the access to open space at the beach, where I could safely walk my dog. That beach is more than 5 miles long, and there are very few people out there most days - except mainly other people walking their dogs. It is an ideal place to walk a dog without impacting anyone. The majority of people I see at Ocean Beach have a dog with them, in fact - except for the rare days that reach over 70s at the beach, when 'regular' people come out to enjoy the area. So these proposed changes to beach use will most greatly affect the specific people that actually use the beach on a regular basis, and their furry friends. Please don't make these changes and restrict dog use at Ocean Beach, and the other beaches within GGNRA in SF.

Changing the dog use rules at GGNRA beaches would negatively impact the quality of our lives for those of us that use the beach regularly, and our dogs lives. I can't tell you how much I value being able to go to the beach daily and find a wild solitude, go running, and get exercise for both myself and my pup. This is such a wonderful and precious aspect of living in San Francisco! Its amazing to have a place where dogs can run, play in the ocean, and be with other four-footed friends in a nature. Without dog access to Ocean Beach I wouldn't want to live in my neighborhood anymore. Please please please don't take this away from all of us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 679 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,15,2013 17:13:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean -

I am writing to express my strong support for the GGNRA's management plan as proposed. I do not, however, support any fenced areas for "dog parks."

Please see my letter to Congresswoman Pelosi which goes into greater detail.

Thank you for all you do, and to your staff.

- Jennifer Greene

Dear Congresswoman Pelosi:

I am writing to request your support for the GGNRA's proposed dog management plan and the process timeline.

I am a mother of a 6 year old boy who lives near Ocean Beach. I have hesitated to bring him there, and have never brought him to Fort Funston or East Beach/Crissy Field because all of these park sites are unsafe and unpleasant due to unmanaged dogs and irresponsible owners.

I understand that you recently referenced St. Francis in support of the dog owner community's request for less regulations and an extended deadline. I encourage you to consider the whole of St. Francis' message, his love for all living things, which can include the snowy plover, wild coho salmon, even Park Police horses, all of which have been harmed by unmanaged dogs.

St. Francis also had great compassion for the vulnerable, such as children, the elderly, and poor. The parks are for all - no one group should overwhelm our national park and make people feel unsafe or unwelcome.

We love dogs, in the right places. There are many provided in the park. It is frustrating to me that their owners are irresponsible and single-minded and do not respect the resources we have. Referring back to St. Francis, I am sure you are familiar with his prayer, "Make me a channel of your peace." I encourage you to do what you can to protect our park and bring our community together, not divide it by supporting lax rules to benefit dog owners.

- Jennifer Greene

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	680	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,15,2013 17:35:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean -

I am writing to express my strong support for the GGNRA's management plan as proposed. I do not, however, support any fenced areas for "dog parks."

Please see my letter to Congresswoman Pelosi which goes into greater detail.

Thank you for all you do, and to your staff.

- Jennifer Greene

Dear Congresswoman Pelosi:

I am writing to request your support for the GGNRA's proposed dog management plan and the process timeline.

I am a mother of a 6 year old boy who lives near Ocean Beach. I have hesitated to bring him there, and have never brought him to Fort Funston or East Beach/Crissy Field because all of these park sites are unsafe and unpleasant due to unmanaged dogs and irresponsible owners.

I understand that you recently referenced St. Francis in support of the dog owner community's request for less regulations and an extended deadline. I encourage you to consider the whole of St. Francis' message, his love for all living things, which can include the snowy plover, wild coho salmon, even Park Police horses, all of which have been harmed by unmanaged dogs.

St. Francis also had great compassion for the vulnerable, such as children, the elderly, and poor. The parks are for all - no one group should overwhelm our national park and make people feel unsafe or unwelcome.

We love dogs, in the right places. There are many provided in the park. It is frustrating to me that their owners are irresponsible and single-minded and do not respect the resources we have.

Referring back to St. Francis, I am sure you are familiar with his prayer, "Make me a channel of your peace." I encourage you to do what you can to protect our park and bring our community together, not divide it by supporting lax rules to benefit dog owners.

- Jennifer Greene

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	681	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94112
-----------------	-------------------------

	United States of America
--	--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Dec,15,2013 21:27:13
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I urge you to keep the 1979 Pet Policy in place for the GGNRA. If off leash dog walking is banned it will create a tremendous burdon for city, county and state parks. During the federal government shutown in fall 2013 several if not all areas in the GGNRA were closed. During this time I noticed a huge spike in usage for off leash dog walking in San Francisco city parks. If off leash dog walking access is restricted in the GGNRA it will lead to unsustainable usage levels in city parks. The 1979 Pet Policy allows thousands of responible dog owners to enjoy the GGNRA with their dogs and it
------------------------	---

---

would cause a huge burden for the local governments to deal with fallout of increased restrictions of off leash dog walking in the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 682    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,15,2013 21:31:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I have walked my dog off-leash at Fort Funston for a dozen years. I last commented on the GGNRA plan more than a year ago. Much has happened in the past year, and my former comments are now obsolete. Fort Funston has deteriorated to the point that any grand plan by the GGNRA is useless. Trails, fences and infrastructure are covered by sand almost as soon as they are erected. The cliffs are falling into the sea with alarming speed.

As a taxpayer I object to my tax dollars being used to fund futile efforts. The GGNRA can't make recommendations to keep pace with the changing topography. Mother Nature will undo any plan put in place.

Any dog management plan will become obsolete before it can be implemented. This is due to deteriorating conditions at Fort Funston and the lack of funding. The easiest and cheapest solution is to do little, if anything, at the Fort. The highest and best use for most of Fort Funston is to leave it as it is for the enjoyment of the hundreds of dog people who use it every day.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 683    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,15,2013 21:54:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I live in Montara and have been hiking the local trails for 35 years, in the area that is now included in the GGNRA. Recently - - in the last, say, 3-5 years - - I've observed a notable increase in the frequency of dogs walked by their guardians. For the most part, these dogs have been unobtrusively enjoying their experience and have not caused any negative impact that I could see. I like dogs; at least the ones which are minding their own pursuits and not jumping on, barking at or otherwise harassing me personally.

HOWEVER - - there are is a relatively small group of dog owners (guardians?) who seem to feel that any open space is their and their dogs own, and in which they can more or less do whatever they choose. This is a problem for me. I cite two examples, below, of the many which have affected me over the years.

I do not like to be approached by large dogs sniffing (or potentially biting?) my hands, when I have no idea whether or not they are "aggressive" to non-owners. The owners assurances that "... it's OK, he/she is friendly ..." are not assuring to me, as in several cases this has turned out to NOT be the case. Nor do I appreciate dogs which have been in the water or mud "greeting" me in the (hopefully) friendly way they seem to prefer by jumping up and pawing my torso.

As one example, on two separate occasions, the same woman's dog (off leash) rushed at me on a narrow

---

trail and, on one instances, knocked me off my feet. Not a problem in this case (other than my apprehension), but on other occasions involving other participants, a similar situation led to injury.

Another example - - a woman with three dogs (ALL THREE off leash) watched as one of her dogs came at me aggressively as I attempted to pass them walking along the trail. The dog started at me from approximately 50 feet away, barking and snapping at my legs when within range. The same dog after having backed off, attacked me a second time, in full view of the owner, who apparently felt that saying "I'm sorry" was sufficient. It was NOT to me! I've since encountered the same "clan," in the same circumstances, but thankfully, without the same aggressive experience. But who knows what will be the experience next time. Such owners are, in my opinion, irresponsible.

The jumping up and pawing examples are too numerous to mention.

To reiterate, I like dogs EXCEPT when they behave in the manner I've described above and are clearly not under the control of their owners. The vast majority of the dogs I've encountered over the 35 years I've been walking on what is now part of the GGNRA are very pleasant and I like to see them enjoying their experience with their owner/guardians. But the small minority makes it unpredictably unpleasant.

MY SUGGESTION? Provide areas where dogs can be off-leash and do whatever they want. But confine the dogs to these areas. I know from many conversations that this is unpopular. But until the responsible owners or others can figure out a way to control the irresponsible, I don't see alternatives that can accommodate/protect those who do not have dogs - - and there are many.

THE PROBLEM? How will any regulations/rules be enforced? I walk in the GGNRA nearly every day and see dogs off-leash that exhibit both positive and negative behaviors. I've only encountered rangers once or twice in over 6-8 months. As usual, it's the small minority of irresponsibles that makes it difficult for the rest.

Once rules are established and agreed upon, there needs to be strict and consequential enforcement and penalties. Please spend the time and effort to devise a way (ways?) to address this issue. Don't simply legislate rules and then not enforce them. To me, that would be an unfulfilled responsibility.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	684	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,15,2013 22:33:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	No. No. No. This new plan is just insane. You do realize there are more dogs than kids in San Francisco, right?				

And those of us who live by these beaches/parks and walk there every day don't want to have to load our pets into our cars to DRIVE somewhere where they are actually welcome.

Keep Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, Ft. Funston, Lands End, Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach, Sweeney Ridge, and Muir Beach accessible to all local residents AND THEIR PETS.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	685	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,16,2013 17:01:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service,

I am a volunteer with the Golden Gate Parks and work both at Crissy Field and in the Crissy Wildlife Protection Area (WPA). I've seen firsthand the problems of bad dog owners (the dogs are fine, it's the people, of course!) letting their dogs harass wildlife, tear up the ground, transmit invasive plant seeds and bother people.

I support the proposed GGNRA Dog Management Policies, but want strong enforcement as well as visible fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas.

Thank you,

Cornelia Foster GGNRA VIP  
San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 686    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,16,2013 18:05:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Superintendent, GGNRA:

I am writting to let you know my position concerning the Draft Dog Management Plan which is currently being considered for implimentation. I am a 60 year old male that has lived on the San Mateo County, California coast since 1981, and I am an advid and responsible dog owner. I am greatly concerned over the Federal Governments plan to severely restrict dog access to our National Recreation Areas such as GGNRA. While I understand the need to regulate dogs in National Parks, such as Yosemite, I believe that alternate guidelines taking into account the needs of the local population, would better serve our community. Here are some of my thoughts:

1) I walk with my dog at Rancho Corral de Tierra twice each week. This is a beautiful part of the coastside and the reason that I moved here. Being local, I drive past or use these trails almost every day. My best estimate is that no more than 100 people use the trails climbing up on Montara Mountain each day, and almost all are local residents. I hike, bike and dog walk in this area and know from experience that dogs with responsible owners cause no harm to either the environment or other people. There are always those that don't like dogs and complain, however, this occurs all over the country and should not influence how our resourse is managed.

2) Further restrictions, that would ban dogs from The Rancho, would in effect ban me from using it as well. I would not be able to leave my dog at home in order to hike Montara Mountain on my own; the reason we are dog owners in the first instance is because we like the companionship of our dogs.

3) The US Humane Society estimates that there are 83.3 million dogs in the US with at least 47% o all

households having at least one dog. What this illustrates to me is that roughly half of us are dog owners. As dog owners we want, and even demand, that our natural resources be shared. This especially holds true for an urban National Recreation Area such as GGNRA.

4) For many years the Montara Dog Group has developed and maintained a network of pet waste stations at The Rancho. We are self-policed and an asset to our community. We clean up after ourselves, we do volunteer trail work and generally watch over our precious resource.

5) We must do everything we can to protect our right to use The Rancho as it has been historically. Over the last five years alone, the California State Rangers have restricted dogs on our beaches, The San Mateo County Rangers have restricted dogs on our coastal bluff tops and now the Federal Rangers are attempting to restrict our dogs from the hills on the East side of Pacific Coast Highway. I feel like I am now living in a police state; only the police are three species of Rangers. Is there any concern that we are over-regulated?

6) Finally, I must appeal to your humanity; dogs are not only companions, but integral family members. They require exercise and areas to play off leash. This is the coast side we are discussing; not an urban big city environment. Please consider this carefully when using your power and authority that will effect our very way of life.

Thank you for allowing me to comment.

Respectfully,  
Michael Yolken

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	687	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,16,2013 18:13:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe that with proper enforcement of existing laws, public education and better signage, dog lovers and non-dog lovers can coexist.				

This plan seems to be an ineffective use of taxpayer money and in it's current format, one that does not serve the recreational use aspect of the land being regulated.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	688	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,16,2013 19:03:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I can't tell you how important off leash access to ocean beach, crissy field and fort funston are to my dog. She has a great life even though she lives in an urban environment because of these places and I urge you not to restrict her access. We live in a flat with a small 15x20 paved yard. I would not have considered getting a dog if I didn't have access to walking her in ggnra lands. But now we have her and we rely on these public spaces. The proposed changes are unduly restrictive, and considering				

---

how often I'm the only one on the beach between Lincoln and Noriega where I mostly walk, seem completely unnecessary.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 689    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,16,2013 19:23:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I understand the need for dog owners to control their animals and I am a responsible dog owner. However, it seems a shame to punish the majority because a few are irresponsible and likely to remain so even if the laws change. Even before I had a dog, I loved going to Chrissy Field to watch the scene- -the vast majority of the time it's terrific dog and people watching as dogs and people of all ages coexist happily and seem to bring a lot of joy to each other. I think Chrissy Field is a uniquely San Francisco place and I think it would be a real shame to restrict it so dogs can no longer play there. Thank you for your consideration of my comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 690    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,17,2013 14:12:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am strongly for maintaining AND increasing off leash areas for dogs and other domesticated creatures. I feel strongly that all animals (humans included) need space to run, feel free and be with one's own will. I recognize that many urban dwellers are interested in keeping order, feeling safe and having additional rules and boundaries however, this should not come at the expense of other creature's freedom. My own dog (12 year old miniature schnauzer) is very well behaved, however, she too needs time to explore and feel free. Off leash areas allow our generous companions to reconnect with their own inherent freedom and thus, feel more at peace. Again, I am advocating for maintaining and increasing off leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 691    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Boulder, CO 80015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,17,2013 14:56:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Golden Gate National Recreation Area Draft Dog Management Plan, CA  
EIS Number 20130261  
EIS Comment Due/Review Period Date 2/18/2014  
Electronic submission address:  
<http://yosemite.epa.gov/oeca/webeis.nsf/EIS01/16B7E679B76D194785257C400021270A?opendocument>  
Response name and address:  
Jasmen Rivers  
11248 Broomfield Ln #312  
Broomfield, CO 80015  
[jasmen.rivers@colorado.edu](mailto:jasmen.rivers@colorado.edu)

---

September 30, 2013

Dear Mr. Edwards,

I have been following your draft supplement on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Draft Dog Management Plan in California and I have some questions and concerns that I would like to share.

This is a very technical and in-depth report in order to enforce new dog regulations for the park, so my question is why? Who is your targeting audience for the report? I ask these questions because if you are trying to reach the community, city, or potential dog walkers you might want to do another report that isn't so technical and the people can understand it. The average person reading this might look over what the new regulations are for having dogs in the park and the good alternatives that you suggest.

When you go over Alternative C and discuss that some areas will be allowed for dogs to be off the leash in some areas is a good alternative. This way people can interact with the park a lot more by allowing their dogs to go off the leash. The only concern that I have with this alternative is what the extranets to the dogs being off leash are. Are there areas in the park where people can camp that their dogs can be off leash or will there be fenced off areas in the park to help protect the wildlife and the surrounding environment.

So to clarify my questions and concerns I have for the project are as follows:

Who is the target audience of the draft supplement?

For Alternative C, are the dogs allowed to be off leash in the park or are they in an enclosed fence?

I am a student of the University of Colorado at Boulder majoring in Environmental Design in Planning. I want to focus around city planning and urban planning maybe working with park space and redevelop communities. I was interested in your draft assessment because I didn't know that you needed to do an EIS draft to change something that sounds simple in a national park. After looking over the draft, it does make sense to do a draft when changing the dog regulations in a national park. I am in an Environmental Impact Assessment class currently and we have been looking at different EIS case studies. It just never crossed my mind that you would need one for changing the rules to allow dogs in a national park. But it does ask a few questions that would bring up the reasons for making one. Like, what will happen to the environment and wildlife when more dogs enter the park? How can you maintain the preservation of plant life and future plant life of the park?

I would appreciate if you could review my comment and maybe clarify some of my questions so then I can have a better understanding of what is all involved in changing regulations in a national park.

Sincerely,

Jasmen Rivers

B.

I didn't pull any sources to compare with the project, I just used my knowledge that we have gone over in class so far. Like, why would you need to do an EIS report? If you are changing the environment, want to seek public comment for a project, and want to view the possible consequences of the environment, these are all reasons for doing a statement. I didn't think that changing dog regulations would cause a big enough impact to the park that you would need to do a report.

The project is titled, Golden Gate National Recreation Area Draft Dog Management Plan and it is based in California. The project proposal is to offer new dog regulations to allow dogs in some areas of Golden Gate National Park. I EIS draft offer five different alternatives:

1. No action alternative
2. 397 units governed for dog walking. Allowing a three dog limit per person for all dog walkers and commercial dogs. All dogs have to be on a leash and no permits required.
3. Options for on-leash and regulated off-leash areas in the park



4. Overall highest level of protection for the natural and cultural resources and visitor safety. This would exercise dogs being on leash in protective areas to preserve nature.

5. Provide the greatest level of access to dog walkers all over Golden Gate National Park.

I was curious on why you would have to do an EIS draft for adding new regulations to a national park.

The only good point that I could find in the report was to protect and preserve the forest for the future and dogs can cause an impact on the park. After listening to other case studies that we went over in class, I'm having trouble seeing dogs doing a large environmental impact on a national forest.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 692    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Walnut Creek, CA 94595  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,17,2013 15:19:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs should not be allowed in National Park wildlife habitat.  
They should be on leash and under control around other people.  
Dedicated, fenced dog parks are a great way to run and play joyfully with one's canine companions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 693    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,17,2013 18:11:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

Having read the draft proposal for dog management on GGNRA lands, I would like to comment that the proposal is much too restrictive. Especially at Fort Funston and Crissy file, where off leash dogs have been allowed for decades.

Please loosen the restrictions proposed and further, adopt a similar set of restrictions as the city and county of San Francisco.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 694    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,17,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a SF resident consider my comments targeted to SF. (map 9-16)

I am supportive of urban 'NPS' areas. But urban 'NPS' areas are inherently different than non-urban 'NPS' areas. The consumers are different, the possibilities and constraints are different and the goals are different.

In SF a large % of consumers of 'NPS' areas are dog owners who need a place for their dog to run around

and be a dog.

We don't have yards or other options. Not allowing dogs would be like stating that kids aren't allowed in the parks.

I can't say I understand the environmental perspective. We have concreted over the entire city so I find it hard to understand how we are ok with that development but we have decided to draw the line with off leash dogs.

In terms of safety, yes, lets create a safe environment.

And I do agree with some dog /non-dog areas in the proposal. But Fort Funston is currently used as a dog park. Everyone there has a dog and is there to hang around more dogs. Same with other areas of the proposal.

I have not see any data about how many dogs use these parks currently.

I'm glad we are spending money on NPS spaces but please be realistic about how people use the spaces.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	695	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,18,2013 13:30:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir or Madam:				

I'm writing to ask you not to rule any areas in San Francisco where dogs are currently allowed to be "off leash" off-limits. Our city is tiny; space for dogs is already restricted. To further reduce their ability to run or play negatively impacts them and creates hardship for responsible owners.

I realize that you seek a coordinated national policy. But a very small city has different requirements than other places, and dogs do need freedom; it's good for them; it prevents aggression or fights over territory in limited areas; and it is beneficial for people who, like myself, live with illness and want our animals to enjoy optimal health.

Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Adrian

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	696	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,18,2013 13:37:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Pets improve the quality of life for many people in urban and rural areas and it is important that city dwellers have open spaces to run and socialize their dogs. Please do not impose increased restrictions on the dog laws in our few dog friendly spaces.				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 697    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94709  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 13:44:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

This is just to register my support for Preferred Alternative F on South Rodeo Beach, or any of the alternatives that allow voice controlled dog walking on that beach. I hope I have not misinterpreted the document, which I believe is essentially leaving the current rules in place, but if I have, please notify me so I can comment further before the deadline.

Thank you for your efforts,

Peter Smalley  
pksmalley@comcast.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 698    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 14:20:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please continue the same level of dog privileges in San Francisco. The dog areas at Fort Funston, the East Beach at Crissy Field and Ocean Beach are a vital part of the culture of our great city. San Francisco's "European Vibe" is the city's greatest asset. To disrupt the availability of dog owners to exercise their animals both on lease and off, would seriously disrupt the "European Vibe."

Allow responsible dog owners freedom; and punish irresponsible owners as necessary. Just as all people are not equally responsible, so too are not all dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 699    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 16:07:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To National Park Service,

I am writing to strongly support your efforts to manage public open space in San Francisco as outlined in the Draft Dog Management Plan and supplemental EIS. Dog owners in San Francisco do not need special treatment. Dog owners throughout the U.S. and California know that dogs are not allowed in many places or at certain times.

San Francisco's dog advocates have already secured many many acres of designated dog play areas. What is outlined in the plan is a reasonable balance of uses for all people.

---

I support the Dog Management Plan as it is now.

Katy Wilcoxon  
San Francisco resident

---

**Correspondence ID:** 700    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 21:22:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is very important that the Dog Management Plan be adopted and implemented to protect the park's resources. Off leash dogs unmanaged in the park cause great destruction to fragile environment and also degrade the condition and quality of the park's trails and amenities for all other users. Dog owners should be expected to respect rules that manage the park for the benefit of the broadest array of public users, not just the most dominant user group.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 701    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 21:39:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA is desperately in need of this Dog Management Plan, it is long overdue! The beach are in particular is a disaster over-run by dogs and their aloof owners. Control/restrict dog activities in the park before it is too late to preserve this special public space.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 702    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94945  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,18,2013 21:50:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am an owner of a 5 year old Boxer. I have always taken my dog to Muir Beach where he has been able to run, chase his ball and exercise on a weekly basis. I live in Novato where there is a dog park. Two years ago, I took Charlie to the dog park where he was severely bitten by another dog whose owner didn't react to his dog biting my dog. I had to take him to the hospital where I spend \$600.00 repairing his wound. After that incident, i've not taken him to the dog park since.

I have never once had a bad incident when at Muir Beach. We have not been there since the closure and we are patiently waiting for the re-opening so we can once again have the freedom to exercise off leash in a place where people and animals are friendly and well behaved. When walking Charlie on Muir Beach I pick up trash left by others at the beach. I also have a 4 year old daughter who accompanies me on our walks. This has become a routine of ours. Walking on the beach while Charlie chases his ball, we stroll and pick up trash, taking care of our beach and ultimately oceans.

I can't imagine the restriction of having dogs leashed at this beach. There are many others who are

---

accustomed to walking their dogs on the beach and we all respect and enjoy our freedom of doing so.

There is no reason why this needs to end. I've never witnessed a dog biting another dog or an owner neglecting their dog at this beach. I cannot see any negative impact this has to our environment. Especially if we owners are picking up trash.

Where will I walk my dog off leash in the future where they can exercise happily? It is the one area we go to safely for exercise off leash and have no other place to go.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 703    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,19,2013 01:00:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the NO ACTION PLAN. We need to continue to have access on these great trails for people and dogs. Dogs need a place to run free and should be under voice control. Dog owners should be required to carry leashes and have dogs under voice control for all areas of the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 704    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Point Richmond, CA 94801  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,19,2013 10:06:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner and lover, as well as a member of the Golden Gate Audubon Society, a devoted birder and wildlife enthusiast. I read with dismay the latest newsletter from the GGAS, excerpted below. Please create and enforce wildlife and domestic animal rules that enhance the lives of all concerned.  
Please revise the GGRNA dog management policies as proposed by the GGAS. Thank you. Celine Lielle

"Some parts of the GGNRA have become so thick with dogs that they are now essentially giant dog runs. Off-leash dogs menace the colonies of threatened Snowy Plovers at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. Park staff spend large chunks of time managing conflicts between dogs and people, dogs and wildlife, and among dogs themselves.

In 2008, the National Park Service filed almost 900 pages of Criminal Incident Records related to dogs in the GGNRA, many of which involved dogs chasing and harassing wildlife.

These problems continue. Just this fall, GGAS board member David Anderson watched an off-leash dog kill a gull at Sutro Baths. The dog owner responded, "I let my dog train with them for hunting. It helps when I go duck hunting."

This problem has several roots. There are not enough dog-free trails in the San Francisco section of the GGNRA. Off-leash areas are not set off clearly enough from other parts of the park. The number of commercial dog walkers with multiple dogs continues to grow. Enforcement has been lax.

The proposed rules improve the status quo in several important ways. They prohibit dogs from some key

---

areas such as the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area. They also require dogs to be leashed in some Snowy Plover.

Off-leash dogs menace the colonies of threatened Snowy Plovers at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. areas where they are currently allowed off leash, such as the Ocean Beach Snowy Plover area.

There are still ways in which the new rules fall short: They don't require fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas. They allow commercial dog walking with permits for up to six dogs.

Yet, overall, the new rules will be a big step forward. They provide more opportunities for people to picnic, hike, or view wildlife without dogs running around. They help make park accessible to a wide variety of visitors-families with young kids, seniors, joggers, and (yes) birders.

San Francisco dog activists are mounting a loud, emotional campaign against the new policies, which they call a "plan to get rid of people with dogs."

We disagree. Many GGAS members are also dog owners and understand the importance of respecting wildlife while enjoying the outdoors with our dogs. We don't see this as an issue of dogs versus birds-we see it as an issue of balancing park uses.

Please join us in speaking up for a balance of uses in the GGNRA, along with a strong enforcement policy that will make the park safe and enjoyable for everyone."

i<sub>6</sub><sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	705	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,19,2013 10:43:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the "No Action" plan. Preserving convenient access to open space where we can walk our dogs, off leash, under voice control, is an essential part of our day to day lives.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	706	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	pacific, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	volunteer Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,20,2013 08:19:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Rancho Corral de Tierra . The lands above Seton hospital,all the way up above Park st, referred to as Vicente Ridge on NPS maps should be all be open for dog walking friendly trails. The parcel consists of ranch roads multiple loops walking options are in existence. Lines of sight are ample,leash enforcement is complimented by these trails being easily accessed from multiple locations by NPS service vehicles.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	707	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,20,2013 12:43:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I am greatly concerned about the environmental impacts of off-leash dogs roaming our natural parkland. I have witnessed off-leash dogs chasing birds and other wild animals along our beaches and trails. I have also seen off-leash dogs chase runners, jump up on children and attack other dogs. Dogs should be allowed off-leash only in specified fenced areas, similar to other "dog runs" that other cities have.

It also seems like only a small portion of actually pick up after their dogs and having dogs offleash only increases the likelihood of dog owners acting irresponsibly.

In addition, I would like to see pitbulls banned from the park. Pitbulls are aggressive dogs and should generally not be allowed in the park because of their tendencies to attack other people and dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 708    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 12:50:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello:  
Park our for people. Dog should be restricted areas. When I walk in the parks I do not want to woory about dogs. Set aside certain area in the Parks for dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 709    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 12:54:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would prefer to see dogs excluded from the parks. I am tired of seeing plastic bags of feces boarding trails, having to wonder if a dog that is coming towards me is friendly or dangerous, and tired of seeing them chase off what little wildlife is visible. Dogs do not belong in the parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 710    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 13:34:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I suggest that GGNRA compromise by setting aside a certain amount of land for a "Dog Park" and if preferred, it could lease that land to a local Dog Association for \$1 so the Dog Association is responsible for usage, maintenance, cleanup and liability. GGNRA can erect an aesthetically pleasing fence around this area so dog owners can allow their dogs to run & play freely off leash in a setting that won't interfere with others use of the GGNRA park. On leash walking should still be allowed in the park as currently allowed. In GG Park, there is a fenced in area for Bison; there are also designated areas for various sports activities - so there is plenty of precedence. I used to live in Mountain View and they have a really well maintained Dog Park that even provides separation between large and smaller dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 711 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 13:50:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** For 19 1/2 years, my family has regularly walked our dogs at Rancho de Corral de Tierra in perfect peace and harmony. We have never had even one single incident with other peoples' dogs or our (many) dogs.

Almost the minute GGNRA took over the property there were PROBLEMS. We never had any dog problems before GGNRA. Now we do.

Before GGNRA, we didn't have a DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN. Now we do.

Before GGNRA, we didn't have our neighbors being shot with taser guns by rangers. Now we do.

Before GGNRA, our taxpayers didn't have to spend their money on 1,431 page DOG MANAGEMENT PLANS, including 29 pages of glossary terms and 10 pages of index. Now we do.

Question #1: Exactly how many tax dollars did the DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN cost, out of curiosity?

Question #2: Is your policy to shoot our coastsiders with taser guns going to continue per your new DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN?

Question #3: Do you think coastsiders are going to read your 1,430 page DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN?

Question #4: Do you think you have gained the respect of our coastsider community? If not, do you expect your DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN is going to help?

Question # 5: Have you considered the fact that We Live Here and You Don't?

Everyone I know who live on the coast has chosen to do so because they love and respect the natural environment and wish to preserve it. Perhaps GGNRA is under the impression that coastsiders are hapless anarchists who run amok with their canines destroying natural habitats.

Please consider your relationship with the coastsider community before implementing your DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN. Particularly if you expect it to be successful.

Regards,  
Debby Lesser

---

**Correspondence ID:** 712 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,20,2013 16:38:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of Moss Beach for approximately 27 years and have walked my dogs off leash in what is known as Rancho Corral Di Tierro, and have never had a problem with horseback riders and the occasional hiker, Being a horse owner myself, it is common knowledge to put your dog(s) on a leash when you see some one on horse back. We have co existed this way for years. Dogs need a place to run and chase their ball, and enjoy the out doors like everyone else. It would be a shame to restrict them just because of a few people's opinion. This area has been my backyard since I purchased my home and I would hate to lose what I have enjoyed for so long. I believe we can all get along without the government interfering with our everyday activities.

There are so many horse owners who also love to bring their dog(s) with them when they are riding, which is good exercise for their horse and their dog, if you restrict dogs to leashes only in this area behind the hospital, I am afraid the ranches in the area would lose their boarders.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 713    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Granada,, CA 94018  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,20,2013 17:19:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for allowing commentary on this plan.

I disagree with your findings to place extreme limits on dog use in what should be considered a recreational area and not a National Park. I list the following reasons.

1. I am a single woman, a taxpayer, and I like to walk. The GGNRA now has control of a majority of the public lands in the Bay Area. I do not have a lot of associates my age who like to walk longer distances, and I find I am much healthier with walking my animal every day. Plus, my dog is my companion.

2. Safety. I like my animal with me for safety reasons. My dog is a safety net for my solo walks. The Pacifica, CA police issued a statement that women should not walk alone after a single female hiker was anonymously videoed on a Montara Mountain trail. The culprit posted his videos of her without her knowing he recorded her and without her permission. Again, the police said "Don't walk alone". There have also been cougar sightings and caution postings in Quarry Park, in Montara, and at 900 Cabrillo Hwy in Half Moon Bay in during Fall 2013. With my dog on leash with me, the guy who videoed and

possibly the cougars would have been detected.

3. Your dog management plan will cause many dog owners to over crowd the few other park areas open to dogs. In my small one block area of El Granada, 11 of 12 households have dogs. You have to consider how the restrictions will impact other public use sites.

4. The trails that dogs on leash are restricted to are close to main roads and prevents me from having a wilderness experience. Horse back riders and bicyclists who maim trails a lot more than dogs are allowed a lot more trail access.

5. Carmel, Monterey, and Pacific Grove, CA have a park/city management/public relationship that should be explored as an example to use. Some beaches allow dogs on leash except for sea animal breeding areas and except for shore bird nesting sites. The park service in this area listened to the needs and wants of the community. I believe the NPS and the GGNRA management should listen to its community before restricting access. Again, I am a taxpayer and want to use the land as the title intends- -for recreation. Instead of alienating the community as this plan does, please be inclusive.

6. Dogs on leash would not disturb wildlife any more than a bicyclist, a hiker, or a person on horseback.

I believe the GGNRA could require a dog access fee to cover the use of trails and to provide poop buckets in strategic locations.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts.

Susan Messner Whipp, El Granada, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	714	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Residential Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,20,2013 23:28:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello GGNRA Folks				

The National Park Service should not allow dogs within or adjacent to areas considered critical habitat for endangered species. The NPS biologist and the restoration/natural resource specialist should provide information suitable to support such action.

I specifically would like to see either alternative E or F used at Mori Point.

1.The sensitive nature of the Lishumsha Trail and it's proximity to critical habitat for the San Francisco Garter Snake and the Red Legged Frog should make it off limits to dog walking.

The Mori Point Ridge Saddle is a corridor for frogs and snakes dispersing or migrating to and from the quarry and Calera Creek to the Northern Mori Point wetlands. To do so they must cross the Lishumsha Trail.

2.The Mori Point Ridge Timigtac trail is very narrow winding thru grassland habitat. User conflicts can occur hear with leashed dogs using it.

3. There are many dog walking sites in Pacifica, two of which are off leash. The rock quarry area is a favored unofficial dog park used by both off and on leash dog walkers.

4. Please give wildlife in need the benefit of an unimpeded lifestyle.

Thanks for your Stewardship.

Ron Maykel  
Pacifica.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 715    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 02:03:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Of all the trails and beaches that exist on Mt. Tam and the surrounding areas there absolutely needs to be some that permit dogs to be off leash. Even if it's during the weekdays, for the locals, etc..

Dogs need to run freely and play as pack animals. This is pure joy for dogs, owners, and many viewers. I believe owners need to be responsible for cleaning up after their dogs, always, I believe we need to respect others who are anxious around dogs, and be proactive, always aware.

Pets increase longevity and quality of life in us. There is little that thrills and amuses me to the core than to watch my three dogs play at Stinson Beach. Almost all of the Trails on Tam either do not allow dogs or require dogs to be on leash.

I have lived here, on Tam, for 12 years and though I wish there were more responsible dog owners, less uptight folks in general, and more dog friendly areas, I would hate to see the latter diminish. John W.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 716    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 08:42:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly favor multi-use of all trails to include hiking, dog walking, biking and equestrian. The undercurrent of "hikers only" attitude is from a small number of people who are the most active in pushing their agenda; while the majority of trail activities include dog walking, biking and horses too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 717    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 09:49:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** my feelings on all the newer ggnra areas in pacifica, montara, moss beach, is that they have been multi use areas for a long, long time. i personaly have been bike riding, hiking, dog

walking and horseback riding in these areas for over 50 years. please do not apply a heavy handed approach, please respect the years of multi use. this is my back yard, i have used these areas for a long time, and didnt even know i was recreating. this is a love of this place that my family (3 generations), friends, and most people that have chosen to live here have always enjoyed. thank you for preserving my back yard forever. jim kehoe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 718    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 10:08:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Fort Funston in San Francisco is a city park. I understand the need to protect bird sanctuaries. Certainly maintenance and restoration is needed. But forbidding all dogs from Fort Funston is an extreme and unnecessary move. This site is used by San Franciscans, and as such the interests of San Franciscans should be as relevant as the Park Service's environmental concerns. Find a compromise. Otherwise, life in San Francisco will be degraded significantly for the thousands upon thousands of dog owners.

Sincerely, Eric Brody

---

**Correspondence ID:** 719    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,21,2013 10:26:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a 51 year old San Francisco native. I am not a dog owner. I have been walking on Ocean Beach daily for over 30 years. I am a nature lover in every sense. I love the birds, the seals, the amazing proliferation of dolphins in recent years, the whales, and yes the dogs!

It is part of what makes the beach seem normal compared to other beaches in our state, seeing people walking and running with their dogs. It brings me joy to watch such happy animals running around, playing with other dogs and just being happy.

In all these years I have never seen a dog fight, a person get bit, or even an uncomfortable situation. Most dog owners pick up after their pets because they cherish our beautiful beach just like us non dog owners.

It is a very rare occasion to see a dog actually chasing the birds. Maybe not even one in a hundred.

I was told by a ranger that it's not the chasing that's a problem but the trampling of their nests.

If that is the case, then why don't we close the beach to people, with their careless children and their blankets and coolers and footballs. We have beach patrol in 4x4 trucks, cops on motorcycles, horses, wind pulled carts, tractors moving sand, thousands of walkers, runners and every possible type of beach goer imaginable.

If this is really about saving birds then lets do it right and close the entire beach to everything and everyone. Why are we singling out a mostly harmless factor without any formal studies showing that dogs are responsible for a decline in bird population.

This whole thing reeks of wealthy, special interest groups putting pressure on politicians and others in order to create a beach that fits their image of a safe, clean place.

I am a third generation San Franciscan. Our great city has always been uniquely tolerant of

---

different lifestyles and diversity. So many of the things that were part of this city's unique personality have been stripped away over time. Please don't turn Ocean Beach into every other up-tight beach along California's coast.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 720 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Brisbane, CA 94005  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,21,2013 10:58:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPD,

I have been bitten by an off leash dog at Fort Funston and have been attacked on one other occasion.

I urge the adoption of Preferred Alternative "C".

Please enforce rules that protect ALL park visitors.

Thank you,

Steve Rodrigues

---

**Correspondence ID:** 721 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,21,2013 15:24:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Im opposing the GGNRA leash law.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 722 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,21,2013 16:34:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** STOP the GGNRA Dog Management Plan! Please!  
There are so many people like me, we love dog! We need a place which is a off leash are can walk our  
pets together! This is our right and also is our human best friends` - -Dogs` right!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 723 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** pcifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,21,2013 17:26:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I think that taking away the use of Fort Funston for responsible dog owners is a horrible idea. People use the area to socialize, exercise and just to get out and about for their dogs everyday. Its a place that people know is safe and good for families and dogs.

Please keep the space the way it is!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 724    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,22,2013 12:38:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** December 22, 2013

I would like to report that I was running on Ocean Beach this morning (at around 45th Ave). A dog, off leash, came up from behind me and jumped on my back. His owner was about a quarter of a block away. Frightened, it was a medium to large sized dog, I started screaming for her to get her dog away from me - the dog was continuing to jump on me and was growling. I turned my back to the dog and remained still(although I kept yelling at the lady to get her dog), as this is not the first time this has happened to me on this stretch of the beach, and experience has taught me not to continue running, to remain still and to turn my back to the dog.

The owner proceeded to lash out at me - asking me why I was being so nasty while her dog continued to jump on my back and growl at me! Several unpleasant "French" words were exchanged, but the upshot was that she felt it was my fault. Luckily, I was not harmed, but just shaken up a bit by this encounter and certainly by her response.

Human nature baffles me as her dog clearly ran after me and assaulted me on an area of Ocean Beach in which dogs are to be kept on leashes. Then to add insult to injury, the owner of the dog attributes the problem to be me! It's quite laughable, really.

As I said this is not the first time this has happened to me, but I am certainly not going to stop running on the beach and so I hope that a dog plan will be put in place and enforced that will allow dogs the freedom to run off leash in certain areas while affording that same freedom to humans so that they can run unharmed.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 725    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,22,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alt A for Mori Point, dog walking has existed on and around Mori Point for decades. Providing opportunities for on leash dog walking when visiting Mori Point will engage acknowledge a large segment of not only the Fairway neighborhood residents who promoted the transition of this property into NPS holdings, but the thousands of visitors that frequent this park with their dogs every month.

---

I support Alt A on Map 19 A , Cattle Hill Sweeney Ridge area.  
The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.  
Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.  
Providing human-dog walking opportunities is critically important to these historically dog friendly lands

I support map#20-E Alternative E for Pedro Point.  
This area is highly disturbed from past uses, and would be suitable for dog walking on the entire parcel.  
Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.  
Providing human-dog walking opportunities is critically important to these historically dog friendly lands

I support map 21-A Alternative A for Rancho Corral de Tierra.

Also,

All NPS trails-lands above Seton hospital to above Park st, referred to as Vicente Ridge on NPS maps should be all be open for dog walking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 726    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Foster City, CA 94404  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,22,2013 17:02:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been to Ft. Funston for over ten years, both as a person with dogs and without. Currently I have two dogs whom I walk there. It has been an amazing place, as the dog owners at this site are responsible and take good care of their animals. every time I have been there most people have dogs. The few who do not have them generally enjoy watching the dogs. As to the environment the areas that were once fenced have been run down, so people with and without dogs walk these areas. Areas that are that sensitive need to be adequately fenced off, but other areas they need to be open for dogs under voice control. In a city like San Francisco there are very few alternatives where dogs can run and exercise, this being one of them. If those who work on the report stayed at the park for hours and observed they would see the park is enjoyed mostly by dog owners, and they are all careful to keep people and pets safe. So I believe alternative A should be in place for the next 20 years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 727    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Foster City, CA 94404  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,22,2013 17:38:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The main concern of my comments relate to the Ft. Funston dog walking area. First off, since the National Park Service has been overseeing this area it has deteriorated from pure

---

neglect by your department. Areas that have been preserved in the past are no longer fenced off as in the past with signage to restrict access to sensitive areas. Any destruction is the direct result of the NPS policy.

You do not acknowledge in your draft documents that the Ft. Funston property is a very small portion of the Golden Gate properties you manage. Yet I have never seen anyone out at Ft. Funston doing any sort of study concerning the populations that are using this area. You do not know the percentage of people with dogs, without dogs or what other users might be out there.

This property should be returned to the people of San Francisco and not become the disgrace that the Presidio has become as a monument to the miss use of national park lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 728    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** San Francisco Towers Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Dec,22,2013 19:21:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Along with fellow residents of our home for the elderly, I walk Crissy Field in the early morning hours of Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. One of our fellow walkers, Norma Chan, no longer walks with us since she fell on the path after having been knocked down by a dog which was not leashed. Several months ago I suffered a dizzying blow to the side of my head from a ball that had been in effect "shot" by a dog's owner who used a wand to send the ball a greater distance for her unleashed dog to chase. This suggests that unleashed dogs present a menace to those who walk Crissy Field, at least during the more heavily traveled daylight hours between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 729    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,22,2013 21:45:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Reducing off leash dog walking by 90%? ur parks' strength is the ability and opportunity to recreate with our entire families (including our dogs). Restricting this access is unconscionable as this action will immediately tear apart the real fabric of what makes the Bay Area so great. We must return to the original 1979 pet policy because all reductions in off leash areas including this SEIS are NOT based on science and are clearly unlawful.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 730    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,22,2013 22:38:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is impossible to enjoy a run along Land's End Trail or Ocean Beach because one is constantly being chased by unleashed dogs. It should be required for all dogs to be leashed and dog owners should be fined if they do not leash their dogs.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 731 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,23,2013 00:46:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the proposal to ban dogs from the vast majority of Fort Funston and the East Beach of Crissy Field. There are precious few places in San Francisco where dogs can romp on the beach and get the exercise they need. If you adopt this plan, you will make it even more difficult for my dog and thousands of others to get the exercise they need for their physical and emotional well-being. Urban dogs have a difficult enough life as it is, please don't make it even more difficult and restrictive.

I know there are a few irresponsible dog owners who may not clean up after their dogs or allow their dogs to cause a nuisance - but the large majority of dog owners are very responsible. It's not fair to restrict access for all dogs because of a few "bad apples." That would be like banning everyone from the beach because 1 or 2 people left a mess.

Please dont further limit dog walking in SF. Dogs are our friends and make our lives happier and more fulfilled.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 732 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,23,2013 09:31:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am certain I will not say anything others have not written. However, the proposed limitations placed on residents and users of the GGNRA areas under consideration represent a dramatic change to policies long older than the 30 years San Francisco residents have enjoyed these parklands with their pets under the 1979 policy. The reason the 1979 pet policy was instituted was to accommodate the needs and desires of the residents of San Francisco who had been enjoying these lands with their companions for years. Changes of the magnitude of limitations both in area and leash control will substantially limit the enjoyment of parklands that have been used this way for decades. This set of changes will most certainly have unintended consequences in other public use areas of the city.

A more considerate approach would be to limit commercial dog walking as proposed, but keep the area of access open as it currently is, and more strictly enforce these commercial limitations. These areas are for public enjoyment, not commercial for-profit use. Second, stricter enforcement of litter cleanup rules would aid in the public enjoyment.

The biggest problem with the status quo is that large numbers of dogs loosely under control by commercial dog walkers is compromising safety and enjoyment of these lands for other city residents.

I urge you to consider stricter commercial dog walking regulations, but at the same time leaving wide area access as it exists today for the residents of San Francisco to enjoy with their own dogs.

Ft. Function is my dog-beach of choice, and I have enjoyed it for decades with my pets. Please do not limit our enjoyment of our city resource. Thank you for your consideration and for taking the time to read my comments.

Sincerely,  
Marion Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 733    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,23,2013 16:27:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I AM WRITING TO ADDRESS THE CURRENT PROPOSED BEACH CLOSURES TO OUR DOGS OFF LEASH AT CRISSY FIELDS EAST TO WEST BEACH AND OCEAN BEACH.

LET ME FIRST REMIND YOU THAT THESE BEACHES WERE "OUR" BEACH BEFORE IT BECAME A FEDERAL PROPERTY. AND, THESE BEACHES ARE STILL "OUR" BEACHES BECAUSE WE PAY TAXES, I DONATE TO THE NATIONAL PARKS AND BETWEEN TEDDY ROOSEVELT AND JOHN MUIR, I AM AN ENVIRONMENTALIST!

WITH SAYING THAT, THE BEACHES SHOULD BE SHARED BY ALL AND SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE. I PROPOSE THAT THERE IS A TIME WHEN THE DOGS CAN COME TO THE BEACH AND ENJOY OFF LEASH. BEFORE SUNBATHING HOURS - OR SHOULD I SAY BEFORE HOURS WHERE AVERAGE FAMILIES AND FRIENDS WOULD CONGREGATE IN THE OPEN SPACE.

THERE ARE PLENTY OF AREAS THAT THE DOGS HAVE TO BE ON LEASH DURING CERTAIN TIMES OF THE YEAR AND THE MAJORITY OF PET OWNERS HONOR THESE LAWS. THE MAJORITY OF US PICK UP AFTER OUR DOGS AND THE MAJORITY OF US ARE CONSIDERATE OF OTHERS.

THERE ARE PLENTY OF SUNBATHERS WHO DO NOT PICK UP AFTER THEMSELVES AND ARE MORE HARMFUL TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC SAFETY THAN DOG OWNERS!

WE MUST SHARE THE BEACHES!

BEST,  
JULIE

---

**Correspondence ID:** 734    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,23,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** First, I am not a dog owner or walker yet I still feel strongly in supporting access for dogs in all of our parks. They, for a large amount of park users, are integral parts of the experience while

---

offering little to no detracton to other park users. As such I support Alt A for Mori Point, dog walking has existed on and around Mori Point for decades. Providing opportunities for on leash dog walking when visiting Mori Point will engage acknowledge a large segment of not only the Fairway neighborhood residents who promoted the transition of this property into NPS holdings, but the thousands of visitors from afar that frequent this park with their dogs every month.

I support Alt A on Map 19 A , Cattle Hill Sweeney Ridge area.

The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.

Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing human-dog walking opportunities is critically important to these historically dog friendly lands

I support map#20-E Alternative E for Pedro Point.

This area is highly disturbed from past uses, and would be suitable for dog walking on the entire parcel.

Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing human-dog walking opportunities is critically important to these historically dog friendly lands

I support map 21-A Alternative A for Rancho Corral de Tierra.

Also,

All NPS trails-lands above Seton hospital to above Park st, referred to as Vicente Ridge on NPS maps should be all be open for dog walking.

The parcel consists of existing ranch roads multiple loop trails for excellent dog walking options

Lines of sight are ample,leash enforcement is complimented by these fire roads trails easily accessed from multiple locations by NPS patrol vehicles.

The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.

Spreading out user groups is a key to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing expansive dog walking within the Rancho will engage a valuable segment of trails users in protecting these remote coastal lands.

Providing ample human-dog walking opportunities near every neighborhood surrounding the Rancho is paramount in reflecting the National "Recreational" Area aspect of GGNRA's mission in serving the broadest segment of citizenry.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	735	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Dec,23,2013 21:21:03
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRA is large and I will limit my comments to the areas that impact me - but as a non-dog owner in San Francisco I am often bothered by the conflict between dogs and people in our limited space. While my preference would be for option D I realize that commercial dog-walking is not going away and that GGNRA covers a large amount of the available space for dog walking in the city.
------------------------	--

I agree mostly with Alternative F except that I would like to see a smaller number of areas available for

---

commercial off-leash dog walking. Commercial dog walkers generally have transport available to them (as they pick up dogs from residences) so they are able to get to the areas open to them.

I would like to see Crissy field (and beaches in general) made off-limits to commercial walking. When I worked in the Presidio I would sometimes try to take my lunch at Crissy field and would be regularly harassed by off-leash dogs. The walkers would make no effort to control them and intuit that I was to blame for having food.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 736    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,24,2013 09:00:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose limiting off leash walking by responsible pet owners, in areas that historically and responsibly have been used for decades within these urban parks.

End this. If you haven't sensed the deep and long lasting position the PUBLIC has taken on this issue, you are truly deaf (or worse).

Enjoin pet owners to support the parks with gardening and trail building and cleanup and fund raising. That would be easy and productive. Most pet owners would like to support you. However, if you stumble forward "trying to enforce" these new and radically restrictive regulations, well... the future is clear. The opposition will not roll over and play dead.

CA politicians are picking up on this, and you are on the losing side. So...are you deaf (or worse)?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 737    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** outraged tax payer Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Dec,24,2013 09:31:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Two words: DEFUND GGNRA

If you don't recognize these parks for what they are, please give them back to the City which needs them.

HELLO ... anybody listening? (very apparently not, since you are still at it after years of opposition)

Guess what? We won't stop, either.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 738    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,24,2013 12:31:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Firstly I am not a dog owner. However San Francisco has a long tradition of off leash dog recreation. After reviewing the maps I like Fort Funston A map, , Fort Mason D map, Chrissy field E map Fort Point A map, Baker Beach A map, Lands End map c, Sutro Heights Map C, Ocean Beach A map.

It is important to keep the tradition and the uniqueness of the parks with off leash space available for dogs and their responsible owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 739    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,24,2013 12:45:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs should be allowed off leash at the beaches IF under voice control and known not to have trouble with other dogs...not an aggressive breeds. Pit bulls should be banned.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 740    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** petaluma, CA 94952  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,24,2013 13:14:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** When dogs can roam all over the seashore and indisputably contaminate our water supply, yet the oyster farm and all the good it does for our ecosystem is being removed, the leaders of the park system are in clear contempt of the very people that fund and benefit from it. The management of the point Reyes seashore is a farce.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 741    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** daly city, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,25,2013 08:20:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The plan does not cover nesting areas and sensitive habitat for birds. There should be fences to control off leash dogs from running thru. Also, the dog's raw sewage that many don't pick up are a threat to wildlife and children who play in the sand. It is a shame that this jewel of a park is being degraded from off leash dogs that can ruin a walk by jumping on you or harassing your dog who is behaving on a leash. Parks are for everybody, not just to the dog people who are let their dogs roam free while they are yacking on the phone and not taking responsibility for their dog(s). Just because they are the majority, that does not give them the right to overtake the parks. Please do the right thing to preserve and protect this valuable resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 742    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Dec,25,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a taxpayer and resident of San Francisco, who owns a dog i would like to express my disagreement with any changes in areas where dogs are allowed to be on leash and any leash free areas. Any plans that reduce the area for on leash or off leash areas at Crissy Field and Fort Funston should be re-considered. The amount of responsible dog owners with licensed pets in San Francisco is higher than else where in the country per capita and should therefore be taken into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 743 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,25,2013 13:53:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a taxpayer and resident of San Francisco, who owns a dog i would like to express my disagreement with any changes in areas where dogs are allowed to be on leash and any leash free areas. Any plans that reduce the area for on leash or off leash areas at Crissy Field and Fort Funston should be re-considered. The amount of responsible dog owners with licensed pets in San Francisco is higher than else where in the country per capita and should therefore be taken into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 744 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,26,2013 12:38:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Comment of Dog Management Plan in Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)

1. I think that dogs should be on leash (fixed 6 foot, one dog per person) in all areas of Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), except in areas where all dogs are prohibited. The leash law should be consistent will all National Parks, such as Kings Canyon/Sequoia, and Yosemite National Parks.
2. The SEIS make continual reference to "voice command". There are so many variables associated with "voice command" that it in effect dogs are simply "off leash". Some people have their dogs professionally trained to respond to "voice command", most people simply train their dogs at home with varying degrees of success. Also the owners must see and recognize when the dog is chasing wildlife, other dogs, or people. How many times have I heard "oh he's a sweet dog he won't hurt anyone", but to some people the dog barking or running at you presents a threat.
3. The National Park, like all land areas has a finite "carrying capacity", that is the number of people that can enjoy nature on a given amount of land. Dogs off leash reduce the number of people that can enjoy nature in the park. Dogs off leash drive people away from the area to seek enjoyment of nature elsewhere.
4. California beach is scarce and a very valuable recreational resource. The National Park Service can provide a "dogs off leash" area away from the beach, but the beach is too valuable and scarce to allocate to a "dogs off leash" park.
5. The National Park Service should not be in the business of providing a dogs off leash area. This should be done by the National Forest Service or better yet provided by private business.
6. My personal experience is that dogs off leash degrade my enjoyment of nature, especially at the beach.
7. The Pacifica State Beach in Pacifica, CA. recently instituted a "Dogs on Leash Only", and it has added to the peace and serenity of the park. Previously the beach area was taken over by dogs running off leash, chasing balls, chasing wildlife, and chasing other dogs. This was disruptive to the general public, in effect

the dogs were taking over the beach. Since the leash law was instituted the beach has become a much more people friendly place. This is feeling and difficult to quantify but the beach is now a much more pleasant place to visit. A small special interest group, such a people who want to let their dogs run off leash, should not be allowed to take over a public beach or any public area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 745    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,26,2013 14:20:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do NOT oppose the dog mngmnt plan. I am in FAVOR of the plan. Dog owners and dog walkers abuse our park lands by not having their dogs on a leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 746    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,26,2013 16:31:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Expand the area of off-leash dog-walking to include the growing population of dog owners within the metropolitan Bay Area. Crowding this population will cause deterioration of existing facilities. We are an urban area, not a wildlife refuge like Yosemite, or other National Park Service areas that allow such environmentally friendly practices as off-road vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 747    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,26,2013 17:17:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My wife and I are 85 yrs. old and walk often at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Sigmund Stern Grove. We have no dog, and find often that we are almost the only ones without a pet. We both use canes, walk slowly, and try to enjoy the beauty of our surroundings.

- 1) We have come close to being knocked over by large dogs chasing each other.
- 2) We are often annoyed by the loud, shouting voices of the commercial dog walkers calling their tardy "clients".

We would support the concept of sharing the parkland with dog owners who have limited areas for free-running, and who use leashes on the trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 748    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Dec,26,2013 20:16:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First, thanks for all the effort the NPS puts into maintaining and improving so many public lands. These lands are true treasures!!!

I would like to request that dogs be allowed to be off-leash at Muir Beach in GGNP into the future. My family has been taking our dog, Socks, there for seven years now. Part of the beach experience is dogs freely chasing balls and playing off leash. I have never experienced a negative interaction with dogs or dog owners at Muir beach, and hope that dog owners will always have the experience of "free dogs" on Muir Beach.

Thanks for your attention!

Calvin Trampleasure

---

**Correspondence ID:** 749    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,26,2013 22:15:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner for many years, I feel the public (dog owners) must take a responsible role managing their dogs if they wish 'freedom' for their dogs, and to enjoy full exercise for the health of their dogs.

As covered in meetings, and documents, the primary areas of responsibility are animal control, non-interference with other persons or dogs, and PICKING UP DOG FECES ! Like bicyclists who are frustrated by other bikers not practicing bike etiquette on the roads - relative to other bicyclists, and particularly relative to motorists, dog owners must recognize other public, rather than just themselves.

I submit the following suggestions:

- Pet store chains be engaged to hold pet owner classes/seminars on public space pet responsibility and etiquette.
- for areas in danger of Leash Only regulation, set calendar dates for regulated ROLA days, rather than 100% 'losure' to dog freedom.
- like Marin Watershed Volunteer programs, an Open Space non-confrontational volunteer force should be promoted to monitor and educate the public in more visually controllable areas such as beaches.

Sincerely,

Tony Lester

Corte Madera.

Dogs: 2 English Springer Spaniels

Long time areas favored for dog training and exercise: Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach (south end), Miwok and Coastal trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 750    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** CAS; GGRO Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Dec,27,2013 09:16:30

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Have witnessed event on birding trip @Crissy Field about 2 years after the restoration work was opened for the public. A Grebe was beached & obviously unable to fly when her two dogs off lease charged @the bird & began barking @it. We told the woman to call in her dogs & lease them but they continued to avoid her. The bird was obviously in stress as it tried to prevent the dogs from coming closer. We even tried to help round them up. We finally had to cover the bird with our windbreaker & remove the bird as it was becoming exhausted from its efforts & found a box to transport it to rehab. The woman could not recognize the behavior of the bird's panting & inability to escape from the lunging behavior of her two dogs. She was under the delusion that she had control of the dogs. They wouldn't "hurt" the bird. Her action reflect a common dog owner behavior: ignorance & denial. There will always be individuals who will test the rules set up to give balance to an area so everyone can enjoy the setting - to enter a place which reflects the balance of life & the movement of the creatures within it. The attitude of entitlement w/o control which seems prevalent because the few who are louder, who continue to challenge the established rules is more difficult to address. They do not reflect some of us who try to educate & reveal the beauty of the area we live. You do have people who support the mission of GGNRA - I have witnessed both places in the world where there is no control & places where the citizens take pride & ownership to protect their special place. I hope you can steer us towards the latter...MK

---

**Correspondence ID:** 751 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,27,2013 13:28:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a former San Francisco resident and dog owner, I stand in disbelief sometimes at the way other dog owners do not appreciate that not everyone and not everything sees the need for dogs and their activities to dominate the outdoor landscape.

Leashes were invented to protect dogs, people and wildlife. Areas restricted to dog on leash or no dogs at all are essential if the GGNRA is going to function as a national park.

As a regular park user, I am quite aware that one of the huge issues concerning dogs in the park continues to be enforcement of the existing and proposed rules and regulations. (I also know that no one really wants to spend a lot of time and resources having to do/say/repeat the same thing over and over again. It is soooo tiresome.) But a strong and consistent enforcement policy would help to manage the various uses and users of the park system and help make the park feel like a park, and not a large, unsupervised dog run.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 752 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,27,2013 15:33:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I love the idea that people can bring their dogs to the park, but I love the idea of providing safe habitat for wild animals even more. What is a simple chase for one dog is uninterrupted harassment for weary animals, especially birds. Please limit off leash access and enforce good citizenship of dogs and their owners alike.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 753    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Dec,27,2013 15:52:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please continue working to protect wildlife within the GGNRA by controlling, limiting and enforcing dog access to critical areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 754    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,27,2013 18:21:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that in too many instances people and wildlife are harried, and, in some cases, threatened by dogs that are off leash in GGNRA lands under management by the NPS. I believe that the majority of dog owners are responsible and well-intentioned, but there is a committed core that place the perceived needs of their dogs above the needs of other people as well as the wildlife that utilize GGNRA lands. The proposed rules seem to strike a reasonable balance between the needs of dogs and their owners and the rest of the public and the wildlife that utilize these precious places.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 755    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Dec,27,2013 18:53:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Thank you for posting the revised plan for dog management policies. Balanced use between dog owners and non-dog owners is very important in an area that gets such heavy usage as GGRNA, especially at San Francisco areas like Crissy Field and Ocean Beach. I would like to see more protection given to bird nesting areas, restricting off lease dogs from these areas, and also stronger enforcement and penalties for letting dogs roam free. Nesting birds are disturbed, wasting precious energy. Often birds are killed by the dogs - Golden Gate Audubon has reported numerous cases of this, but no penalties have been enforced. Endangered Snowy Plovers are particularly at risk but even common gulls and baby geese and ducklings are frequently killed. Most dog owners don't seem to care - one commented that he lets his dog kill gulls as practice for duck hunting. Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 756    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,27,2013 20:30:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Living in a small apartment, the parks and beaches of Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Lands End, and Ocean Beach are the areas we go to with our dogs to have unfettered play.

It is important to our health as well as the health of our dogs to have these areas where we can commune with nature and be free.

After looking at the maps for San Francisco parks and beaches my vote is for option A. Voice command in these areas is enough to keep our dogs enjoying the park while caring for the park foliage and visitors.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 757    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Winters, CA 95694  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,27,2013 22:21:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a regular hiker in many Bay Area parks, including GGNRA, I would like to see all the proposed stricter dog policies implemented and better enforced.

Dogs frequently aren't under control of their owners.

Off-leash and even on-leash dogs approach me, growl at me, jump up on me, and escalate aggressive behaviors when they see that I'm afraid of them. Dog owners laugh or casually say to me, "Oh don't worry, she doesn't bite," or "He just wants to play, that's his way of being friendly" and then that same dog starts barking in a mean manner or looking like it's going to bite or jumps on me and then the owner looks surprised. By then it's sometimes too late, especially when the dog is close to me and off leash and the owner can't call their dog off successfully.

I have never observed park staff around in these situations for help and never seen any misbehaving dog owners approached by enforcement staff ever.

Another recurring problem is collared dogs whose owners are letting them run off leash, while the owners hold the (empty) leash. About half of such owners immediately call their dog back and put it back on the leash long before I get closer; that's great and it's much appreciated. But other owners aren't paying attention and don't act fast enough, or they call their dog back but the dog ignores them and runs toward me barking aggressively. I can't outrun a dog. I'm reluctant, when hiking by myself, to get into an confrontation with a dog owner or challenge them about their dog's behavior or about the rules of the park, especially on a trail where nobody else is in sight.

What exactly are my options if I'm enjoying a hike and a big dog or an aggressive or angry dog starts running toward me? Should I carry around mace or pepper spray in a national park (I don't) and spray a dog that won't back off when I'm petrified and I'm confident that I'm in danger of being bit? (For the record, I've been bitten once, and had my clothing bit on two other occasions, and been jumped on by other angry barking dogs, so I do know the difference between a dog merely barking and a dog about to attack or bite.)

Friendly dogs are a problem too. Too many dog owners believe that everyone must be a dog lover and everyone must want to stop and pet their dog, let their dog lick their face and drool on them, let their dog shove its nose into their crotch or butt, or jump up on their legs or stomach. But these things are NOT in fact welcome by all members of the public.

I regularly see dog owners violating the policies of individual trails, such as letting their dog run off-leash in an area where it's prohibited, or having a dog on a trail where dogs are prohibited.

If I'm seated on a bench bird-watching or sitting on the ground near the trail resting mid-hike - if I hear a dog or see any dog at all that's off leash or if it's leashed but the owner doesn't appear to be managing their dog, I have to immediately stand up to put myself in a better position in case the dog comes closer.

Many dogs and dog owners aren't a problem in the parks. But it's not just a rare few that are a problem, it's a regular thing. If all dogs were truly under the voice or leash control of their owners, and all owners actively made sure their dogs didn't approach people who aren't interested and people who are afraid, that would be a different story.

I want to be able to hike in my parks without being afraid of being jumped on, growled at, or bitten by someone's aggressive dog.

I want park wildlife and habitat to be similarly protected from being physically harmed by dog behavior.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	758	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,27,2013 22:35:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I object to the plan to require owners to leash their dogs at Fort Funston. In my experience, almost everyone who uses the beach is a courteous owner of a well mannered off-leash dog. For individuals who wish to access local beaches without off-leash dogs, they can go to Ocean Beach, Linda Mar or a number of other local beaches. I would like GNRA keep Fort Funston as one of the sole off-leash beaches in the area.

This issue is important to us because our dog Koda is 100% daf, we cannot safely allow her to run free in any location near moving vehicles. Since the San Francisco Bay Area is so dense and urban, almost no places meeting this description exist in our area. Fort Funston is the one place we can feel confident that she can run and play safely without a leash. As a dog who resides with us in a small apartment (like many dogs in San Francisco) this unrestricted running is a critical part of her exercise routine. If the restrictions in the plan are passed it would adversely affect our ability to get Koda the exercise she needs. Accordingly, I respectfully request that GNRA maintain the status quo and allow dogs to run off leash at Fort Funston.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	759	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,28,2013 02:14:58				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My son has a service dog, and we walk regularly (always - - year-round- - with dog on leash, because that's her cue that she's on duty) on Ocean Beach in the area between the stairwells and Sloat. We have been dismayed at owners who allow their off-leash dogs to chase birds.

However, we would urge you to choose Option E for that area. There is a balance to be struck between prioritizing wildlife and accommodating domesticated life. There are precious few areas for dogs to walk in natural surroundings with their humans. Restricting dog-walking to being on-leash will strike that balance.

Prominent notices that warn people not to let their dogs lunge at birds, and to avoid bird nesting areas, will likely help. It may also help to point out how few of these endangered birds exist in the world.

Ideally, we'd have enough green space that everyone could wander freely and there would be extremely low impact. But this is an urban area, and the life settled here, wild or domesticated, needs to compromise.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	760	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,28,2013 08:39:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We have walked our dogs at Ocean Beach and Baker Beach for the last 35 years. In my experience dog owners are respectful of areas that have been set aside for bird nesting and planted areas fenced off for landscape reclamation.				

Regular visitors of the GGNRA beaches tend to be surfers and daily dog walkers. In my experience these groups take a direct and consistent interest in the quality of the local environment.

We rarely find any dog feces left by the hundreds of dogs walked at Ocean and Baker Beaches every day. Everyone carries bags to pick up after their pets. Additionally, I think the example set by responsible dog walkers encourages people to remove their own trash when leaving the beach. The overall level of trash at both beaches is negligible compared to 10 years ago. I know various groups volunteer regularly to clean the beaches, but the consistently cleaner landscape would not be evident by that effort alone.

I have never seen a dog that is possibly difficult or aggressive off-leash. I have never witnessed a true dog fight or an attack on a person by an off-leash pet. Dogs will confront each other briefly, but are under control and move on to share the area separately.

Please find a compromise that allows people and people with dogs to continue to use the very public areas of GGNRA to play freely together while setting aside the wildlife protected areas that are of concern. The human population at Ocean and Baker Beaches is already disruptive of any truly wildlife protected condition. Educate beach users to respect these valuable places, don't change them into nature museums that restrict our enjoyment of the tides and weather at the close range of walking the shore with our well behaved four legged friends.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	761	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	-----	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,28,2013 11:44:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have 2 points I wish to make:

1) This continual delay for additional comments or re-evaluation favors the group who desires the changes. This is true for any changes to rules, be it park rules, local zoning changes, or legal cases. I am invited not to comment again if I have already done so, but the group wanting more freedom for dogs will be rallied to comment as often as possible, thereby stacking the deck in their favor.

2) Dog Owners do not obey the rules anyway - Look at ANY park in San Francisco. When I last visited Pine Lake Park, SF, I was driven away by off-leash, out-of-control dogs. As I am elderly, I did not try to confront anyone. I just left.

I'm a birder, and my companion and myself have about given up trying to bird in San Francisco. The dogs are everywhere, and usually off-leash in spite of all the "No Dogs" or "Dogs on Leash" signs.

Thank you  
Travis Hails

---

**Correspondence ID:** 762    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,28,2013 12:21:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've been walking my dogs every morning on Oakwood Valley Trail for 15 years and the trail is no better or no worse that it was 15 years ago. The northern branch of the trail is a fire road and more damage is done to the trail by vehicles than dogs.

I support the "No Action" alternative for the trail. The existing 1979 Pet Policy should remain in effect.

Thank You  
Rob Beaton  
Sausalito, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 763    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94123

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Dog Trot by Chris Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Dec,28,2013 13:42:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

My name is Chris and I own a dog walking company. We go to Crissy Field and central beach every work day. While I understand some of the complaints addressed in "preferred alternative F," I am concerned about the small spaces provided for off-leash activity. I fear that it would force too many walkers and dogs into the limited spaces provided and a whole new range of problems would arise from the over-crowding. I feel that if such large areas were deemed off limits, some spaces should be created to off set the restrictions. What about the creation of fenced in dog parks within the Presidio? They would be safer than the areas now allowed and would keep us away from the people who do not care for dogs. The parks

could be located in parts of the Presidio that are currently unused and that people do not regularly go to. It would also separate us from distractions such as the police horses where there have been the occasional bad encounters. Further, the limit of 6 dogs per walker could be easily enforced by the proper authorities.

Thank you for your consideration,

Chris Petersen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	764	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,28,2013 14:01:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly support the new dog management policies proposed by the NPS. Protect wildlife and people from the growing problem of unleashed dogs!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	765	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	holyoke, MA 01040 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,28,2013 14:44:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	this is a thorny issue, but luckily the nps is in a good position to make a sound decision.				

---

My opinion is that the nps must balance user group interests/wants with the ecological and biological needs of these protected places.

Dogs MUST be severely restricted (and in many cases eliminated) from GGNRA properties.

In the areas that they are allowed, there should be areas that are dog-centric and developed amenities for dig users. BUT in all other areas, they must be regulated (even requiring permits, user-education, conditional access dependent on compliance) to protect these natural areas for the plants, animals, and other non-human residents AND to protect the resource for the non-dog-user humans.

We all know that dogs are "man's best friend," but they are not the best friend of birds, small mammals, and the non-dog-centric public.

please follow-through with your proposed restrictions of dogs, their poop, and their destruction to a very small subset of the GGNRA lands, with tight controls on their access conditional on their compliance with sensible regulations (just like any other user group).

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	766	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,28,2013 15:52:55				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off leash dog areas are an important part of living in San Francisco. I am opposed to any further restrictions in this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 767 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,28,2013 17:20:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am against any regulation of private citizens being able to walk their dogs off leash in any of the areas outlined in the document. I do however support limits to how many dogs commercial dog walkers may control at any one time.

These areas are the only place where I can safely walk my small dog off leash. This greatly improves both my quality of life as well as his.

Let us walk our dogs off leash please!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 768 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,28,2013 20:35:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a home owner in SF, a lesbian parent of 2 children, and a dog owner who has enjoyed Fort Funston as an off leash recreational area with my family for over 12 years. I bring my dogs to Fort Funston every morning and I am writing to voice my opposition to the GGNRA dog management plan. I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Additionally, in the SEIS the GGNRA asserts they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" as utilized in its enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI and the GGNRA's first Superintendent, the Honorable William J. Whalen, in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA. These promises, along with the conventional definition of the term "recreation", do not comport with GGNRA's current philosophy exemplified by Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management and Science for the GGNRA, who in 2007 was quoted as saying "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design.



Deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it, e.g. the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management. Alternatively, for sites heavily utilized by dogs and their guardians, such as Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

The GGNRA should develop a new alternative, the A Alternative, that will better balance the recreational needs of the Bay Area with protection of natural resources. The DEIS calls the No Change Alternative A. This is the 1979 Pet Policy with some restrictions, particularly restrictions on off-leash at Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, and Crissy Field because of the snowy plover and native plant restorations. More than one-third of Bay Area residents have dogs and we now know the importance of off-leash recreation for dogs physical and mental health, as well as the importance of the significant social communities that develop where people recreate with their dogs off-leash. This large segment of Bay Area residents should not be restricted to significantly less than 1% of GGNRA land (that is how much GGNRA land is available for off-leash recreation in Alternative A) to have a satisfactory park experience, especially since there is little scientific evidence supporting restrictions on off-leash. There has to be more space available for off-leash recreation, not less, given the huge demand for it in the Bay Area. The A Alternative would include everywhere that is currently off-leash, plus sufficient off-leash opportunities in San Mateo County to meet the demand, and more trails off-leash throughout the GGNRA. In addition, new land added to the GGNRA would include off-leash areas, especially in those areas where it has traditionally taken place. There would be no compliance-based management strategy in the A Alternative. Any dog management philosophy in the GGNRA, like that for any other recreation use, should be based on Bay Area values of co-existence, shared space, collaboration among park user groups, and education where problems arise. Enforcement of already existing regulations should target irresponsible dog owners who create the few problems documented by the GGNRA, while allowing responsible dog owners to continue their traditional off-leash recreation without harassment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	769	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110				

	United States of America
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,28,2013 21:59:35

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs are not an endangered species - in San Francisco or anywhere else. The number of dogs running off leash in park areas continues to increase every year. I am an animal lover and I live with a small dog. I feel there are plenty of places to take a dog off leash and that we need to set
------------------------	--

---

aside park areas to help protect animals such as the Snowy Plover. Additionally, there is a Burrowing Owl atop the rocks at south Ocean Beach, just north of Fort Funston. Dogs pose the largest threat to birds and other wildlife. Dog owners who insist that, "My dog doesn't chase \_\_\_\_\_," are part of the problem. They believe they maintain control of their dogs while they are off leash, but evidence has shown time and again that dogs on the hunt will not respond to their owner's voices. A Burrowing Owl was killed in Berkeley last year, and it likely was the victim of an off-leash dog.

Please consider that dogs should not be allowed in some sensitive wildlife habitats, and they should be required to be on a leash in other areas. Wildlife deserves a chance, and the public also deserves a place to walk where they don't have to deal with dogs (and dog excrement) as well. Dogs are great, but just because we are such a dog-centric city, does not mean that we need to continue to let dogs run off leash in our national parks. Please consider putting in place some restrictions on dogs so the public and wildlife can enjoy our national parks more thoroughly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 770    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,28,2013 23:29:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please severely restrict dogs on the beaches and strictly enforce the law. They should never be off leash but they are all the time. The dogs have taken over the beaches. They ruin the use of the beaches for me and my family, including our young children. We have stopped using the beaches because the dog situation is out of control. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 771    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,29,2013 00:49:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love animals, but I think we need to put people first as far as our parks are concerned. Yes, dogs need to run and their owners need to make sure that they are cared for properly, but we have way too many dogs running wild at many of our parks and beaches. Small children are often knocked over and sometimes bitten. The children and their parents and caretakers need to be able to enjoy our parks without worrying about run ins with aggressive canines. And, I haven't even mentioned the mess that animal owners often leave for the rest of us to contend with. I feel that there are many areas within our parks that should be completely off limits to dogs, particularly where endangered wildlife (nesting birds for example) can still be found.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 772    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** el granada, CA 94018  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,29,2013 09:16:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support: Alt A for Mori Pt.  
Alt A Map 19A Cattle Hill Sweeney Ridge Area  
Map 20 E Alt E for Pedro Pt.

---

Map 21A Alt A for Rancho Corral de Tiera

In addition to the above all of Vicente Ridge should be open to dog walking.

I have lived here for 30 years and have historically walked my dog in all of these hills. These are large areas that will not be impacted by dogs controlled on leashes. Many people have dogs and are running out of places to walk them with the exception of city streets.

Thank you for all the work you have done

---

**Correspondence ID:** 773    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 10:35:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I wanted to express my concern for new ruling against dogs at ocean beach and all other areas up for debate. Yes, I am a dog owner, who takes my dog to the beach every day. This is a large community of dog owners, and to be taken away the right makes me feel sick. I can understand the issues, but they are not substantial enough yet to ban dogs. I'm sure you have many responses to read, I wanted to make sure I added a vote for continuing the allowance of dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 774    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,29,2013 13:26:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to support the position of Golden Gate Audubon on the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan.

I support a balance of uses in the GGNRA, along with a strong enforcement policy that will make the park safe and enjoyable for everyone.

I feel that dog owners/activists and commercial dog walkers have taken over large areas of the GGNRA and that the majority of these people seem entitled as if the GGNRA belongs only to them. There are other people such as seniors like myself who would like to walk and enjoy the GGNRA without dogs everywhere barking and jumping up on you and knocking you over. Also the GGNRA is a prime birding location and there are many people who enjoy birding for a hobby. This is difficult to do if there are dogs everywhere chasing the birds and other wildlife away. Lastly there are areas of the GGNRA which need to have restricted use for wildlife protection, such as nesting areas for sensitive birds and dogs need to be banned from such areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 775    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Dec,29,2013 14:24:05**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love dogs, but I think dog owners should take more responsibility and prohibit their pets from running off-leash around wildlife. Also, some people (such as small children) may be frightened by off-leash dogs, so I believe that leash laws are important. I've seen many irresponsible dog owners not pick up after their pet, or ignore their dog's destructive behavior (digging/trampling plants) on public land. I would be in favor of sectioned-off areas especially for off-leash dogs, but also leaving sections of area strictly for wildlife and people. There should be a balance.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 776 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:** Member**Received:** Dec,29,2013 19:10:09**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** - Dogs are not a threatened species.

- Dog owners are not a threatened species.

- Dog owners do not respect the needs of other species or the needs of non-dog owners.

- Dog owners will violate any and all laws when it comes to their dogs.

- Dog owners must be policed or they will allow their dogs to run, hunt, damage the areas that are sensitive to endangered species, children, families, and nature.

- Any legislation must include policing and punishment for dog owners who will in fact break all of the laws that restrict their dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 777 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Dec,29,2013 19:26:37**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It will be a disservice to a large population of tax payers who own dogs and use the GGNRA if off-leash areas are restricted or eliminated. A responsible dog owner understands that a well-exercised dog is a well behaved dog. To eliminate and/or severely restrict off-leash use of the GGNRA will force owners to have to secretly exercise their dogs in an area that has been off-leash for years. Dogs are a huge compliment to many families and exercising with your dog and family together is an immensely satisfying experience. The GGNRA is a beautiful asset to the Bay Area and should be able to be enjoyed by dog owners and their dogs in the same capacity that generations have experienced. Please keep the GGNRA open to off-leash in the same capacity that exists today.

Kind regards,

Laura Kennedy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 778 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Dec,29,2013 19:47:19**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support a policy of only dogs on leashes at all GGNRA properties.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 779    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94947

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,29,2013 21:32:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand the reasons you have provided for greater restrictions on dogs and owners however I strongly disagree. There are many restricted areas already. I believe responsible dog owners are being unnecessarily harmed by these restrictions. Consequences are already expensive enough. Just stop, Freedom in this county/country is coming at an incredibly expensive price. Compare the users of the area and the number of incidences and you will realize how unbelievably stupid this endeavor is. The expense and idiocy has gone too far.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 780    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94710

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,30,2013 10:14:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly urge the NPS to protect birds in Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The birds are threatened by so many parts of our daily lives. Dogs do not face these threats and are prolific in the Bay Area, especially San Francisco. The dog regulations will provide bird habitat, prevent bird deaths, and encourage use of GGNRA by families with small children and visitors seeking a peaceful environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 781    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Arnold, CA 95223

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,30,2013 10:24:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the proposed rules which will prohibit dogs from the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area, require dogs to be leashed in the Ocean Beach Snowy Plover area and increase enforcement of the regulations. I believe that all dogs should be leashed at all times in public parks except in fenced dog parks; however, the proposed regulations do not go that far. They are reasonable and moderate changes to allow the public a bit more access to this publicly funded and broadly supported resource.

The present dog management policy makes it impossible for people like me to access safely and to enjoy the golden Gate National Recreation Area. I urge passage of the improved dog management policies.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 782    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94706

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Dec,30,2013 11:44:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support implementation and strong enforcement of more stringent controls on dogs within our National Parks and Recreation Areas, especially within the very urban GGNRA. I urge you to require on-leash control in high use areas, sensitive wildlife areas (e.g., Ocean Beach Snowy Plover area, Crissy Lagoon, Sutro Baths), and beaches where kids and the public play and walk in the sand.

Dogs should only be allowed off-leash in clearly marked and fenced areas. There should be high fines (\$100s) for out-of-control, aggressive dogs outside of fenced off-leash areas and for not picking up their dog waste. These fines should be used to support the implementation and enforcement of the more stringent dog management policies.

The number of commercial dog walkers and the number of dogs they are permitted to walk should be strictly limited with a high permit fee to be used to maintain the off-leash fenced areas and to pay for clean-up, enforcement, and resolution of dog-related conflicts.

I am sick and tired of having to watch out for, and protect myself from, out-of-control, off-leash, aggressive and rambunctious dogs; and having to always watch my feet so that I do not step into dog waste. Dogs are NOT people or kids. In fact, I fear for the safety of all the small kids and people who use GGNRA who are at significant risk of injury from the large number of out-of-control dogs and their irresponsible, disrespectful owners.

There are more than enough exclusive dog play and running areas provided throughout our cities for dog owners and commercial dog walkers to let their dogs off-leash without putting our kids and wildlife at risk.

GGNRA and other public parks were set aside and preserved as peaceful places for people (not dogs or pets) to enjoy nature, protect unique flora and fauna, and to preserve our natural heritage. Our parks are special places and are NOT DOG RUNS!

Please control the dogs in GGNRA! Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Laura Fujii  
Berkeley, CA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 783    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,30,2013 14:55:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am commenting to make clear that I support the NO ACTION alternative. If the GGNRA further limits dog walking as recreation, what few surrounding parks and trails that do allow off-leash will become overcrowded and overburdened. We need more access, not less. Well-socialized and well-exercised dogs are much more likely to engage in nuisance behavior like barking and biting. There is no legitimate reason to restrict dog walking beyond the restrictions already in place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 784    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,30,2013 15:12:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service Staff- -

I would like to commend you on your commitment to an an open and thoughtful process for the development of the Draft Dog Management Plan.

Although I would still like to see some of the habitat protection areas strengthened further by adding fencing or natural barriers, I think the plan is a good step in the right direction. It seem that you have managed to balance all the needs of the park users while making sure that we are doing as much as we can to protect the natural systems and habitats upon which all life depends.

I strongly urge you to adopt the current Draft of the Management Plan.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Tracy Grubbs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 785    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Piedmont, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,30,2013 15:35:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in support of the new rules for dogs in GGRNA in SF. I do not think off leash dogs should be allowed near vulnerable wildlife or other park users. SF dog owners should agitate for dog parks in other areas of the city that do not conflict with the goals of access for all, safety, and wildlife conservation.  
I am particulary concerned with protecting snowy plover nesting sites.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 786    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,30,2013 17:21:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** For the life of me, I cannot understand why the government is spending millions and millions of dollars to address a problem that doesn't exist. This is not Yosemite, this is not Yellowstone... this is an urban area that is blessed to have beautiful, contained beaches where people and dogs have co-existed respectfully for decades. Certainly these dogs are less destructive than the feral horses on Assateague - why aren't they removed to preserve a much more vulnerable ecosystem? Better yet, ban

---

people because they leave plastic and other deadly materials behind that will actually kill sea life. Under control, dogs don't pose any more of a risk to wildlife and environment than coyotes.

I am all for aggressive enforcement of people who do not clean up after their dogs or allow them to roam beyond voice control, but I haven't seen one convincing, undeniable fact that warrants the exclusion of dogs from our beaches. Having this as a blanket policy for national parks is like requiring snow chains to visit the Dry Tortugas - - one policy does not fit all national parks and recreation areas.

Stop wasting tax money on this nonsense and let everyone coexist as they have for decades.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	787	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,30,2013 23:01:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not impose new rules prohibiting dogs anywhere in GGNRA around Bay Area or requiring leash-only areas currently allowing voice-control off-leash areas in San Francisco or Fort Funston.				

Please do not require dogs on leashes on Crissy Field or adjacent beaches. Please allow the 1979 Pet Policy to remain in effect. We allow for ball fields, baseball diamonds, other sports, kite flying, picnicing in all these areas, and dog playing and exercising is another of life's outdoor pleasures and sport that should not be so restricted in a city that enjoys a large dog/pet society.

There is no reason to implement any restrictions in the park. I use Crissy field and other open areas within GGNRA every day to walk and allow my dog the freedom to run and never encounter any problems from other dogs or their owners. I see more damage left by users who leave cigarette butts,beer cans, picnic waste, etc than anything a dog would leave behind. City dog owners are respectful to remove dog waste and manage dog behavior.

Dogs need open areas like kids need soccer fields, like softball and baseball players need fields and tennis players need courts; these sports are accommodated all over the city; please let us keep our open areas for dogs.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	788	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Woodside, CA 94062 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,31,2013 08:03:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for working on this Dog Management Plan. As dog owners who enjoy the outdoors, we want to take our dog on our outings. There is a rich choice of open space in the bay area and most of it is off limits to dogs. POST is an example. POST studied allowing dogs and has opened very few areas.				

---



I think the maps I am seeing show an area and then multiple maps with different possible plans of trails available for leashed dogs. Please use the maps with the most trail miles and then consider a place for off-leash dogs to run and chase balls. Leashes are necessary in most areas, but there should be some area where the dogs can truly run.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 789    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,31,2013 09:02:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I support Alt A for Mori Point, dog walking has existed on and around Mori Point for decades. Providing opportunities for on leash dog walking when visiting Mori Point will engage acknowledge a large segment of not only the Fairway neighborhood residents who promoted the transition of this property into NPS holdings, but the thousands of visitors from afar that frequent this park with their dogs every month.

I support Alt A on Map 19 A , Cattle Hill Sweeney Ridge area.

The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.

Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing human-dog walking opportunities is critically important to these historically dog friendly lands

I support map#20-E Alternative E for Pedro Point.

This area is highly disturbed from past uses, and would be suitable for dog walking on the entire parcel.

Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing human-dog walking opportunities is critically important to these historically dog friendly lands

I support map 21-A Alternative A for Rancho Corral de Tierra.

Also,

All NPS trails-lands above Seton hospital to above Park st, referred to as Vicente Ridge on NPS maps should be all be open for dog walking.

The parcel consists of existing ranch roads multiple loop trails for excellent dog walking options

Lines of sight are ample,leash enforcement is complimented by these fire roads trails easily accessed from multiple locations by NPS patrol vehicles.

The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.  
Spreading out user groups is a key to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing expansive dog walking within the Rancho will engage a valuable segment of trails users in protecting these remote coastal lands.

Providing ample human-dog walking opportunities near every neighborhood surrounding the Rancho is paramount in reflecting the National "Recreational" Area aspect of GGNRA's mission in serving the broadest segment of citizenry.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	790	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Albany, California, CA 94706 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,31,2013 11:11:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is not really about dogs ... It's about humans and why Crissy Field was created and how humans fit into it. My late husband work tirelessly for *years* BEFORE the opening of Crissy Field GGNRA to build a place where humans can relax, reflect and rejoice. Robert Haas himself gave my late husband (and so many others) a banquet in appreciation and special sweatshirts: "I Helped Build Crissy Field." But within weeks following of the opening of Crissy Field my husband and I saw the future...the loss of Crissy Field for humans (and loss of habitat for wild creatues) due to unbridled dog intrusion. Crissy Field was created with the sweat and tears of people who dreamed of a place where **people and wild creatures** could safely walk. They envisioned a place without threat of unleased dogs and mounds of canine fecal waste. Ah shoot I'm crying. This matter is so very very sad. But please get the dogs out. I say this as a dog-lover and former dog-owner til my beloved airedale Max died. Maybe fence off a part of Crissy Field to make PART of "Crissy Field Dog Park"?				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	791	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Granada, CA 94018 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Dec,31,2013 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Alt A for Mori Point, dog walking has existed on and around Mori Point for decades. Providing opportunities for on leash dog walking when visiting Mori Point will engage acknowledge a large segment of not only the Fairway neighborhood residents who promoted the transition of this property into NPS holdings, but the thousands of visitors from afar that frequent this park with their dogs every month.				

---

I support Alt A on Map 19 A , Cattle Hill Sweeney Ridge area.  
The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.  
Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.  
Providing ample human-dog walking opportunities is critically important to these historically dog friendly lands

I support map#20-E Alternative E for Pedro Point.  
This area is highly disturbed from past uses, and would be suitable for dog walking on the entire parcel.  
Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.  
Providing human-dog walking opportunities is critically important to these historically dog friendly lands

I support map 21-A Alternative A for Rancho Corral de Tierra.

All NPS trails-lands above Seton hospital to above Park st, referred to as Vicente Ridge on NPS maps should be all be open for dog walking.  
The parcel consists of existing ranch roads multiple loop trails for excellent dog walking options  
Lines of sight are ample,leash enforcement is complimented by these fire roads trails easily accessed from multiple locations by NPS patrol vehicles.

The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.  
Spreading out user groups is a key to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing expansive dog walking within NPS lands will engage a valuable segment of trails users in protecting these remote coastal acres.

Providing ample human-dog walking opportunities near every neighborhood surrounding the Rancho is paramount in reflecting the National "Recreational" Area aspect of GGNRA's mission in serving the broadest segment of citizenry.  
Yosemite Park style extreme dog walking restrictions is overstepping the GGNRA's "Recreation" area's purview.  
Trails walkers-riders that do not like sharing RCdT w dog walkers already have most all of San Mateo County Parks 15,000 acres of lands to go recreate in a dog free environ.  
Maintaining the NPS lands as dog walking friendly parks will embrace a valuable segment of citizenry from the surrounding communities.  
There is added value of dog walkers frequenting these lands in that they will report the instances of moto intrusion,garbage dumping,pot farming,bonfires, illegal encampments,after hrs party'ng that occasionally happen on NPS governed lands.  
Having more law abiding citizens(dog walkers) ranging these lands is a good thing to promote responsible trails use for all.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	792	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 14:17:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** please restore balance to the golden gate nra by restricting dogs off leash.

my wheelchair bound husband has been physically intimidated by dogs off leash on various occasions; owners either did not have dogs under control or appeared not to care. one owner was aggressive and hostile toward my husband when he asked her to control her dog.

we choose not to use areas of the GGNRA where dogs abound.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 793 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94618  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 14:36:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support this plan. In addition I would recommend that there be physical barriers defining the off leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 794 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 18:53:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The new rules will be a big step forward. However, they should require fencing or natural barriers around off-leash areas. Commercial dog walkers should be required to have their dogs leashed. I am a dog owner but do not feel that our irreplaceable wildlife should put at risk by dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 795 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94704  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 18:56:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** With 5 million Americans being attacked by dogs every year, a significant percentage of the population has good reason to be uncomfortable around strange, unleashed dogs. To someone who has been attacked, being approached by a group of unleashed dogs and a single human (often off in the distance somewhere) can be a terrifying experience. Having been in this situation I can assure you that compassionate reactions from dog walkers are rare. Mocking amusement, scoffing at the person's fear, or outright anger and aggression are far more common. Add to this those who are not steady on their feet, such as the elderly, and others who are vulnerable, such as children, and we have a situation where dog owners demanding that all areas be off leash are being extremely selfish. Furthermore, while dogs can be great companions, their benefits are exaggerated- for example, why do people need to have a dog in order to be motivated to walk for exercise? You can go with a group, a friend, or on your own to have a more meditative experience.

---

One of the biggest hypocritical attitudes I have observed in most dog advocates is their total disregard for wildlife. I have observed many instances of dog owners allowing their dogs to chase wildlife, especially birds. In many ways, dog advocacy seems to have an irrational element to it and I implore policy makers to keep this in mind. Bending to the will of hysterics may quiet things down in the short term, but only because dog advocates are so aggressive - it will not help wildlife or those who have a right to enjoy the park in peace.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 796    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Marin City, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,31,2013 19:44:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in Marin City below Alta Avenue, part of GGNRA, above Oakwood Valley. My husband and I walk up there from our house on a regular basis. This area has become a MAJOR dog walker destination. We often see 7 - 12 dogs walk/run off leash per dog walker with over 100 dogs a morning frequenting this area. We both love dogs but are very tired of being barked at and rushed by sometimes multiple dogs that are off leash. Some dog walkers are great about getting the dogs gathered to the side of the trail and under voice control while people pass while others don't even call the dogs off when we are feeling threatened by them. When I was very young I bent down to pet a dog that the owner assured me was very friendly. I was bit on the face by this "friendly" dog. I feel part of the problem is that dog walkers and individual dog owners who have a loving relationship with their dogs don't see this aggression and warnings by dogs as a big deal. When we are being threatened we often have to insist that they call their dogs off and get them under voice control. We shouldn't have to do that. When we tell them that the dogs are supposed to be on leash we get the finger or are told to "shut up." We are getting sick of this situation.

We have a couple of neighbors who no longer hike up there, which is in their "back yard", with their dogs (one dog each on leash) because their dogs have been attacked too many times by other dogs off leash. It is completely out of control up there. I do feel that dog walkers are making it worse for those who only have one voice controlled dog. So if you hire a dog walker ask them where they are taking your dog and how many dogs go out with them at a time. We have seen as many as 13 dogs with one dog walker. You as their customers have the best influence on their behavior.

We live near two dog parks where dogs can run and socialize. They don't have to be off leash in the park.

Another problem is the number of dogs in the San Francisco Bay Area overall. The dog population has exploded over the past 10 years. According to a 2007 article in the SF Chronicle: "There are an estimated 120,000 dogs in San Francisco, according to the city's Animal Care and Control department. There are anywhere from 108,000 to 113,000 children, according to U.S. census figures from 2000 and 2005." Who knows what the true number is now 5 years later.

As wildflower photographers we see the effects of so many dogs on special wildflower areas and the plant life where these large numbers of dogs are allowed to run off leash off trail in GGNRA on daily basis. It seems that individual dog owners don't always see the cumulative effect of so many dogs in the Bay Area.

I hope we can find a way to respect each other and what little is left of the magnificent natural world around us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 797    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 17:50:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

I am a dog owner and dog lover who lives on the San Francisco Bay. I walk my dog off leash every day for his and my health, sometimes at Crissy Field.

I want to ask you to enforce the rules on dogs in the GGNRA.

The birds were there first. And more importantly they need our protection in order to survive.

Do not let people's sense of entitlement and confusion stop you from protecting the birds.

For the birds, it's life or death; for the dogs and people it's fun and a sense of abandon.

I appreciate what you do to protect the birds.

Yours truly,

Mandy Wallace

---

**Correspondence ID:** 798    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 18:01:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to add two points to my previous message.

I support strengthening rules to control dogs and protect birds in the GGNRA.

I also firmly believe from much experience around professional dog walkers and as a dog owner that 6 dogs in one person's care is too many. This number should be reduced.

Thank you,

Mandy Wallace

---

**Correspondence ID:** 799    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Albany, CA 94706  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 19:40:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please stick to your guns and enact the most stringent controls for dogs. Dog owners need lots of dog walking areas, but wildlife needs protection too. Dog walkers and owners enjoy plenty of areas for dog walking currently. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 800    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 20:06:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

I am writing to submit comment on the proposed dog management policies. I am in favor of a balanced approach that gives dogs and dog owners a place for off-leash activity, as well as protected areas where dogs are not allowed and/or are required to be on leash.

I visited Fort Funston myself today and loved the experience of seeing dogs, children, and owners roaming freely amid the waves, dunes and open beach, but I believe part of the amazing GGNRA area should also be set aside for wildlife who need to thrive as well. I didn't see any birds during my visit except a few in the air and indeed, it was dogs galore.

We need to protect the wildlife that is integral to the beauty of the place as well as the place's "recreational" uses for our families (and pets) as well.

Sincerely,  
Rachel Medanic  
Oakland, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	801	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,01,2014 21:05:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been encouraged to comment on the Draft Dog Management Plan by Park Service personnel, who suggested that my experience might give a useful perspective. I want to stress the importance of limiting the number of dogs in a group to six, and to require permits for groups larger than three.				

I have worked in Fort Funston as a Parks Conservancy employee and a volunteer. I have been doing volunteer work at Fort Funston for almost 15 years. I have had very few bad interactions with dogs. However, the couple that did occur are generally with large (> 5) packs. I have also noticed that the animals in such groups are rarely well controlled and often range far off the trails, while dogs being walked individually or in pairs generally keep more or less to designated trails. Thus the restrictions on number of dogs that can be walked is essential.

In addition, the regulations in the GGNRA, at least those areas in San Francisco proper, should be consistent with the city of San Francisco regulations, which require a maximum of six dogs per walk (<http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=1083>) and a permit for professional walkers (<http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=3857>). If regulations in the GGNRA do not align with those of the City, every would-be professional walker who can not get a City license will walk their dogs in the GGNRA. For simplicity of paperwork, both for the Park Service and the walkers, it might be easiest to simply require that professional walkers have a City license.

Thank you for your time.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	802	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Jan,01,2014 21:50:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and regular user of Ft. Funston, I implore the National Park Service not to close any off-leash areas in or around San Francisco without simultaneously opening other similar sized areas for dogs to be off leash. It is unrealistic not to provide dog owners with a large space to exercise their dogs off leash in San Francisco. If Ft. Funston were to be closed to off-leash dogs but another area were to be opened, perhaps at Ocean Beach, Golden Gate Park, or the Presidio, I would understand and accept the new regulations. But to close an off-leash area without opening another in its place will put dog owners in an extremely difficult position. I, for one, would likely exercise my dog in areas with leash requirements but lax enforcement, which is not a good solution for anyone.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 803 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,02,2014 01:00:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It's so important for dogs to have a place to run and play off leash. They are more sociable off leash and I hope that the beach stays dog friendly for a long time to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 804 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,02,2014 02:43:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to thank the National Park Service for allowing me to make public comments in reference to the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

I have concerns about several issues raised in the Statement. For your convenience, I am including the page number from the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for each issue I am addressing, and in some cases I am including references (also for your convenience, I am including references in the form of web addresses so that you may more easily review the basis for what I am writing), and I am including some information about myself in order to establish why I believe I can legitimately offer criticism.

Page 35 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement states: Exercise. Visitors with dogs, including elderly and handicapped visitors may experience beneficial effects of walking their dogs. Dog walking provides mental health benefits by providing a social community for many people. Studies have shown that dog owners exercise more than people who do not own dogs. A study in Australia looked at how dog ownership influenced physical activity (Cutt et al. 2008). Dog owners walked their dog on average 2.6 times per week. Frequency and duration of total walking, walking for recreation, walking in the neighborhood, and total physical activity were higher among dog owners than those that did not own dogs. The results confirm the potentially important role that dogs could play in increasing levels of physical activity among owners (Cutt et al. 2008). In a separate study, 61 percent of the 2,170 dog owners sampled walked their dog for at least 10 minutes at a time. The



median number of times dog owners reported walking their dog each week was three and the median duration was 25 minutes. The median weekly duration of dog walking was high among young dog owners, declined in middle age, and increased in persons aged 65 years and older. Dog walking contributed to a significant increase in the total amount of walking conducted per week (Reeves et al. 2011). In addition to providing physical health benefits, dog companionship has been linked to better physiological, social, and mental health. Although I agree with what is written, a reasonable review of the medical literature supports a much stronger view of the health benefits of dog ownership. As a licensed California physician who is a Fellow of the American College of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology, a Fellow of the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology, and a Fellow of the American College of Physicians, I believe I have standing to offer additional information; to wit, The American Heart Association, in its peer reviewed medical journal *Circulation* recently (May 9, 2013) published an analysis of this issue

(<http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/early/2013/05/09/CIR.0b013e31829201e1.full.pdf.html>) entitled Pet Ownership and Cardiovascular Risk: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. They noted on page 1 that cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death in the United States. Further, obesity and physical inactivity are at epidemic proportions. They concluded on page 4 that Pet ownership, particularly dog ownership, is probably associated with decreased CVD risk (Level of Evidence: B). Level of evidence refers to the estimate of certainty or precision of the treatment effect. In order to reach a higher level of evidence, more studies would be needed and randomized studies would be required: this is problematic as it is hard to get patients to agree to being randomized into a study where they either get or do not get a dog, and further, it would be difficult to perform a blinded study as most participants would know whether or not there is a dog in their house! The American Heart Association further concluded, Pet ownership, particularly dog ownership, may have some causal role in reducing CVD risk (Level of Evidence: B). It is my professional medical opinion, as supported by the best available applicable medical literature, that dog ownership is causally related to lowering the risk of the most deadly disease in the United States of America today. Restricting available parkland that can be used for dog can reasonably be inferred to be likely to decrease exercise and pet ownership, and would likely cost lives. I humbly submit that page 35 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement should be strengthened to reflect the medical evidence that this is a matter of life and death for some visitors, and any analysis of limiting areas where dogs are to be allowed should include loss of human life as the likely outcome of any significant restrictions. As noted on page 1226, under the heading HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY GUIDING POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

#### NPS Management Policies 2006

The NPS has designated management policies related to human health and safety for park facilities as outlined below or as discussed in the NPS Management Policies 2006.

8.2.5.1 Visitor Safety - The NPS will seek to provide a safe and healthful environment for visitors [sic]. It appears to me that NPS regulations would thus be required to not further limit dog access without a reason that outweighs death.

Pages 1231-2 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement concerns pathogens. It notes, Evidence shows that pets and urban wildlife can be significant bacterial sources. In the case of Fort Funston, the facts clearly show otherwise. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission operates the Oceanside Wastewater Treatment Facility and Lake Merced. It monitors Ocean Beach and Lake Merced for bacterial contamination. The Daly City Water and Wastewater Facility monitors water quality just to the South of Fort Funston. I separately asked both of these government agencies if they had any evidence of even a single case of water contamination of any kind that has been attributed to dogs at Fort Funston since the GGNRA was established on October 27, 2013. By personal communication, both agencies could not find any evidence of dogs as a detectable source of bacterial contamination. A related issue that has been noted is that horse owners would like to be able to ride in areas apart from dogs. As a dog owner, I can from personal experience attest that dog owners frequently

pick-up their pets waste material. Sadly, my experience is that horse owners do not do the same. Thus, any consideration of limiting dog access, in favor of the pleasure of equestrians, should consider the potential for worsening of this problem. The Statement also notes, Assuming compliance with the regulation, the amount of dog waste at each site should decline and would reduce the health and safety risks associated with dog-related pathogens. I challenge this assertion. It assumes by limiting dog access, the net amount of fecal material would be decreased, and unless there was a concomitant prohibition of riding, this assertion could be described as horse manure. In any case, bacterial contamination has been monitored and not found to be an issue.

Pages iii of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement concerns The 1979 Pet Policy provided for on- and off-leash dog walking, and states the 1979 Pet Policy, developed with input from park staff, provided general guidance for dog walking and recommended locations for both on-leash dog walking and off leash or voice control dog walking in lands owned and managed by GGNRA, although this recommendation did not abide by the federal regulation regarding dog walking in national parks (36 CFR 2.15). Although I am not an attorney, I read 36 CFR 2.15 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol1/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol1-sec2-15.pdf>) and it states (e) Pets may be kept by residents of park areas consistent with the provisions of this section and in accordance with conditions which may be established by the superintendent. Per the NPS (<http://www.nps.gov/goga/historyculture/creation-of-golden-gate-national-recreation-area.htm>) The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established in 1972 as a new urban park. To me, the operative word is urban, which can be defined as being of, relating to, characteristic of, or constituting a city per The Free Merriam Webster Dictionary (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/urban>). It stands to reason that as an urban park, per the law cited in the Statement, the superintendent is empowered to allow pet access to residents of the park areas, and since it is an urban park, that would include the defining, urban environment surrounding the park. Thus, the assertion that this recommendation did not abide by the federal regulation regarding dog walking in national parks is undercut by the intent expressed in the creation of the park and is invalid. Although I cannot make a legal argument, morally, I believe the good people of the Counties of San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin, should have the right to continue, unchanged, the current Pet Policy under the legal doctrine of adverse possession (per [http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/adverse possession](http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/adverse+possession), Adverse Possession is

A method of gaining legal title to real property by the actual, open, hostile, and continuous possession of it to the exclusion of its true owner for the period prescribed by state law. Personal Property may also be acquired by adverse possession. The legal theory underlying the vesting of title by adverse possession is that title to land must be certain. Since the owner has, by his or her own fault and neglect, failed to protect the land against the hostile actions of the adverse possessor, an adverse possessor who has treated the land as his or her own for a significant period of time is recognized as its owner.) Morally, this doctrine should protect citizens who lawfully get a dog under the assumption that they shall have a place to walk their dog, while one set of rules is in effect, from having public park access taken from them, at least, during the life of the dog. Morally, in my opinion, if there must be changes, they should have a lead-time where the current rules are maintained for a period of time that just exceeds the lifespan of some of the longer-lived dog breeds, or current park visitors should be able to get a permit allowing access for the life of their current pet.

Page 18 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement concerns endangered or nesting birds, particularly, plovers of the Genus Charadrius. The Statement notes off-leas dogs disturb snowy plovers, potentially reducing their chances of survival. I have a Master of Science degree in Biological Sciences from Stanford University, and although I concur with what was written, I fear this leaves out crucial information. I reside in the Park Merced apartment complex, and over the last year I have on three occasions seen coyotes there. I have walked my dog in Golden Gate Park and Glen Park and have seen warnings of coyotes. From my observations, these three areas are not used as extensively for dog walking. In contrast, I have never seen a coyote, or seen a coyote warning sign, or seen a reference to coyotes in any of the regions of the

GGNRA that are extensively used by dogs (such as Fort Funston or Crissy Field). From the perspective of a dog, some shore birds bear an unfortunate resemblance to the tennis balls they have been taught to fetch. However, from the standpoint of coyotes, snowy plovers look like dinner. Excluding dogs from regions of the park where they currently exist in large numbers might allow coyotes to take up residence, and such a scenario could be much more damaging to birds than the current state of affairs. Page 351 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement clearly states: Impacts can be either beneficial or adverse. I concur. I suggest that before dogs are removed or leashed in an area where they appear to thrive, and coyotes have not, further research on predation of shore birds, and the impact of relatively dense dog populations, as a counterbalance to predation by coyotes, should be considered. Moreover, The San Francisco Chronicle (<http://www.sfgate.com/default/article/State-of-the-Birds-report-focuses-on-Bay-Area-2327006.php>) reports The beach-loving bird called the western snowy plover and the bay-centric bird known as the California least tern, have seen population increases over the past few decades. Both are federally listed endangered species. It appears the current plan is serving well the interests of the snowy plover, and any change, including limiting dog access, should be viewed as a potential threat to the survival of this endangered species.

Page 20 of the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement concerns Soundscapes, and notes The natural sounds heard in GGNRA are a positive and valued park resource, as well as a component of the visitor experience, which dog barking may interrupt. As a native San Franciscan who grew up in the Sunset, is a graduate of South Sunset Tiny Tots, Ulloa Elementary School, A. P. Gianinni Junior High School, and Lowell High School, who has lived within earshot of Fort Funston for nearly half of a century, I believe I have standing to point-out the obvious: in reference to Fort Funston, the idea of natural soundscapes is completely undercut by its location under a flight path of SFO, next to a highway, and across the street from the San Francisco Police Department Pistol Range and the Pacific Rod and Gun Club trap and skeet shooting range. It is disingenuous to use this canard to try to exclude dogs from any part of Fort Funston.

In view of the concerns I have raised, and for the good health of the people who use the park, I hope the current rules (<http://www.nps.gov/goga/parkmgmt/pets.htm>) can remain, unchanged.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dean Kardassakis, MS, MD, FACAII, FAAAAI, FACP

---

**Correspondence ID:** 805    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 08:48:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Muir Beach and surrounding trails off-leash dog area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 806    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94709  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** GGAS member Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 09:21:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a hiker and birder, I feel this plan is a significant step forward in balancing land uses and conservation. I would like to see more use of fencing or natural barriers around protected areas

---

(similar to what I've seen at Muir Beach recently), since all too often I've observed people allowing their dogs off-leash even in areas that are already clearly designated as on-leash only, or no dog areas, and I realize that enforcement through higher staffing levels is not realistic.

I'm particularly pleased that this plan calls for better protections of the Crissy Fields Wildlife Protection Area which is a great, highly accessible, urban bird-viewing area that needs sufficient regulation to provide safety for its diverse wildlife.

Thanks for taking our views into consideration.

Sincerely,

Wendy Hoben and Lydia Huang

---

**Correspondence ID:** 807    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,02,2014 12:12:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My dog and I enjoy walking the trails in the NPS (as well as other trails). I enjoy being able to take him both on leash and off leash (depending on the rules of the trail). I am concerned that the trails I current use could change from on leash to no dogs (and from off leash to on leash). My dog is trained and well behaved (and well socialized). I clean up after him and ensure that he stays on trail. I am concerned that the NPS is going to penalize law obeying and considerate/responsible dog owners for the actions of the few that do not obey the laws and/or are not considerate or responsible. The NPS should enforce the current laws - rather than looking to change the laws.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 808    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,02,2014 15:15:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** No 10 page letter, just a few comments and a need to add my voice to the calls for a carefully balanced use plan. The GGNRA is such a precious resource for so many people and creatures, and some of both of these groups need protected. As a senior, I enjoy watching dogs play in duly designated areas. Meeting hordes of them on the trails is another thing.

I applaud you for making Wildlife Protection areas safer for wildlife, but am concerned about the plan providing for no containment of off-leash areas. I believe it's necessary to have some sort of barrier to provide clear delineation of the areas and prevent inevitable roaming and unwanted human and wildlife encounters.

I'm also concerned about the burgeoning number of professional dog walkers. This could make the growing number of dogs untenable.

The GGNRA is the only national park in the country that allows unleashed dogs. There's something very democratic and san franciscan about that. On the other hand, there's probably, when all is said and done,

good reason for that decision.

Thank you for listening, and I wish you the wisdom of Solomon in resolving this matter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 809    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** MILL VALLEY, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 15:27:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I have been walking my dog in the GGNRA for over 10 years and taking away space to walk dogs will have a negative impact on one of the biggest reasons for moving to Marin. As a dog guardian and citizen it would place me in a limited position in relation my enjoyment of the space and constrain my ability to properly care for my pet. It seems to me that there is already a limited space to walk dogs off leash and taking more away will only further crowd and burden the few areas left. I would argue that we need more off leash space as opposed to less. I can tell you from experience that a dog that gets a lot of exercise is a well behaved dog -> and that has a direct impact on the community and environment as a whole.

I also have some concerns about the decision making process:

It seems that the decisions are not based on any scientific data and lean heavily on assumptions and assertions that provide little firm evidence that support them. It also appears to lack any peer reviewed site specific studies that I would think would be required before taking such action. Without studies and more formal review process, there do not seem to be any legitimate or legal foundations for these policy changes. Also, the plan does not differentiate between the impact caused by human beings or other animals and assumes that all negative impact is caused by dogs.

I oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative and support the NO ACTION alternative.

Patrick McComb

---

**Correspondence ID:** 810    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 15:39:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly object to the GGNRA Dog Management Plan. San Francisco is a dog friendly city with limited open space for dogs to run off leash. As any dog owner understands, this is critical to a dog's health. Below are some additional thoughts and a poem by Mary Oliver from her latest book, Dog Songs:

If You Are Holding This Book by Mary Oliver

You may not agree, you may not care, but  
if you are holding this book you should know  
that of all sights I love in this world-  
and there are plenty-very near the top of  
the list is this one: dogs without leashes.

Thank you for soliciting comments and I hope rational and compassionate hearts prevail in this discussion and decision.

Nora Blay

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	811	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pinole, CA 94564 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,02,2014 15:55:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I adopted my dog in early 2013 and she has substantially improved my quality of life, requiring me to get outdoors, recreate, and socialize with others. I've learned what it is to care for someone other than myself. I now have a healthy support community of fellow dog owners.				

The biggest shock to me since becoming a dog owner is the level of dog regulation in our state. I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. My dog has learned to be social through being with me wherever I go, but most importantly, through visiting various parks throughout California. Yet I find myself increasingly anxious about where I can take her given regulations and policies like the one proposed. I'm increasingly forced to research where we can or cannot be and never imagined the outdoors/wild wasn't the place to bring a dog. Who would growing up with stories of Old Yeller and White Fang?

If we care at all about the state of health in California, we will stop going out of our way to make it a crime to enjoy nature, not simply observe it. My love and respect for nature grew out of running x-country, mainly at Ocean Beach and Golden Gate Park. My new running companion makes long runs much more challenging and fun; she pushes me to explore new trails and my limits. I learned to love the parks during family picnics and camping excursions with our dogs in the GGNRA, East Bay Regional Parks, and Sierra Nevada. That's what makes the GGNRA a resource: because people have enjoyed bringing their families and family pets there to explore and play for decades. A day in the park with your dog, frolicking and foraging, or playing in the waves is an integral part of California recreation. We should be expanding access and reducing the limitations for off-leash park access.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	812	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Dog Adventures Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,02,2014 17:00:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The document and drafts are a bit confusing and not very clear. It seems like there are a number of drafts but not sure which one is the proposed one. With that said, I vote for the 10A and				

---

12A at Crissy Fields and Baker Beach respectively. I have been a dog walker for almost 19 years now and I definitely think that there needs to be regulation but not so much about off leash areas BUT number of dogs people can take as well as gathering of dog walkers where there are two dog walkers walking together that would be about 15 to 20 dogs in one area. This is truly what I feel has been the problem from the geco.

Back in 1995, dog walkers were responsible and not taking so many dogs. There were limited complaints. Now there are so many dog walkers who take any kind of dog whether aggressive or not plus 10 plus. Not all dog walkers. There are so many like myself who are responsible, taking only voice control dogs, well behaved dogs and also only 7 to 8 dogs at the most.

When dog walkers gather or walk together it creates so much confusion for everyone...dogs get lost, dogs get into fights and it is hard for even someone like me who is a dog walker to walk through or by these people.

I truly think that if you regulate the number of dogs that each dog walker has to 8 dogs like the city has done as well as enforce no more than 10 dogs in one area or dog walkers standing with each other, this will alleviate many problems. When a dog walker has control of 7 dogs and has them with her or him, it really is not a spectacle like when someone has 10 plus dogs or walking with another dog walker.

I do feel like the number should be 8 as many dog walkers take 7 dogs plus their own canine.

In addition, I think that the GGNRA should team up with SF city and their permit situation if they are going to do a permit situation. It would be so confusing for everyone to have to carry so many different permits for different areas. I think that could cause problems as well. As the old saying goes "Keep it simple stupid". GGNRA in SF is in a city/urban area and I think you need to accept this is not Yosemite and work with the city adopting their policies that seem to be working. everyone needs to be on the same page because whether you like it or not Baker Beach, Crissy Fields, Fort Mason, Fort Funston etc are in a city called San Francisco. Not the great outdoors of Yosemite Valley.

I also find it fascinating that you are so worried about dog walking ruining the environment when I continually find used condoms, human feces, used tampons and sanitary napkins as well as beer bottles, wine bottles and toilet paper all over the Presidio, Baker Beach, and even in the headlands on Alta trail. It is really disgusting and actually unsanitary. I take my kids walking with me and I worry about them touching some of the garbage I find out there.

It would be a mistake to limit off leash dog walking but I do believe in regulation of dog walkers that I think has gotten out of control with the number of dogs each person takes as well as the gathering.

In addition, my husband is a Phleger as in Phleger acres and he is also going to comment but has told me that his family were huge dog fans and walked their dogs off leash on the Estate as well as everyday at Crissy Fields (benches down at the beach are his mom and his uncle). He said his mom would be so upset by the restrictions the GGNRA are doing to dog walkers and dog owners. Please keep in mind that the Phleger family graciously donated thousands of acres to Open Space to then to give it to GGNRA. Respect their wishes of dogs being able to walk off leash.

Thank you,

Lisa Gates

---

**Correspondence ID:** 813 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 17:31:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Re; Dogs off-leash at Muir Beach.

The NPS has just completed a wonderful multi-million dollar refurbishment project at Muir Beach.  
Wonderful and congratulations.

I am writing to encourage the NPS to require that dogs be on-leash only at this beach. My main concern involves dogs (I've counted up to a dozen at a time) playing and swimming in the pond that empties Muir Creek into the Pacific Ocean. This is the creek that runs through Muir Woods and is vital to the survival of the annual salmon run.

Despite posted signs requiring owners to keep their dogs out of that area, far too many dog owners ignore the signs to the peril of the salmon, birds and other wildlife for whom this critical area means their survival.

Please require dogs on-leash at Muir Beach!!

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 814    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 18:49:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let dogs be "leash free" on Muir Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 815    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 21:03:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The .pdf of Marin maps "cannot be opened because it is empty." ? Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 816    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,02,2014 23:31:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

Hello. My name is Zachary. I'm an eighth grade student at Chinese American International School in San



Francisco. I have deeply value the idea of public land and conservation, and I am committed to the upholding of personal safety as well as right to benign recreation in the national parks. I am also a dog owner. I'd like to encourage you to be conservative in your regulation of canine recreation in the parks. Animals of all kinds have many uses, but dogs have held a position close to the heart of man for thousands of years. Many San Franciscans own dogs, and consider them a part of their own family. In your support of indiscriminate and accommodating recreation opportunity in the national parks, I hope that you consider the health of these dogs and their families.

I'd like to share with you a tradition that has survived many weekends in our family. It's a feeble, informal tradition, but I would be dismayed to discover that this activity is no longer legal in our parks. Our dog, Maisie, is a Boston terrier with bright brown eyes, short black and white fur, and a great capacity for rapid release of energy. She loves chasing her ball. Many times, we have taken her down to Crissy Field to play ball. We typically purchase food at the hot dog stand or the warming hut, and take our food further down the promenade to eat. All the while, Maisie is running back and forth. If there is a gap between different members of the family, she quickly runs back and forth, making sure that everyone is accounted for. But no person catches her eye nearly as often as her rubber ball: fluorescent orange, and not a tennis ball because those had worn away her teeth. This ball, modest in size, had a jealously guarded place in her heart. If one just raised it in their hand, Maisie's eyes would widen, and follow it. Her muscles would be poised to explode, her heart thumping, and her mouth open, panting. No other dog could distract her. And when the ball was released from the plastic "chuck-it", she would be spirited away by the wind. Nothing could match her speed. And her ecstatic gaze, so smug, as she carried the ball back would infect me with a bit of her unrestrained excitement. Doubtless, Maisie's joie de vivre will sustain until the day she dies, but I hope the ability for dogs like her to play, imbued with such vivid energy, will last long after she does. I will hate the day that the Crissy Field promenade is restricted to leash only, as demonstrated in Map 10-B of the plan.

Dog owners in San Francisco face a plethora of restriction. The streets are busy and dense, and the bustle of city life can restrict the time available to walk a dog. Please sympathize with our search for a safe, beautiful place to walk and play with our dogs. These are public lands, and indeed, they should belong to the animals more than us. Domestic canines may not have as much of a place there as the wildlife, but there is a canine that makes every day a bit better for me. Please allow this happiness to continue in the lands we all own, and share, and have coexisted in since 1872, when President Grant set aside Yellowstone National Park for protection. Dog walking is a recreational activity that can leave us all imbued with ecstatic energy, an energy to be outside and in nature, and an energy that should be preserved along with all else that is beautiful in the national parks. Please, once more, I urge you to support canine rights in the Golden Gate. It's not just dogs we're talking about; these dogs belong to a family that needs a place to walk their dog. Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially,  
Zachary Ngin  
8th Grade Student

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	817	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,02,2014 23:53:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a new resident to San Francisco with an active very well behaved dog, I hope you keep all current off leash sites as such.				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 818    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 11:11:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I live in Mill Valley and regularly - - including on cold and foggy days when no one else is there - - visit Muir Beach with my dog. On the few hot days when the beach is mobbed with people from all over the Bay Area, I don't take my dog there. Muir Beach's biggest advocates are those who live in the area. We cherish and protect this natural resource in our own back yard, and most days it's just locals out there with or without a dog.

Marin is a dog-friendly county, with many educated owners and well-socialized animals. We pick up after our dogs and do not allow them to be nuisances.

I understand that the Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Thanks -  
Sylvia

---

**Correspondence ID:** 819    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 11:20:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Plans A through F are unacceptable to me as a dog owner who loves to see my dog able to run around freely at Ft Funston, Ocean Beach, and Chrissy Field. I 100% support saving the 1979 Pet Policy Plan as the new permanent plan or rule.

Our dogs aren't doing any harm to the environment, they are more a part of the natural environment than we are. Humans are the environments worst enemy! Dog owners are responsible people and take care of and pick up after their dogs in these areas. I've never encountered an issue with another dog owner not being responsible. We know how precious and lucky we are to have these areas for our dogs.

Please save the 1979 Pet Policy Plan! My Laboradoodle Caleb would forever be grateful and so would I.

Thank you  
Ashley Leifer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 820 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 11:22:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We want our dogs to have access to these areas that are in question as well as be able to run free on trails and beaches where it has always been ok to do so.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 821 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to all the trails and areas that are being restricted.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 822 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941-3588  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 11:41:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. I strongly support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I frequently take my dogs to Marin county GGNRA trails and beaches. Dogs are prohibited on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There is no compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. No peer-reviewed, site-specific studies support such restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy which works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 823    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 13:20:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Marin County Trails - Need MORE Dogs Access

To Whom it May Concern:

Countless studies have shown the immense physical and mental advantages of dog ownership. In Marin County we have a beautiful outdoor space where we are privileged to get our exercise with our beloved canine companions.

Dogs on leashes do NOT cause problems other than waste management. It has been my experience that Marin County dog owners are extremely conscientious about picking up their dog litter, and so what is the logic in the further restriction of dogs on our magnificent hills.

As a Marin County tax payer and voter, I respectfully request that you EXPAND on leash dog access, but if necessary increase the fines on those who do not pick up after their dogs.

Thank you for consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Sherry Thomas-Healy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 824    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 13:58:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs and Madames,

I was born and raised in the Bay Area, traveled the world for work, and despite my love of other countries, returned to my home of Marin County to raise my family. Part of what I appreciate about this region, and what brought me home, is our collective effort to create a model of tolerance and mutual respect for all life. I believe this should carry over to responsible dog ownership.

Having witnessed my younger sister being attacked by dog at the age of seven, an attack which led to a huge number of facial stitches, one might assume I would be pro-dog leash at all times. However, I think that just like there are some bad seeds of people, there are some bad seeds of dogs, and not all dogs (and dog owners) should face punishment and prohibitive laws because of a few bad seeds.

The joy and emotional support brought to many a family via off leash playing with their dog(s) together in places such as parks, beaches, and open spaces provides meaningful connection for many individuals. True that on rare occasions, there are out of control dogs and irresponsible owners. But the vast majority of dogs and dog owners work together beautifully, as can be witnessed on any given day at open spaces throughout the Bay Area.

We live in a society in which a great deal of decisions are made out of fear. Doing so begets only more fear, not to mention increasing insurance costs due to litigious behaviors rather than personal responsibility. It is healthy and wise to be aware of fear; it is unhealthy and unproductive to lead with fear. I implore our elected officials and the decision makers of our region to lead with the power of positivity rather than fear and keep open spaces available for off leash freedom of families with dogs.

Thank you.

Kind regards,  
Kimberly Falkenburg

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	825	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

In addition, on some open space trails (not GGNRA), there is a CARRY LEASH policy. If people carry leashes for their dogs, people who object to a dog's behavior can ask the owner to put the dog on leash.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	826	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,03,2014 14:35:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** As a resident of Muir Beach, I cannot urge you strongly enough to retain the current policy regarding dogs and their access to beaches and trails- - to restrict them even further seems pointless. This is the sort of thoughtless silliness that makes people distrust and loose respect for their government. Why you would restrict dogs from beaches and trails while at the same time doing everything in your power to encourage an even heavier carbon footprint in the increased amount of cars and people flooding into a tiny valley and even smaller and more fragile site is beyond comprehension. This is senseless and absurd meddling and, by the way, will be extremely tiresome to try to enforce - - BACK OFF, Parks Department.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 827    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 14:48:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you,  
Tracey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 828    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 15:16:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love hiking and beach walking with my dogs. I keep them on leash, except on certain beach areas. I take them to the beach when few people are there- weekdays . They are well trained. As much as I would love to let them run free on the trails - I know this is what will take the privilege away from all of us- so they are on leash. I have lived where there was nowhere to walk a dog off leash - except my backyard! If dog owners want to keep our privilege to enjoy the outdoors with our beloved four legged friends- please ask other owners to obey leash laws. If we did not see dogs on trails where they are not allowed, and leash laws ignored-we would not be fighting to keep our present privileges. I also think the park service could do a better job with signage, and tickets should be issued to pay for enforcement of the rules. This would be far better than loosing our special lifestyle in Marin.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 829    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the trails around Tenn Valley and Miwok. These are already very limited trails and when running I not only feel safer with my dog, we both are enjoying the outdoors and exercising... primary reasons I moved to Mill Valley!

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 830    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 16:08:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please take account of the phenomenon that the people who are annoyed by inconsiderate dog owners are less vociferous than the owners who loudly proclaim their demands. I live alongside Lafayette Park in San Francisco which just been redeveloped at considerable expense. It has an a specific area for dogs. More owners than not continue to use the entire park (including the area adjacent to the toddler playground) to play and poop their dogs off leash. I have seen no effort to correct the condition. Ask them why this is the case and whether any rules for dogs will be obeyed or enforced. It makes this process hard to take seriously.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 831    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mil Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 16:42:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We Oppose the GGNRA's dog management plan, there should be more trails available for dogs not less.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 832 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 16:42:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have two dogs in San Francisco and our dog walker is respectful and conscientious of GGNRA property. Please do not remove a way in which dogs can enjoy the surroundings of GGNRA offleash. Please consider the needs of our dog community.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 833 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Oakwood Valley Trail and Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs, was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

It doesn't make any sense to be more restrictive. Just think of all the unintended consequences...

Thank you,

Marge Entwistle and Emma and Dylan, my two Shetland Sheepdogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 834 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 17:18:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, I am a frequent walker in Fort Funston and Ocean Beach, and spend a lot of time in other GGNRA parks. Often with family members and my dog.



I am opposed to the entire proposed GGNRA Dog Management Policy. There is no evidence or studies that show dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety or damaging the resources of the Recreation Area.

The GGNRA wrongly asserts in this SEIS that they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" from what it was defined in enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA. The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design.

I strongly oppose the SEIS' "Monitoring-based Management Strategy", which is just a mechanism tried earlier that allows GGNRA to decide whether we are in compliance, since the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. This goes against the spirit of the enabling legislation and is totally unacceptable.

The GGNRA should instead codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation, which it has the authority and responsibility to do. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area, which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it or these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

Thank you for your attention in this manner. Please do not fix something that isn't broken!

Regards

Greg King

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	835	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,03,2014 19:49:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'd like to express my opinion that dogs should be kept away from sensitive habitats. We do need to ensure that there are enough places for dogs to roam, but not on federal land that may be impaired by their activities. I wholeheartedly agree with the NPS's decision to ban dogs in certain areas.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	836	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 20:22:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Almost one-third of households in San Francisco have dogs. The plan to limit off-leash access for the city's dogs means that our city parks will become over run with dogs.

The new plan affects not only dog owners: anyone who uses city parks will immediately notice the difference. The city parks alone are not large enough for all the dogs that already live here in the city!

This new plan is bad for dog owners AND for people who do not have dogs.

Please reconsider!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 837 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 20:35:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We need better cooperation from dog owners. We all love dogs but when they go after birds at the beach it's just not right. I have never been to Ocean Beach without seeing that happen. Maybe dogs should be completely restricted if their owners can't control them. The dog owners who think it's ok for their dogs to chase birds and other wildlife, the people who are sentimental about their animals can't be allowed to take over. Birds are beautiful too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 838 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94928  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 20:43:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for your tremendous efforts in this work. Your efforts are appreciated. I am impressed with the depth you have gone too. I used to walk my dogs on Cronkite Beach for many years and those times are among my best memories. Please allow some form of off leash walking as this makes for a great connection between dogs and other dogs and owners. Thanks again for your great work.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 839 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 21:13:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** GGNRAA must be kept open for use by folks and our dogs, you won't like the backlash in our neighborhoods I can assure you!

Next thing the city will attempt to ban dogs altogether. Good Luck with that and all your political maneuvers .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 840 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 21:23:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Golden Gate and Fort Funston open to off-leash dogs!  
We are a city full of dog lovers and need open spaces to keep our canine companions happy and healthy.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 841 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 21:53:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep these wonderful areas open to city dogs. They need it more than we do  
to have as many natural and stimulating environments as possible.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 842 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 22:07:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Fort Funston is frequented by dog owners, keep it that way. Dog owners vote and  
are more passionate than typical voters/donors

---

**Correspondence ID:** 843 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 23:08:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge you not to increase restrictions on dog walking in the ggnra. Thousands of  
people benefit from being able to walk their dogs both on and off leash in the ggnra. San Francisco has  
over 100,000 dogs that need a place to excercise. If they are not able to use the areas they have been using  
in the ggnra for the last 20 years it will overwhelm the city parks with dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 844 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,03,2014 23:25:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** This proposal if allowed to be put into effect will have profoundly negative consequences on the citizens of San Francisco. There is an abundance of land for all to enjoy the natural beauty and resources of the GGNRA. To focus on limiting areas for the 120,000 dogs that live here is going to have a drastic impact on the use and enjoyment not only of the GGNRA but our city parks as well. Please, allow common sense to prevail. These limitations are severe, unnecessarily restrictive and will dramatically lesson the use and enjoyment of these areas for \*all\* citizens, not only those who enjoy the parks with their canine family members.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 845 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,03,2014 23:46:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs need places to run freely.

Dogs are more sociable when off-leash.

The majority of dog owners are responsible.

As a Muir Beach resident, I respect the natural habitat and make sure my dogs are under control, well-trained, and responsive to voice commands.

Muir Beach and trails throughout the Marin Headlands should be SHARED and not dictated by a minority.

California has hundreds of miles of coastline for birds and sea life such that environmentalists' arguments that Muir Beach and Marin trails need more regulation are unfounded.

It is unreasonable to limit off-leash dogs to Rodeo Beach which in fact seems to get more urban visitors than beaches further north.

The status quo is working; more rules do not equate to better solutions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 846 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 00:55:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep these areas off leash for dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 847 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 01:11:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

San Francisco is a city founded on the principle of many living as one. As a whole, we are a community committed to taking care that our individual choices don't harm others.

In the case of our many parks, dog owners here are particularly dedicated to making sure others are not bothered or harmed by their pets. Difficult or aggressive dogs are almost never encountered in off-leash

areas, and owners are quick to rein in overly-friendly or rambunctious dogs.

The generous off-leash areas in San Francisco are in fact an important safety valve, because dogs who are well exercised are almost never aggressive in more restrained situations like small city parks and sidewalks. Dogs who are never allowed off leash can become anxious and unpredictable, which is much more of a concern than dogs running free and relaxed in wide-open areas like Baker and Crissy Beaches.

San Francisco is chock full of dogs who need regular exercise to be safe and happy members of our community. Please consider the logic of this. We hope you will realize how well our parks function when ample space is allowed for dogs to release their natural energy and live peacefully with all their human neighbors.

Thank you,  
Cara and Miles

---

**Correspondence ID:** 848    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 07:55:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service:

There are 120000 dogs in San Francisco. They need a place to go. Keep Fort Funston and Crissy field open. The dogs are here to stay and need a place to run. If you stop them from these place, the city parks will be overrun. Are you thinking that they will be banned from there next? Leave these spaces open.  
Joan Loeffler  
415-816-1335

---

**Correspondence ID:** 849    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 08:28:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs must be allowed off-leash in Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and at Crissy Field.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 850    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 09:35:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not further restrict off- leash dog areas. There are so few currently available. I'd prefer more. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 851    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94112  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 09:40:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please please please we need areas to walk our dogs!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 852 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Save McLaren Park Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 09:45:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm writing to express my STRONG OPPOSITION to the proposed dog management plan for GGNRA. My concern stems from how this plan will negatively affect Bay Area parks that are not part of the GGNRA. By pushing most of the dogs out of the GGNRA, the most likely place for people to take their pets is regional and urban parks, such as McLaren Park in the south eastern portion of San Francisco.

McLaren is a dog-friendly place, and already there's concern that heavy dog use is affecting the flora and fauna of the park, especially with the volume of dog walkers with their client's pets. If GGNRA properties are deemed off limits to dogs, parks like McLaren will be overwhelmed and the natural environment of this park could be severely damaged.

By spreading dogs throughout all the open space in the bay area, including GGNRA properties, the damage to any one location will be minimized.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 853 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 09:56:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I use both Fort Funston and Crissy Field regularly for dog recreation. I prefer to see no changes on any of these site, or the other GGNRA sites. The documentation is confusing at best, but if you are forcing a choice, Alternative A is the only viable option for my use.

I also employ responsible dog walkers who use these sites, and we depend on their continued, year round access.

The proposals for seasonal access rules are absurd.

Please remember that GGNRA works for me and other dog owners.

I expect GGNRA and the US Government to apply fair and equitable access to all kinds of recreational usage, in my case off leash pet exercise and quality family time with our pet.

Steve Loving

---

**Correspondence ID:** 854 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 09:57:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** we NEED off leash dog areas in this very dog-friendly city!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 855 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Nevada City, CA 95959  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 10:04:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Baker Beach open to off leash dogs. If the entire city is on leash, the dogs have no place to enjoy the best aspect of being a dog, running free. I have the fondest memories of my dog running those beaches with a look of ultimate joy on her face. I would like others to be able to continue to have the same experience.Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 856 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 10:08:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NPS Decision Makers,

I urge you to maintain unleashed access to dogs accompanied by their owners on Park land.

As a life long resident of Marin County, I've been to Muir Beach many times, some with a dog and some without. Sharing the beach with dogs is part of the character of Muir that everyone I know appreciates.

The existing policy increases use of the area by local residents, many of whom own dogs and would not visit the beach otherwise. The policy also aids local businesses like the Pelican Inn, who are often frequented by dog walkers like me and my wife.

In other areas like Oakwood Valley and Alta Ridge, use is predominantly by dog walkers, who pose no conflict with other activities. It would be a shame to limit a dog's freedom in these areas and essentially close the trails to half the population by changing the current policy or instituting any plan beyond voice control.

Thank you,

Howard Flax

---

**Correspondence ID:** 857 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,04,2014 10:25:21**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I seriously oppose this law that has been put on the ballot, particularly with Fort Funston. Had I not had a dog I would have never learned of Fort Funston. The second citizens of San Francisco (the dogs) need this space as well as their owners, many of them whom pay property taxes that seem to benefit everyone but themselves in the city.

As it stands, Crissey Field and Fort Funston among others are needed by the dog walkers. Taking that away will overcrowd the city parks with animals. The City parks are now shared by animals that are familiar with each other and live in harmony with parents and their children. The facts remain that dogs outnumber the children of the city. Dogwalking is another source of employment as well as revenue for the City in licensing. Not everyone works at Silicon Valley and thank God for that, but I'm sure that many of them have animals and use DogWalkers. Whoever proposed this law must hate animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 858 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,04,2014 10:31:05**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very concerned with the conservation of our City parks, and the impact that extremely restrictive regulation of dogs in our treasured GGNRA/SF will have on our neighborhood parks. So please do keep on/off leash areas available, except Land's End which is a very, very delicate habitat.

For the sake of fair distribution of dogs in San Francisco County, and the safety of people, critters and the land, I prefer the following options:

Upper Fort Mason Map 9-C

Crissy Field Map 10-D

Fort Point Maps appear to have little difference, on to the other, so any will do

Baker Beach Map 12-E

Land's End Map 13-D

Sutro Heights Park Map 14-A

Ocean Beach Map 15-A

Fort Funston Map 16-F

Thank you for your exceptional efforts to address a very difficult situation.

All the best for 2014!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 859 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,04,2014 10:42:01**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I support alternative "D".



This process has been hijacked by a small but vocal minority. Though there's some room for leashed dog walking in a federal protected area that harbors threatened species, this balance has swung ludicrously far away from resource protection due to steady, aggressive pressure by a minority.

At this point virtually all of the GGNRA is a de-facto off-leash dog area! Because of relentless political pressure, the NPS has been unable to enforce the existing laws. Some areas - the beaches near Chrissy Field, and Fort Funston, for example - are so crowded with unleashed dogs that their use for any other purpose is effectively denied to other park visitors. Exploring a scenic beach loses its appeal when the experience is reduced to a steady stream of uncontrolled dogs running at you, jumping on you, or sniffing your crotch. You need to do what is right, obey the laws that guide your agency, and protect the land that's in your trust.

The concept of "voice control" seems to have no legal definition, and in practice all areas with "voice control" regulations simply become at-large off-leash dog toileting areas.

Please take the time to leave your planning offices and visit ANY of the areas under discussion. Within minutes you'll see that the NPS has completely ceded control of these places to those possessing uncontrolled dogs, both on the ground - and now - in the planning process.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	860	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,04,2014 11:00:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't restrict the places dogs can go! As dog owners, we love being able to bring our dog to Fort Funston with us, and as parents we prefer that dogs are there in big open spaces rather than clogging up smaller local parks! Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	861	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94610 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,04,2014 11:11:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	If it's not barken, don't fix it!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	862	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,04,2014 11:17:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello, As a responsible SF dog owner for over 20 years, I am extremely concerned about the proposed ban of				

---

dogs from Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and most of Ocean Beach.

As you know, nearly one-third of households in San Francisco include at least one dog, and they all need to be walked daily. Limiting the areas that already allow dogs will flood our city parks with dogs (both on and off-leash), which seems unnecessary and counter-productive.

Please do not support this ban.

Regards,  
Thomas Muer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	863	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,04,2014 11:17:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not restrict dog access to Chrissy Field, Fort Funston or Ocean Beach. People with dogs must have access to exercise their pets.				

Thank you,  
Mary

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	864	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SF, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,04,2014 11:54:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Don't take away our dogs happy places! Happy dogs are well behaved dogs- Fort Funston w/o dogs off leash? Crazy!!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	865	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,04,2014 12:13:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have owned a dog for most of the 20 years I have lived in San Francisco. When ever I have visited Fort Funston, either with my dog when he was alive, or with my children with out a dog, I have enjoyed the experience. I also noticed that almost everyone there was with a four legged friend. Very few people were there otherwise. It would be a shame to take away off leash access. Less people will visit Funston. Suggesting certain times during the year access should be more limited makes more sense.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	866	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 12:15:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Folks,

I am another Marin County dog-owning resident, and also oppose Alternative F, the plan restricting dog activity in the GGRA. Instead, I would ask you change your focus to the "No Action" Alternative A.

I regularly use the GGRA, and take my dog to Muir Beach or Oakwood Valley Trail 3 or 4 times a week.

As you know, almost all of the GGRA is off-limits to dogs. There aren't any real reasons to restrict the rest, and there aren't any studies that support these restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

As you also know, the GGRA was created as a recreational area for local residents, and is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite, so a different strategy for management for the GGRA is necessary.

The original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy calls for access for all users, including people and their dogs. This was a cornerstone of the that policy, and it still works today, and will work in the future.

We appreciate and love the opportunity to use our open space! Please, consider the concerns of the population of Marin County and the Bay Area when you make your decisions.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Darrell Adams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 867    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 12:24:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the dog management plan for the GGNRA. I am a dog owner and have been for the last 35 years. One of my favorite places to walk/contemplate and exercise is Fort Funston. The proposed reduction in off leash areas will greatly compromise my and my dog's enjoyment of the area. I support option A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 868    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 12:28:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a native San Franciscan, a responsible dog owner and a senior citizen. In order for me and my two dogs to get adequate exercise, we need reasonably easy access too off-leash areas where we can walk a sufficient distance in a pleasant outdoor environment. Currently there are far too few such areas in San Francisco.

---

At present, I must drive several miles from my home to access a pleasant off-leash area to walk with my dogs. Your current proposal would unacceptably decrease the number and size of such areas. Walking with my dogs is an important part of my health regime; it is equally important for my dogs' health to be able to obtain adequate exercise. Walking on leash with a 70-year-old woman does not afford them adequate exercise.

The passing of any proposal which further limits the off-leash areas in San Francisco would be a travesty. If the current off-leash areas seem crowded, it is simply because they already are to limited in area. We need more off-leash open space, not less.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 869    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 12:44:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose any ban on dogs at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Baker and Ocean beaches. These areas are wonderful resources that Bay Area residents, and their dogs, should continue to be allowed to enjoy. Fort Funston, in particular is one of the few paved off-leash areas in SF and allows access for people with disabilities or injuries to walk, crutch, or wheel with their dogs off-leash. I grew up in SF, and now have a child and I very much enjoy taking him to these parks and have never experienced a negative interaction with dogs. It is important that we retain these areas as places where we can enjoy the outdoors with dogs. Every so many years the GGNRA considers banning dogs, and there is such tremendous outcry every time because so many people with dogs share these outdoor spaces and use them on a daily basis. These outdoor spaces provide beautiful, free places for people to enjoy our natural and local resources, get exercise, and appreciate our city. Do not take away this space. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 870    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 13:00:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do NOT ban dogs from public park lands! This is absolutely not necessary. I live right next to the Marina Green in San Francisco and a few blocks from Crissy Field in the Presidio. I see these areas every day. There has been no damage done to the parks due to canines. None. I am a big environmental supporter, and, believe me, if I thought for one minute that dogs were harmful to the people, the wildlife, or the environment, I would be the first one backing this plan....but, they simply are not a problem! Let this idea go!

My husband, Jeff Morris, agrees with me.

Sincerely,  
Sharon Morris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 871    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,04,2014 13:02:16**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment. My initial response would be to support Alternative D, because we have been negatively affected while on GGNRA land by dogs and dog owners in the past. But after reading through more, I am willing to be satisfied with Alternative F. Alternative E seems to have too much enforcement that will eventually negatively impact parks because of cost and lack of funds. I really appreciate the fact that you are addressing the increase in the number of professional dogwalkers and the number of dogs they have. There is really no way they can handle so many dogs sometimes and it makes me and my family very uncomfortable when we see them coming. I hope that SF parks and rec follows this recommendation as well.

Regards,

Kim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 872 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,04,2014 13:10:33**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For God's sake what are you people thinking? Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and Fort Funston are not fragile rural ecosystems filled with rare species and so forth. San Francisco is a big city, and these are its beaches. The giant concrete retaining wall on Ocean Beach or the thousands of buildings by Crissy Field should have tipped you off. This is a solution in search of a problem.

Hundreds of thousands of people and their dogs happily use these beaches every day. If you need to make restricted areas without dogs, they should be as few as possible. Stop trying to pretend that this is Yellowstone and respect the wishes of the people who ACTUALLY USE these highly urban beaches every single day. This is a City! It's full of people - and their dogs. The few NIMBYs who think they should have the advantages of living in a big city, yet have empty beaches and trails whenever they want them right outside their door, are selfish and unrealistic. If you want an empty beach experience, move to Mendocino.

I am genuinely flabbergasted at how restrictive and unrealistic these proposed rules are. It is almost like the people who drafted them had never seen how the beaches actually are used, or where they actually are, or thought about whether the rules could possibly work.

If this comment is a little strident, I am sorry. I just get frustrated when I see the same few curmudgeons exaggerating and imagining problems to get their way. No, people are not being attacked all the time on the beaches. No, Crissy Field is not a giant open sewer. No, normal children are not terrified when they go to the beach and a dog runs by and sniffs them. People and dogs coexist just fine right now on these beaches. If you think it necessary to set aside an area as a "children's beach" or a plover habitat, that makes sense. But other than that, the default status should remain as unrestricted as possible, in keeping with the reality of urban beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 873 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 14:31:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

I do not see any valid reasons why these spaces (particularly Fort Funston) which have ben used this way for so long now have to change.

I live near McLaren Park, which also has a large and well-used off-leash area for dogs, perhaps the only other one in the city that is equivalent to Fort Funston or Chrissy Field. I am concerned that if this new plan goes into effect, then McLaren will become even more heavily over-used, creating a serious threat to this beautiful city park.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	874	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,04,2014 15:07:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern,				

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed dog management plan for Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I am a long-time resident of San Francisco, and a have been a pubic educator in the city since 2003.

I have actively served my city (and my nation's) children and their families by providing experienced educational leadership, particularly in the area of literacy. I hold two master's degrees: a Master of Science in Teaching from New School University in New York City, and a Master of Arts in Educational Leadership from University of California, Berkeley. I taught in San Francisco public schools from 2003 - 2013, and have recently taken on a new educational role as Assistant Principal of a public K-8 school in Oakland, CA.

I am also the owner of a rescue dog named Theo. I actively use Golden Gate National Recreation Area as a place to both enjoy nature and to experience the release that both Theo and I acquire because of our access to such a beautiful space. My ability to visit Golden Gate National Recreation Area will be restricted if the proposed dog management plan goes into effect. As life in San Francisco and the Bay Area becomes even more financially restricted for the poor, artists, activists, and civil servants such as myself, the open access that Golden Gate National Recreation Area provides must be maintained. The proposed dog management plan with contribute to the homogenization of a region already beset by severe economic and social inequity. All residents of the Bay Area (both human and dog) need access to places that provide sustenance and renewal.

If the proposed dog management plan goes into effect, I will consider moving to another area of California, taking my extensive educational leadership and social service experience with me.

Thank you,  
~Meroe Elahi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 875    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 15:13:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do not change the off-leash laws that are presently in place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 876    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
I live in Sausalito and walk my three small well behaved mixed breed dogs frequently in the Marin headlands.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 877    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 16:47:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Friends -

Increasingly across the planet we are removing fauna from public places.

Dogs provide humans with a connection to animals and to wildlife by patiently serving us, listening to us and sharing their world with us. Dogs bring joy, peace and love to humans. Dog-owners are among the few humans that recognize the importance of animals to the health of the planet and the human population.

By limiting the areas for dogs and their humans to roam, you sever the connection between man and nature and you deprive one of the more important contributors to the health of the planet - human cared-for dogs - a last space to act as dogs. it is cruel, unthinking, unconscious and unnecessary.

There is very little public space for human-dog recreation. Do not eliminate any more. In urban and suburban areas, which mankind must develop and evolve if life is to continue on the planet, we must also keep our connections to nature, to animals, to flowers and grasses and trees. There is no need to keep dogs off public lands - especially when so much of this land is already restricted against dogs. Do not take anymore of this land away.

Thank you,

Virginia Thomson  
Conservationist, Mother

---

**Correspondence ID:** 878    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 17:16:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco and a frequent user of GGNR, for hiking and bird watching. I am also a Biologist. I do not think dogs should be allowed off leash within the GGNR. In addition I do not think that professional dog walkers should be allowed to use GGNR. Our federal lands are not used by other commercial entities. Some dog owners are responsible for cleaning up their dog feces while others are not. The urine that dogs produce cannot be removed and produces foul odors that accumulate during the dry season. I believe that the buildup of nitrogenous wastes from dogs is harmful to the soil and the plants that grow within the GGNR. A number of these plants and the animals that depend on them are endemic to the area. Many dog owners are not responsible about keeping their dogs under control and this results in danger not only to humans but more importantly to wildlife. The GGNR is established to be a place of recreation for people and also a place to protect the beautiful and valuable resources of the area; because the Bay Area is so densely populated these uses are not compatible with major dog usages of the areas.

To make regulations hold, there will need to be more rangers or other enforcement people dedicated to giving citations out to people breaking the regulations and the citations should carry a significant fine. I believe this would be a good use of resources since the damages that dogs cause can be significant. Dog owners have been given a chance to show responsibility for their pets and have, in my observations, failed notably at doing so.

Thank you for considering my comments.  
A San Francisco Biologist

---

**Correspondence ID:** 879    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 17:57:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** San Francisco residents and their dogs are all part of a healthy community. Getting out and walking with your dog has been proven to increase mental and physical health. Reducing the places dogs can walk in the city, will increase stress, mental illness and physical ailments. Can San Francisco afford this burden when population density is on the increase?

Also, the idea that we are making a conservation effort in the middle of an urban area is silly. It is not along the shores of a major city that we should be trying to revert back to nature. But the many miles with private single family homes or housing complexes. But also, even with many people getting out and visiting the beaches, we have had little impact on the over bay and coast health. It has been big business, oil tanker spills, chemicals release into the water system and air causing environmental pollution. Not a dog running on the beach.

I wonder, too, is this just another move to keep us out. I live in the south east part of the city and one day when we tried to visit the Presidio, the entrance from Presidio street is closed off. Of course, Fort Mason entrance is open to the Marina community while we had to lose over 30 minutes making the detour. Are you sure you don't want to keep the beaches for the rich in the big condo being in the Presidio?

Long time SF resident,  
S.J. Ong

---

**Correspondence ID:** 880    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Cocoa, FL 32926  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 18:06:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It would be a shame to restrict or exclude dogs and responsible owners from trails in the GGNRA. The taxpayers pay the maintenance for the area. It is a beautiful area and has a lot of room for various groups or individuals to enjoy. Although I no longer live in the Bay Area, I would hate to see restrictions placed on responsible dog owners to not be able to enjoy the area with their dogs. I enjoyed many days hiking and spending time on the beach with the two dogs I had then. I have always hoped to visit friends there with my dogs and enjoy the GGNRA again.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 881    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94709  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel that the proposed revision of the dog policy in the GGNRA would be an improvement and would like to see strong enforcement in defense of wildlife and peaceful enjoyment of the park for all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 882    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94709  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 18:11:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel that the proposed revision of the dog policy in the GGNRA would be an improvement and would like to see strong enforcement in defense of wildlife and peaceful enjoyment of the park for all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 883    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Hornthal & Co., Inc. Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 18:37:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As 33 year residents of SF who have raised children and dogs in the city, my husband and I are concerned that one of the reasons we enjoy our city (we have ample space within which to exercise our dogs) is being severely threatened. Dogs are a part of what makes an environment habitable. For them to behave in a civilized manner they need to be able to get their necessary exercise. I believe that Sf is a city that prides itself on trying to make space for all comers as long as they practice reciprocity and respect the space of others. I believe that the new laws under consideration are too limiting for dog owners and their dogs and compromise the quality of life for both. This is not the city I moved to 33 years ago, nor is it the city my husband or now adult children will be happiest in if such changes are enacted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 884    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,04,2014 18:38:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I doubt that I have any comments to make that you have not already heard, but please add this letter to those who oppose restricting off leash dog walking at Crissy Field or Fort Funston. Although they are part of the National Park system, they are parks in urban areas where off leash dog walking is a longstanding tradition and I believe a good one. The wildlife and native plant life habitat has not been impacted so much by dogs but by people. Shorebirds used to be plentiful at Crissy Field when I walked my dog there before the restoration project and the onslaught of windsurfing, The Americas Cup and the thousands of people walking along the paths now bordering the shore. It is beautiful and I appreciate the great effort that has gone into the planting of native plants, but I don't believe it has really improved the area for wildlife.  
I ask that you please leave the off leash dog walking areas intact

---

**Correspondence ID:** 885    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 18:43:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Oakwood Valley Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 886 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 887 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 19:30:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not take away the joy of watching happy dogs romp at Crissy Field. It's one of the pleasures of daily life in this wonderful city. The space given to dogs in LIMITED and SMALL as it is. Do not change it.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 888    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 19:55:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a responsible and proud dog owner, and a voting tax payer, I implore you to reconsider banning off-leash areas in GGNP. In particular, my dogs and I use Fort Funston on a very regular basis it is almost my only exposure to parks and a significant portion of my personal hiking and outdoors time. My dogs enjoy the outdoors, and I enjoy the outdoors with them. If part of the mission of our parks is to allow Californians to enjoy the parks, then making fewer and fewer parks unfriendly to dogs and dog owners then you are excluding more and more of the human population.

In fact, every time I have out of town guests I take them to Ft. Funston, which I call the greatest dog park on Earth. All of my guests have marveled at the beauty of San Francisco and California at this park. Please don't take this away from us.

Thank you,  
Cara Meverden

---

**Correspondence ID:** 889    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,04,2014 22:42:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Fort Funston is one of the best dog areas in the city, it is fine exactly the way it is. When we are there on the weekend, there are thousands of people and their dog, freely walking and playing. Why is the Federal government coming in and changing what is working, is that like some oath you took "We shall make that that works, not work"? Where are all the dog owners going to go? Your plans new plans, even the more more liberal one, is an attack on the citizens of San Francisco. If you go through with i=this, it will be shame and a lesson to keep the Feds out of our parks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 890    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 00:08:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is the BIGGEST mistake the city is about to make.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 891    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 00:10:15

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail. Donahue Marin City trail, and Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	892	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGRA				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Oakwood Valley Trail, Miwok Trail, Wolf Ridge Trail, Rhubarb Trail, Coastal Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I'll leave with one final thought. You seem to be hell-bent on banning dogs on the trails and beaches in and around GGRA in Marin County, but I don't see any mention of banning horses from the very same trails. Horses do far more destructive damage to the trails than dogs, with these 3,000 lb. animal's hoofs eroding the trails, not to mention the large mounds of shit that is left behind by their owners/riders. I myself use these trails to run and hike, and I find it very annoying that I have to be subjected to stench, health hazards, and inconvenience, of the enormous quantities of horse shit. You need to get (pardon the

expression) your heads out of your asses before you start to effect the lives of Marin County residents, who appreciate the environment they live in, and quite frankly pay quite the premium to live here.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 893    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 01:48:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I commend you for your exhaustive, comprehensive approach to this challenging issue. I don't envy your having to try to appease all the various groups and their respective passionately held opinions, so thank you for your efforts.

As a dog owner, I can certainly appreciate the benefits of enjoying the beautiful outdoors with one's pet dog(s). But I must say that I have seen too many instances of irresponsible dog owners who don't adequately manage their pet, be it picking up the waste or keeping them under proper control. I can certainly appreciate that there are people who are afraid of dogs or who simply don't want them in certain areas of NPS areas. It is also my strong sense that we are dealing with a very fragile ecosystem that is being subjected to ever increasing use, one that deserves more than less protection.

Though I love dogs, I am even more of a nature lover. There are, after all, other alternatives other than NPS territory for recreating with one's pet dog(s). Thus, I support Alternatives C and F. C is my first choice, F my second. I think the ability to effectively enforce whatever policy is chosen should be a major deciding factor; there is no point in choosing an Alternative that can't realistically be enacted, especially in this era of governmental budget cuts.

My main observation, however, is that the Dog Management Plan document is simply overwhelming. I can't imagine how anyone has the bandwidth to really take in all this information. Unless one is an attorney and used to dealing with such massive documents, I don't think the average person can absorb it all. Perhaps a summary document with the important points and summarized options would be useful.

Thank you again for your efforts.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 894    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94401  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 08:26:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. If there were an alternative to EXPAND dog-friendly areas, I would support that.

I do not have a dog, but I appreciate meeting dogs on my visits to the GGNRA.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 895    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 09:44:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep dog spaces open. Where would they go? They do live here and are part of this urban community. The idea of restricting access as much as I see on the maps is unrealistic. Voice control areas are necessary. We love the beaches & our families and pets do too. This is a necessary part of our community.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 896    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 11:09:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

Myself and my family would very much like to see the current dog policy stay in place within the GGNRA. We use the parks frequently with our dog and meet friends there with their dogs. We visit Fort Funston, Sweeney Ridge, Milagra Ridge and the Marin Headlands multiple times per month.

Please do not change the existing dog policies.

Thank you - Andrew Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 897    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94801  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** PIDO Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 12:59:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Re: Dog walking access in five areas. Please don't limit dog access to your parks for responsible dog owners. It's very hard for working pet owners to exercise their dogs as it is now. Limiting dog access puts an unfair burden on a specific population which seems very much like discrimination. I do beleive the parks can be shared in a fair and just way by all park goers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 898    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 13:06:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ocean Beach should be completely off-limits to dogs since dog owners consistently refuse to leash or clean up after their dogs and the GGNRA lacks the means to enforce leash and dog feces laws. Dogs off leash regularly harass people, other dogs and wildlife. The NPS has failed to provide adequate signage to inform dog owners of their responsibilities and the fines are too low to make an effective impression.

Dog feces are a public health hazard. Children playing on the beach are constantly exposed to this hazard. Owners do not clean up after their dogs and there is little or no enforcement.

Dog owners seem to feel as though they are exempt from the law and that they have special privileges. There are many responsible owners, but as in many other cases of the abuse of the commons, irresponsible dog owners ruin it for the rest.

I have often approached dog owners whose dogs are off leash in areas that are off-limits and whose dogs are left to harass wildlife. The responses range from ignorance (feigned or other wise), which is due in part to a lack of signage, and outright hostility as if their dogs have some kind of inalienable rights.

Dog owners have only themselves to blame for restrictions on their dogs. As a group, they have shown a lack of respect for the law, understanding of the impacts of their dogs on wildlife and the failure to police themselves.

The GGNRA is an invaluable resource for all to share. Those who fail to abide by common courtesy and personal responsibility have forfeited their rights to bring their pets to this common space.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 899    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 14:03:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our family respectfully requests that GGNR not restrict access to Muir Beach to dogs off leash. There are so few places where we can let our little guy run free. We do not have a yard for him to run. He is a 10 lb. dog that is terrified of big dogs, so taking him to dog parks is not an option for us. Muir Beach is one of the only places he can let his doggie spirit out. We are conscientious dog owners and always clean up after our dog no matter where we are. In this age of computers and other electronic distractions for kids, taking our dog to the beach with our 13 year old is one family bonding experience we don't want to lose. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 900    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 14:32:33

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Alta, Miwok and Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 901    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 14:41:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep dog access available and encourage others to be responsible stewards for their dogs! Pick up waste, control aggressive dogs, and maintain our beautiful parks. But don't ban our dogs, please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 902    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 15:38:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I can't take my family to the Sausalito beach anymore because there is so much dog poop in the sand and in the water. My 2 year old plays in the sand and always end up with dog poop in her hand. This is disgusting.  
Thanks for helping with this and making sure Muir Beach remains child friendly (i.e. controlling dog's poop by keeping them off the beach or on leash)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 903    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 16:11:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am all for a ban on off leash dogs. Dog owners in this city need to be more responsible. I have seen dogs steal food from tots and scare them, as well as use open areas for bathrooms where their owners don't clean up.

---

If you can't take care of your pet - don't get one.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	904	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I am writing to ask you to please not implement your new dog management plan. This updated plan will still dog areas by 90% ad will have a very negative impact on the Bay Area. People need areas to walk their dogs, where will we be able to go? Any remaining areas will be completely overrun.

I had hoped that this new plan would be an improvement over the original GGNRA dog management plan, because of the overwhelming opposition to the last one. This new plan, however, ignores what the vast majority of people say they want.

The SEIS plan will ban people with dogs from 99.9% o the GGNRA's 80,000 acres. There is no way that one can say this plan is balanced or fair, since it denies dog-walking access to hundreds of thousands of people in the Bay Area who have dogs.

There is no credible reason why people with dogs are not allowed to have adequate and reasonable space to walk them in the vast area that comprises the GGNRA.

Are there no dog lovers in the National Park Service? Is there no one there that understands the joy of enjoying the outdoors with your pet? It would not be such a hardship if there were a number other places in this area to go to but there are not. Can't your mission include finding a reasonable way to serve the needs of such a large portion of the people who live and visit this area.

It would seem to be a much more reasonable strategy to work with dog people, who I know could be an important resource for contributions and volunteers to help maintain the parks. Instead of alienating a large portion of the population why not work with them. Instead of having meetings where there is no real discussion why not have meetings where all points of view are listened to. Making so many people so angry does no one any good.

Isn't it possible to have some of the plans discussed be at least remotely acceptable to dog lovers? The way it is now the Park Service is pretending to listen and to have public comment but you must know you are not fooling anyone. The way you are acting just doesn't seem like what I have always thought the Park Service to be. Are Park Rangers no longer the friendly and helpful people I have always known? How will I be able to be able to enjoy getting my national park passport stamped in parks across the country after being treated like this?

Please reconsider what you are doing and the way you are going about it. There has to be a better way.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	905	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,05,2014 17:08:07**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please, please do not change the leashed areas at Ft. Funston and Crissy Field. They are two of the few places in/near San Francisco where we can take hike with our dogs and let them play freely. It's really unclear why the GGNRA is striking out against the people (dog owners) who use these areas the most. Instead you should be restricting bikes on these paths that are so heavily used by pedestrians, runners and owners walking their dogs. The rental bicyclists - who usually ride without helmets - are the real threat.

Crissy Field and Ft. Funston should be kept off-leash friendly. Otherwise, I don't know what my taxes and donations are good for.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 906 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,05,2014 17:19:28**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I am writing to request that you not make changes to the 1979 Pet Policy in the Golden National Recreation Area. This area was established to provide outdoor recreational opportunities to people who live in a densely populated urban area. The management approach should be one that reflects the number of residents and visitors who use this easily accessed area. With easy access to this area of our "backyard", we are able to regularly (and responsibly) enjoy the beauty of Marin and the company of our four legged companions.

It is important that you consider that the SEIS alternatives will instead require us to drive to other Marin areas to walk our pets. Existing traffic already impacts the ease of travel and the congestion and pollution we experience. We do not need changes which will make travel worse.

Please consider you actions in making this important decision.

Thank you.

Sally Peck

---

**Correspondence ID:** 907 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94062  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,05,2014 18:23:13**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Wolf Ridge loop.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a

densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 908    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 18:57:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** One of the reasons I live in San Francisco is that the city is so dog friendly. It would be a terrible mistake to leash dogs on the beaches. I see that everyone has their opinion but it is not right to take the rights and freedom of one group away for another group.  
I suggest that shared time schedule I never bring my dogs during the mid day, just early in the am and late in the pm when the only other people are dog walkers and dog lovers. The mid day time on the beach when the traffic is heavy is not when we go.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 909    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi,

Please do not take away our off leash access locations!

Why? Because the changes made in the 2013 SEIS don't adequately address the concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 and that the comments in 2011 rand 3 to 1 AGAINST the plan.

I support the "No action alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands, as well as the San Francisco locations.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands."

Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs which is bad for the environment and bad for Marin and SF.

Thanks,  
Lynn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 910    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 19:47:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Support No Action to SEIS alternative

Give dogs same access they have to trails and beaches  
In San Francisco and Marin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 911    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 20:41:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a taxpayer in San Francisco who pays over \$12000 in property tax alone, I am very disappointed to find out that proposed changes to the leash laws would not allow me to walk my dog off leash at Funston and Chrissy Field in San Francisco. I don't consider this to be treating me fairly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 912    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,05,2014 21:06:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog walking on the Miwok Trail and Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 913    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 1. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS don't adequately address the concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 and that the comments in 2011 ran 3 to 1 AGAINST the plan.  
2. You support the "No action alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands, as well as the San Francisco locations.  
3. The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands."  
Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.  
4. The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.  
5. The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs which is bad for the environment and bad for Marin and SF.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 914 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 21:36:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I'm not in favor of the proposed plan because it reduces the very limited recreational areas in SF and Marin that allow dogs. This plan would force more people into cars to drive longer distances to find places to enjoy with their pets, causing congestion and environmental impacts. I ask that you please retain the 1979 Pet Policy.

The GGNRA was established to provide outdoor recreational opportunities for people who enjoy the outdoors and live in urban areas. As such, the approach to park management should accommodate pets and their owners.

I ask that you please reconsider this plan to instead permit pets in GGNRA areas.

thanks,  
Bill Graham

---

**Correspondence ID:** 915 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 22:01:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I strongly oppose Alternative F to further restrict dog access. You are wasting your own time and

---

everyone elses, not to mention the probably millions of tax payer dollars you have already wasted by dragging out this issue. Why do you feel the need to further restrict access to dogs when it is already severely restricted? Do you really think this would be an improvement? GGNRA was founded as a recreation area for a reason and it is near a major metro area, its not exactly pristine wildneress.....it doesn't take a million dollar study to figure out that one... Are you planning on restricting horses from using trails also?

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog on the Miwok trail and to Muir Beach

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	916	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,05,2014 22:10:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	What a bad idea.....restrict dog use even further than it already is....Wow! You should think more about the real consequences of your action....one of them is making it more difficult for poor people to have dogs....Rich people can afford property for their dogs to run around on while many of us can't...is this what you want to do??? They can also afford the tickets you hand out for people breaking the dog rules...				

Didn't you all try to do this before and it got rejected? Why do you continue to waste everyone's time and money on this proposal???

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	917	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the

---

Marin Headlands. I have witnessed many dog owners treating the lands there with utmost respect and care. Even in the rare case that one pet owner neglects their responsibility to care for the parks, I have seen others step up and fill in the gap. We all care DEEPLY about our dogs and our ability to enjoy the wonderful outdoors of SF and Marin together with our dogs.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Residents of SF and Marin rely upon this open space to make existence in this expensive city with our dogs possible. Managing a park in an urban area requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	918	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Ross, CA 94957 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,05,2014 22:36:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:**

1. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS don't adequately address the concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 and that the comments in 2011 ran 3 to 1 AGAINST the plan.
2. I support the "No action alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands, as well as the San Francisco locations.
3. The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands." Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.
4. The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.
5. The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs which is bad for the environment and bad for Marin and SF.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	919	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Larkspur, CA 94904 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,05,2014 23:23:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I strongly feel that there should be strict rules and regulations what goes to walking dogs off leash, but more importantly they have to be enforced.

As a mother of two young children it worries me a lot when I see a dog (once it was a pitbul) running towards the park where my children play and the owner 20ft behind talking on the cellphone! No matter if an owner thinks his/her dog is the friendliest dog in the world it's an animal and it is unpredictable! I love dogs, but some owners think their dogs have more rights than my children!

---



---

**Correspondence ID:** 920    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley , CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 00:33:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am very happy to hear that wildlife will be protected by requiring all dogs to be leashed in certain areas. More and more often, I am finding dog owners to be irresponsible with their pets when in public: leaving feces on trails, allowing boisterous dogs to approach small children; on 1/1/14 I saw unleashed dogs starting to chase after a bobcat just across the street from the Oakwood Valley Trailhead (in Tennessee Valley). My preference would be to have NO dogs allowed in areas where wildlife is commonly present, but barring that, to have all dogs leashed at all times.

Thank you,

A Mill Valley Resident

---

**Correspondence ID:** 921    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94041  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 00:45:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please follow through with keeping dogs leashed on our public lands. When dogs are unleashed they spoil it for the rest of us, and on public lands I think the humans' needs should come first. It's the fairest option. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 922    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 08:35:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep baker beach leash free. City dogs need a place where they can run free, subject to only voice control. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 923    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 09:39:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the "no Action Alternative"!!!!!!

---

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

GGNRA requires different management approach than large wilderness areas.

Retain the 1979 Pet Policy!!!!

Preferred alternatives force people into their cars to exercise their dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 924    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito , CA 94964  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 10:10:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow dogs off leash in the Marin hike trails. The dog owners here are very responsible with their dogs, well trained dogs and pick up after their dogs. Would be a shame for dog owners who enjoy these trails to be inhibited.

Thank you kindly,  
Bibi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 925    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 10:31:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the dog management plan as currently drafted. The restrictions on off leash dogs as well as banning dogs entirely is very unfair. I live in SF and to ban dogs from Fort Funston, East Beach at Crissy and most of Ocean Beach is way too restrictive and makes no sense. I urge you to reconsider this plan. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 926    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 11:02:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** When those without dogs and those with dogs share public space problems can and do arise. My experience has been that irresponsible dog owners are to blame for most of the problems. My comments focus on the things I think the plan should address to mitigate these shared use problems. Banning dogs from public space is NOT the answer. Addressing the irresponsible owners is the answer. The best the plan can do is have a state employee stationed at each spot to walk and monitor dog owner activity and issue citations and/or park bannings for irresponsible ownership.

I am a dog owner. We enjoy twice daily outings in San Francisco because the exercise and variety is good for my dog and his well being (and mine). Before I got my dog I read about dog behavior and dog

---

ownership. When I got my dog, we went to training sessions. My dog is well mannered and on voice command because of the time I put into understanding him and training him and because I watch him when he is off leash. We frequent many SF area open spaces and trails including Land's End, Chrissy Field, Ft. Funston, Mt. Davidson, Bernal Hill, McClaren, Candlestick Pt., Golden Gate Park and many others.

Since I take my dog out twice a day, and have for 7 years, 365 days times 2, times 7 years is a lot of times out to see what goes on at off leash parks, the legal off leash spaces and the not allowed off leash spaces. Problems I see with the dog people vs. the no dog people, are without exception, the fault of the dog owner who acts irresponsibly in the off leash space: Chrissy Field is the perfect example. If there was a park officer walking the premises, maybe owner behavior fines and proof of dog training certificates would encourage irresponsible owners to be more aware when they are in public spaces.

Please, do not eliminate off leash space at ALL locations. Chrissy is used by walkers, joggers, picnickers, bikers and dog owners and dog walkers. Maybe off leash restriction would make sense there. All other above mentioned places are used by dog owners and walkers and not others, like Chrissy. Incidents of shared space problems do NOT occur at the other places, because they are primarily used by hikers with no dogs, and dog owners and walkers with dogs and these groups cohabitate well without incident.

Please do NOT simply eliminate off leash space for ALL locations. If the new plan cant finance dog officers issuing citations for bad/irresponsible human (dog owner) behavior, please at least limit off leash in areas where the problems might exist: at Chrissy.

Thank you

Rachel Smith

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	927	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 11:07:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	1. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS don't adequately address the concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 and that the comments in 2011 rand 3 to 1 AGAINST the plan. 2. You support the "No action alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands, as well as the San Francisco locations. 3. The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands." 4. Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy. 5. The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite. 6. The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs which is bad for the environment and bad for Marin and SF.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	928	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 11:45:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Stinson Beach, Rodeo Beach etc etc..

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 929    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA, CA 94134

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 12:10:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I applaud this version of the dog plan. I appreciate the park service's efforts to find ways to make the GGNRA accessible and enjoyable for everyone and strongly support the idea of keeping some parts of the GGNRA available to those who seek a dog-free experience.

Off-leash dogs have jumped on our children, trampled our picnic blankets, and have deposited dog waste in many areas of the GGNRA, including places where dogs are supposed to be kept on leash. As well, I see people and dogs trampling in protected snowy plover habitats despite clearly posted signs and fences.

I know that the park service is attempting to provide for a balanced use of public land. The current balance of use has swung too far in favor of damaging use by both dogs and people, and I appreciate this attempt to make clearer distinctions about which areas are and are not suitable for off-leash dogs and for people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 930    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 12:34:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I rescued a large dog 2 years ago, and live in the Glen Park neighborhood without a yard. I was able to adopt my dog in this situation with the understanding that I had many public areas where I could run my dog to provide her with enough exercise to keep her healthy and well-behaved.

---

If 90% of the areas are closed under the new laws, the remaining areas will become very crowded and overburdened and likely no longer a good place to take my dog. I may be forced to move out of San Francisco.

We walk in designated off-leash areas 4-6 times a week at Crissy Field, Fort Funston and McLaren Parks.

I do not see where in the SEIS there is conclusive scientific data showing that dog walkers and owners are causing damage to designated off-leash areas, which means there is no legitimate or legal foundation for these policy changes. The plan doesn't differentiate between impacts caused by humans or other animals. It just assumes all the negative impacts are caused by dogs.

The GGNRA is an urban park, not a wilderness area. Its critical recreational open space for a densely populated urban area. By severely reducing off-leash dog walking, the GGNRA is in violation of its enabling legislation that allows different user groups to recreate.

I support the NO ACTION alternative and ask that you rather enforce the existing (and adequate) rules to manage dogs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	931	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 13:29:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please please do not do this. Our dogs have so little space to run free as it is. I'm in a particularly tough spot because my dog is extremely allergic to grass and trees. The one and only place I can take him to run free is the beach. Chrissy Field is a total haven for him and so many other dogs. Please don't take it away.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	932	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 13:38:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I want to strongly endorse the off-leash police for Chrissy Field out to the Golden Gate Bridge, Fort Funston and other dog walking areas. I use these regularly and have never experienced either any aggression or Litter. Most dog owners are very grateful for this urban resource for their pets and behave in a responsible manner. Let the community enforce the dog management as stakeholders. We want orderly parks - with no rangers and citations. These areas are vital to San Francisco quality of life and pose NO problems. If it isn't broken, don't fix it! The animosity and expense of policing this activity would be very bad for the NPS image. This is not wilderness. There should be rules for high density urban situations and others for wilderness. I am a native, tax-paying citizen, who cares about keeping as many areas "off-leash" as possible. It would also be great to have bigger paths to walk along the bay. Now there are strollers, old folks,				

---

bikes, joggers and scooters. It gets pretty full. .  
Thanks for your consideration. Ann hatch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 933    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 13:56:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As residents of Muir Beach, we strongly favor the NPS pass a NO ACTION alternative. We are appalled frankly, that changes are being suggested to Muir Beach - one of the few dog friendly beaches in the area. Having an off leash area just at Little Beach portion would be a disaster because a) it requires scaling rocks at high tide b) there is no beach area at low tide, c) there are no garbage facilities to handle waste.

We urge the NPS to maintain the plan that's been in place for decades. As activists on the subject, we will strong defend our position.

For the betterment of parks and enjoyment of its visitors please select a NO ACTION alternative. Leave this great institution in place!!!

Dan Fitzpatrick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 934    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 13:59:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposed changes to the dog polices are simply ludicrous. Why change something that is working well - and infuriate and alienate the public in doing so?

As residents of Muir Beach, we suggest the NPS pass a NO ACTION alternative. We are appalled frankly, that changes are being suggested to Muir Beach - one of the few dog friendly beaches in the area. Having an off leash area on just Little Beach portion would be a disaster because a) it requires scaling rocks at high tide b) there is no beach area at low tide, c) there are no garbage facilities to handle waste.

We urge the NPS to maintain the plan that's been in place for decades. As activists on the subject, we will strong defend our position.

For the betterment of parks and enjoyment of its visitors please select a NO ACTION alternative. Leave this great institution in place!!!

Darcy Fitzpatrick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 935    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965-9716  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,06,2014 14:07:15**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm a Muir Beach resident, with a dog. Are you people even Looking at the impact on local Muir Beach residents when you put forth your plans? More people less dogs, bigger traffic jams larger buses and bus stops, multi-million dollar projects for Coho stream restation when there isn't a even a vital population?

One way traffic in Frank's valley, 4000 more people visiting Muir woods on every day! Get a handle on what you are doing or go work for a "Fracking Co." where you can screw things up and not have to explain yourselves to the general public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 936 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,06,2014 14:19:53**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner who had a wonderful, uneventful off-leash/under voice control walk with my dog at Fort Funston just yesterday, as well as a wonderful New Year's Day walk at Crissy Field, I cannot for the life of me understand what problem exists. At the same time, I did read the report of impacts made by off-leash dogs in environmentally sensitive areas, and the complaints of those who have been harassed by dogs. People, dogs and the existing natural life co-exist right now. Some people with dogs are irresponsible and let their dogs run wild and harass people, but the majority of dog owners are responsible and considerate.

The benefits of having open space (and especially on beaches like Ft. Funston and Crissy Field) available to off leash dogs is critical. Dogs, and especially medium to large dogs, need that kind of open space exercise; they do not get it from on leash walking or off leash in tiny enclosures. Dogs that do not get sufficient exercise can potentially become more dangerous, quite frankly.

Even if you put dogs on leash in some of these natural areas, people and dogs will still be there, so the natural bird life is not likely to use the space any differently with dogs on leash. I have never seen any incidents with a dog being out of control, so I can only imagine that this situation is about as common as humans breaking the law - it happens, but not constantly and not with the majority of the population.

I would support there being hours in certain areas during which time dogs under voice control are allowed in the areas where this is currently allowed and prohibited during other times. The truth of the matter is, a compromise is needed. Human beings are also dirty and destructive of habitat and some of them can be quite hostile and dangerous. We simply have to prosecute those who break the law rather than preemptively punish all those who are good and law-abiding. Otherwise, by this logic, we shouldn't allow human beings to use the NPS either.

My dog is the reason I regularly get out to these parks, and I know that is true for many others. I love these parks and want to support them and maintain them. I would even pay a dog license fee to help fund clean-up and habitat restoration if that would help. But please do not go on-leash everywhere all the time. That would be a catastrophic decision that will cause lots of battles and folks will simply break the law, which will cost the NPS more money trying to enforce and punish. A compromise that brings everyone together who loves the parks and it's wildlife, including dog lovers, is the path towards a sustainable and harmonious future. The dogs are not going away, but neither should they run free everywhere, and it costs money to manage their use. There is a path through this that can come close to making the majority of

people reasonably happy. Sensible compromise!

Thanks for taking this response.

Sincerely,  
Nicole Grindle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 937    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm a long-time member of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, and I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

My family regularly takes our dog to Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field. It's a great outing for our entire family-our kids get outside and spend some time exploring nature, and our dog gets some exercise.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. San Francisco residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 938    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 15:10:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't take away these off-leash areas and force dogs into overcrowded parks and neighborhoods. Kids can be just as destructive but no one bans them from public areas!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 939    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 15:12:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

---



I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog on the Oakwood Trail, Rhubarb Trail, Miwok Trail and to Muir Beach and have been for 15 years. Remy will be 16 years old in July and she has enjoyed these places among others in Marin for her entire life.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the GGNRA. There is no reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. My understanding is that no one has conducted any peer-reviewed site specific studies that support such a drastic restriction of our public lands.

We live in an urban environment and expect to have recreational areas we can enjoy with our families and our dogs. We are not living in a wilderness area and we rely upon this open space. It is the reason many of us choose to live here.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

This whole thing seems very random and would change the quality of life for many of us here in Marin County.

Sincerely,  
Dana

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	940	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 15:24:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am a regular dog-walker at Fort Funston. I would not like to see the off-leash area at Fort Funston decreased, as has been proposed. Fort Funston is one of the few off-leash areas where my dogs and I can enjoy a long walk. In my opinion, the dog-walkers at Fort Funston are wonderful stewards of the land, keeping the area clean and respecting the natural planting and environment by staying on the paths and picking up trash. It would be a shame to minimize our enjoyment of this remarkable park. I have not witnessed any adverse encounters among the dogs and dog people at Fort Funston. Please reconsider your plans to inhibit our use of the park.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	941	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 16:37:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Baker Beach and Fort Funston are tremendous resources for all San Franciscans, but especially for responsible dog owners. It is well-known that dogs outnumber children in San Francisco, and based on the current housing trends, I would guess that most of these dog owners are live in cramped apartments, often with no outdoor space.

For many dogs, walking on-leash is simply not adequate exercise for keeping a dog healthy, both physically and mentally. For our dog personally, unless we traverse the entire length of the city, it is not the most effective form of exercise. A dog that is not well-exercised does not only affect his owner, but society at large. Many behavioral issues such as aggressiveness, boredom barking, and anxiety directly correlate to a lack of adequate exercise. Off-leash areas, specifically large areas such as those at Baker Beach and Fort Funston are essential to keeping dogs well-exercised and sane, leading to fewer anxiety issues, and better socialization interactions with both humans and other dogs.

Personally, my husband and I have been taking our medium-sized, trained, and very active dog to Baker Beach for over 4 years on a twice weekly basis. We live less than 5 minutes away from the beach by car, and are thankful every day we are able to go. Whenever we do go, the beach is often fairly empty. We always pick up after our dog, dispose of our trash properly, use voice commands to maintain control over her, and are respectful of others at the beach, be they families, tourists, crabbers, or other dog owners. We know they enjoy Baker Beach as much as we do.

While I understand the environmental and social concerns for this proposal, I do feel a significant number of this city's population would be negatively impacted.

With respect to the Baker Beach proposal specifically, I would support Map 12-E (Alternative E), which maintains a regulated off-leash dog area in the South Beach area. This appears to be the existing rule according to "Dogs on the Beach: A Review of Regulations and Issues Affecting Dog Beaches in California" (Lisa K. Foster, May 2006, <http://www.library.ca.gov/crb/06/06/06-006.pdf>). This is also where we tend to take our dog anyway, as it is typically not that populated and enclosed at the end.

I would also propose clear signage to encourage responsible dog ownership (i.e., using voice commands, picking up after your dog, and being mindful and respectful of other visitors). For those who are mindful or law-abiding, I do believe such signs would be helpful generally. Those who are not law-abiding or have ill-behaved dogs, will likely do what they want regardless of the rules, meaning an on-leash law would be useless anyway.

Having had off-leash access to these areas for many years, I believe it is unlikely that this proposal will have an effect on the behavior of the dog owners of San Francisco. However, I do believe some compromises are possible. Please do not take away one of the greatest and important resources San Francisco dog owners have.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	942	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern:				

Leave the Dogs Alone. Release the Hounds! I very strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you,

B.B.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	943	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 16:55:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a San Francisco homeowner, public school parent and dog owner, I am very much against the proposed "Dog Management Plan". It's not our dogs that need managing - it's our irresponsible citizens and our elected officials that believe they can make changes to services we pay for and desperately need, to please a few and without asking all of us. If I cannot stand there during the meeting, will my voice even be heard?				

As a homeowner, I would not want you to decide to arbitrarily cut down a tree in my backyard because falling leaves impact the yard of my wealthy neighbor.

As a parent, I would not want you to decide my child is damaging the schoolyard grounds with their sneakers so they are to kept inside all day.

So as a dog-owner, why would you severely limit the places I can take my dog outside to play in the water? Are they not animals also?

Are dogs ruining these coastal areas? Are you sure?? Why not ban children as well? Elderly adults? Those that illegally fish in those areas? Are you punishing the masses to benefit a chosen few? Who not section out the areas we can use for different needs, rather than a blanket ban against one particular group?

Additionally, regulate dog-owners and dog-walkers who have more than 4 dogs at a time, so they can easily monitor the dogs they have.

I welcome more discussion on this topic so we can all come to a mutually beneficial decision and share our waterside spaces!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	944	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 17:32:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We are residents of San Francisco and long-term members of the William Kent Society . One of the main reasons we are financial supporters of the GGNRA is our almost daily walk on Crissy Field with our dog off leash. I have been walking on Crissy Field with our dog off leash for almost twenty years and have never had a bad experience with another dog or my fellow dog walkers not picking up after their dogs. It has made walking on Crissy Field one of the great pleasures of living in San Francisco.

I cannot speak for other parks but my daily experience of Crissy Field is that the owners of off leash dogs are MOST

responsible. Please keep Crissy Field an off leash area for dogs and their families.

Sincerely,

Shelagh Rohlen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 945    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 17:43:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

Please at least consult with someone who 1.) knows about dogs and 2.) doesn't hate dogs, and then revise this terrible plan!

Thank you for your time.

Rebecca Coolidge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 946    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Ross, CA 94957

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** citizen Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 18:02:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom it may concern:

re: GGNRA

I am a lifelong resident of Marin County, and have been blessed to make the Golden Gate National RECREATION Area, Mt. Tam, the headlands, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, and the many trails surrounding the area my backyard. These areas were set aside for public recreational use. Although we consider it to be equally as awe inspiring as Yellowstone or Yosemite, this area is very different and has very different uses which have been in harmony with the area for decades.

I am writing regarding the changes that were made in the 2013 SEIS, and that fact that they absolutely do NOT address the criticisms and concerns expressed in the comments that were filed in 2011. Please let it be noted that the 2011 comments were overwhelmingly (3:1) against this plan.

The SEIS has no peer-reviewed studies specific to our sites. It contains no information on vital monitoring (as required by law) to make such a significant change to the public's use of this public land.

Muir Beach has always been a favorite destination for our family (including our dogs). The GGNRA should retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy. The GGNRA is a recreation area and the citizen's of Marin have been excellent stewards of the area. I appreciate that the National Parks need to mandate certain things countrywide, such as accessibility, but each park should be considered in the context of their environment. GGNRA is special and unique and should not be treated like Yellowstone or Yosemite. This is a special park near a populated area and requires an altogether different management approach than other National Park Wilderness areas.

Thanks you for your consideration of this matter.

Please do not put my name on any mailing list.

Sincerely,

Lisa Williams

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	947	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Fransisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 18:21:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA, please just leave things as they are. No harm is being done and everyone is happy and can walk and play with their dogs in beautiful places that belong to everyone, dog people as well as non-dog people. As a wheelchair user I in particular need places I can drive my dogs to and just let them loose to run and run and run and play and play. Dogs need fresh air and space and currently there is plenty of this around San Francisco. Unfortunately for some reason the GGNRA have decided to curtail, severely, what is currently available. Who is not happy? Only the GGNRA. Who for some reason do not want dogs on "their" property. But it is not "your" property. You are merely the current stewards of the land and should be providing it on a freely available bases for all to use. Including dogs and their owners. I look at your proposed maps and it makes me cry. I can't bear to see how much you want to take away and how much of nothing you want to leave for myself and my dogs. Shame on you. Instead of taking away why can you not provide more and better facilities. But I doubt you will and I shall be forced to seek somewhere else to run my dogs. I shall miss the spaces and the views and the walks and so will they.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	948	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	MILL VALLEY, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 18:52:19				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	949	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 19:59:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Why are you removing more and more of the freedoms that make Marin such a fantastic place to live?				

This county is famed for its walks, views and open attitudes. Yet one by one these freedoms are being eroded away. The very things that drew its residents and tax payers here are now being eliminated, so that life here is no better than in the cities we left?

Dogs (of which there are more than children) are part of those freedoms and environment we pay for and protect. Already the options to walk off-leash with dogs is limited, yet again and again GGNRA continues to remove those options. This recent series of restrictions is just too much. The latest recommendations - without peer review are going too far for those responsible pet owners who love and support the countryside we live in. The SEIS initiative contains insufficient studies and monitoring and is bad for dogs, owners and the environment, as we will be forced to drive further and further afield to find alternatives.

Please take no further actions to restrict the choices of dog owners in this area. Keep Muir Beach, The Marin Headlands, Homestead and Oakwood Valleys accessible - please take the No Action Alternative and keep our open spaces, truly open for all who use them - and pay their taxes to do so!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	950	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 20:33:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Please keep Fort Funston open for the dogs. San Francisco has plenty of open space for people to roam.. Healthy dogs need to run free. The city parks will be overwhelmed and destroyed if the footprint if the GGNRA becomes smaller and smaller. Regulate dog walkers and fine people who let their dogs run out of control.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 951 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 20:35:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In reference to Oakwood Valley, the Miwok trail and Muir beach the preferred alternative , alternative F, is overly restrictive, contrary to the recreational intent of GGNRA, dismissive of historic uses, over reaching and supported by assertions rather than facts.

The legislation which created the GGNRA states, in part; The objective of H.R. 16444 is to assure the preservation of open spaces presently prevailing within the proposed recreation area, to provide public access along the waterfront, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available to the region. Please note the phrase "maximum extent possible". Restricting areas where dogs are allowed and requiring leashes in areas previously allowing off leash is clearly contrary to the intent of establishing legislation. Alternative F clearly reduces outdoor recreational opportunities.

The Oakwood valley area and Miwok trail from Tennessee valley to highway One is frequently populated with dogs and their owners. On many days, more than 50% o users have dogs. I have been walking, hiking and biking these trails for 26 years both with and without dogs. I have never had any incident with a dog, nor seen a dog harassing people or wildlife. Most of the users in the area are residents of the area and if like myself moved to the area because of numerous available recreational activities including dog walking. To restrict the use of areas adjacent to suburban areas adversely impacts those who make greatest use of said areas. We are stakeholders, with a long pattern of use whose use of areas with dogs has not been demonstrated by SEIS to adversely impact other users nor wildlife.

The citing of various studies where dogs affect wildlife may be applicable to a national park such as Yosemite but fail to consider multiple uses of an urban park. The GGNRA is not a wilderness, it is an urban park, historically used and abused by the military and ranchers. Allowing historic uses in regards to dogs strengthens the community of stakeholders, fulfills the intent of those who were instrumental in establishing it and is consistent with previous NPS policies.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 952 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Roseville, CA 95661  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The following comments are my concerns:

1. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

---

2. Support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands"

3. Retain the longstanding 1979 pet policy

4. Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

5. The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk with their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County

---

**Correspondence ID:** 953    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 21:20:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a long time resident in Mill Valley and a volunteer at Marin Headlands Nursery( GGNRA) I strongly urge you to reconsider the use of GGNRA land use. I feel very strongly about retaining the long standing 1979 Pet Policy. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.  
We would like to keep walking our dogs in our neighbourhoods instead of having to drive far away, which would be bad for the environment and Marin County.  
Thank you ,  
Seija Weissman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 954    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94710  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 21:41:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and wish to continue doing so.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 955    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,06,2014 22:00:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** Please, please don't take dogs away from Muir Beach. My husband I got married there in 2002 because it was simply gorgeous and because we could bring our dogs to be part of the small wedding party. It was the most beautiful sunset wedding I can imagine and everything I hoped for, then we stayed at the lovely Pelican Inn (we had sitters for the dogs that night). Please don't take the opportunity away for others to have such a joyous wedding! Twenty years from now I can only hope our son will be able to bring the woman he loves, a few friends and a dog or two to Muir Beach and create the happiness we all have now. Spread the happiness! Please!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 956    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Fort Funston. Anyone who gets into their car with their dog and drives across the city is already much more likely to be a responsible dog owner and I have never seen any of the issues described in your letter.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 957    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 00:04:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I applaud GGNRA for putting limitations on dogs in Marin...though the proof will be in the enforcement. Currently I feel that every natural or public area we go in Southern Marin or San Francisco (even those where dogs are not allowed or are only allowed on leash) is overrun with dogs off-leash. If you plan to increase leash laws, what are the plans for enforcement/fines?

I have a 2-year-old who loves hiking on his own. We go to GGNRA areas frequently, but lately there have been several incidents where we were walking and without warning an off-leash dog has come bounding up to my son, jumping on him or stomping on him or just surprising him before I could make an appropriate doggy introduction or pick him up out of reach- -while the dog's owner has ineffectually shouted "he's very friendly!" from far away. I have tried to downplay the incidents in my son's mind, but the result is that now he is scared of all dogs and runs screaming from them. (I hate to think if any of these

dogs had actually been unfriendly or aggressive toward him!)

If there is an area where off-leash dogs and children are both present, the dogs always win, and the children always lose (from incidents where dogs scare/injure children to dog poop that hasn't been picked up). There needs to be a balance of uses.

Dogs are beloved members of families and communities, but they are not people, and their "rights" should not trump the rights of the humans to safely enjoy at least some public or natural spaces. Nor should they trump the rights of endangered or threatened bird, butterfly, or plant species or native habitats, all of which have been here much longer than either the dogs or the people.

Consequently, I support the most stringent restrictions on dogs being considered in Marin, and those most protective of the natural environment. I also strongly support adequate enforcement. I hope you will provide signage and online information educating people about who they should call or what they should do if they see dogs on- or off-leash where prohibited. Otherwise, GGNRA's bark will be worse than its bite, and off-leash dogs will continue to run rampant over our precious natural areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	958	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,07,2014 01:18:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Recently I was walking with my 4yr old son on the beach at Chrissy Field when suddenly a wet, slimy tennis ball struck me in the head. A woman with one of those ball throwers (the thing dog owners use so they don't have to touch the slimy wet dog ball) approached, but didn't apologize. Instead she told me i shouldn't be walking with my son in that area because it was for dogs.				

Last I checked the dogs aren't paying the taxes that keep our national parks open. Why then should they get to run free to kick sand on picnics or knock over small children while everyone except dogs and their owners suffer. There are plenty of spaces for dog walking that don't disturb the public. Please restrict dogs from our national parks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	959	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,07,2014 09:42:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Although we no longer have a dog, we did for many years when our children were growing up. Dogs can be good teachers of values that we want our children and residents to have, especially responsibility and being able to connect emotionally and for many people, they contribute to emotional stability and happiness.				

Having a dog is part of the Marin lifestyle for many. People aren't going to just get rid of their dogs if Alternative F is passed, and restricting all those existing dogs to such a small area is bound to create problems of over usage as well as dog conflicts. Additionally, dogs without sufficient exercise and freedom can be aggressive and are certainly not as happy or acceptable as well-cared for dogs who are allowed to have a reasonable amount of exercise and freedom.

Dog ownership is of critical emotional value to many, especially single people, children, and seniors. Proper ownership of a dog requires space to allow the dog to run and socialize with other dogs. Dogs also encourage people to get out and exercise, something that is repeatedly emphasized as being critical to the emotional and physical health of people.

For all these reasons, I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. RESTRICTING DOGS TO SUCH A LIMITED AREA OF THE PARK IS IRRESPONSIBLE AND UNNECESSARY!!! If dogs are creating problems for the GGNRA or other people using the park lands, design solutions that address those problems such as heavy fines for not picking up after their dogs. Don't throw the baby out with the bath water!!

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	960	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,07,2014 09:53:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern				

I am writing to inform you that I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Please note that I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA.

I regularly take my two dogs to the different GGNRA trails and beaches in Marin County. My dogs need the ability to run freely to control their energy levels and maintain their mellow personalities.

Dogs are important companions for a large part of Marin's population, and it is hard for many Marin citizens that dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area.

It would vastly impact the recreational option of dog owners and their pets to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%, which constitutes a dramatic restriction of the public's use of our public lands.

I understand that the GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. Such an area requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives you have put forth force people into their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

Please stay with Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, to support the needs of a large part of the

Marin County population that owns and loves their dogs in the 1% o the GGNR in question.

Thank you, Vera Sparre

---

**Correspondence ID:** 961    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Google Inc. Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 10:36:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I understand the comment period for the controversial GGNRA Dog Management Plan is coming to a close next month. As a dog owner in San Francisco, I'm writing to strongly urge dramatic amendments to the Plan to support the continued use of the GGNA.

I'd like to add my voice to those who strongly believe that making the Bay Area less dog friendly by restricting off-leash areas is a terrible idea. The overwhelming majority of Bay Area residents are responsible dog owners, and only use off-leash areas for dogs under voice control and without behavioral issues. And, the negatives to restricting off-leash areas dramatically outweigh the positives. I found the comments and statistics by a San Francisco dog advocacy group to be quite persuasive. A list can be found at <http://www.sfdog.org/content/tips-writing-ggnra-comments>

My wife and I make use of Fort Funston and Chrissy Field weekly to exercise our playful and friendly terrier; the joy it bring our family is a highlight of any week. I strongly urge you to take whatever action you can to make sure the voices of the thousands of responsible San Francisco dog owners are heard by the NPS and GGRA.

Please help us keep San Francisco and Bay Ares dog-friendly.

Warm regards,

Matt Gubiotti  
4037 25th St.  
SF, CA 94114

---

**Correspondence ID:** 962    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 11:09:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave the rules they way they are and have been for years. I'm particularly interested in allowing off-leash dogs on Oakwood trails, Muir Beach, and Rodeo Beach. I am dismayed by the disconnect the NPS seems to have.

GGNRA is a recreational area in an urban/suburban area. While I want to preserve the environment, I also see this area as a park, not a nature reserve.

In addition, at the same time GGNRA uses "preserving the environment" as a reason for not allowing dogs off leash (without any scientific evidence that dogs have actually harmed anything), the park service

---

continues to greatly disturb the environment with paved parking lots, proposals for more paved parking lots, concrete restrooms, and by finding ways to bring more and more people into the park. The people walking dogs in Oakwood Valley are neighbors for the most part who have a keen interest in preserving the area they use daily. However, as the park service continues to "improve" the trails and promote them, we're seeing more and more tourists - people who visit once and are less interested in the future of the area. As more people come, more "improvements" happen. I wouldn't be surprised to see the park service eventually pave that precious meadow on Tennessee Valley Road - the one they worry about an occasional dog disturbing - and run shuttle buses to the trailhead. By focusing on putting dogs on leash in the remarkably few areas dogs are allowed at all in GGNRA, I think the park service is looking at a tree, not the forest.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 963    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 11:25:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep more off leash areas for dogs on Baker beach. Alternative A is my families choice for the options you are currently proposing to the SF beaches.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 964    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 11:40:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep ALL of Baker Beach as a off-lease and voice control environment for dog-owners and their pets. I have enjoyed both BB and Crissy Field areas for 20 years and would be heartbroken to see this change! Thank you. Nancy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 965    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Stinson Beach, CA 94970  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 12:03:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been at Stinson Beach for more than 30 years, and strongly encourage you to continue banning dogs in the beach area and ban a dogs in any other areas where they are now allowed. Everywhere I walk in Marin, dog owners abuse their privileges by allowing dogs to be off leash and run free. The beach is for people, not dogs. Dog owners have consistently abused their privileges by allowing dogs to chase and bark at after beach walkers ("Oh, she won't hurt you, shs nice"), and to poop on the beach and in the water. For health and safety reasons, please continue to ban dogs in the park and adopt the strictest policy possible anywhere you have authority to do so.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 966    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

Thank you in advance for considering my opinion. I know that a lot of thought has gone into Alternative F and the overall dog management debate. However, I strongly oppose Alternative F. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

My wife, our dog Hazel, and I recently moved to Mill Valley because of the easy access to GGNRA trails that are dog friendly.

Because dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the GGNRA, there isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. Furthermore, there seems to be a complete lack of peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The GGNRA was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. Residents of Marin County, like our family, rely upon this open space on a daily basis. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 967    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 12:40:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs and people need beach areas to run and exercise.

Rodeo Beach is good, but it is too remote for SF and Marin residents.

Muir Beach - need area on the beach for voice control or regulated off-leash dog area. Prefer Alternative A. ROLA in Alternative E is much too small.

Stinson Beach - again, need area on the beach for voice control or regulated off-leash area. Need an additional alternative.

Crissy Field - prefer addition of East Beach for regulated off-leash dog area. Prefer Alternative A.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 968    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 12:56:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the "No Action Alternative" in the 2013 SEIS for Muir Beach, and request that GGNRA keep the long-standing 1979 Pet Policy.

Muir Beachers with dogs want to continue to recreate together in our adjacent Golden Gate National Recreation Area. This ability is a feature that has always drawn neighbors to live in and love our special town.

Banning us from what's right outside our doors, and forcing us to drive to some other place that will be crowded and is 30 or 40 minutes away so that we can try to play and run with our dogs makes no sense for the environment, the roads, the dogs, us or that other place!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 969    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 13:03:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I am an avid runner and regularly take my dog to the tennessee valley trails and I rely on this open space to walk/run/exercise myself as well as my dog.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. I strongly support retention of the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

Furthermore, the SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 970    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 14:11:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am shocked and dismayed to learn that there are current plans to reduce off areas in Golden Gate National Recreation park by 80%. As a 5th generation San Francisco native, this defies one of beautiful elements that comprise our San Francisco culture. With more dogs than children in this city, San Francisco's liberal and respectful animal practices are what draw many people to this city. My experiences with my family (i.e. my dogs) and the ability for them to run free in many areas, is what

---

makes my existence here so spiritual and unique.

Dogs on leashes, all of the time, with no outlets, are not happy dogs. This will create undo stress for the dog, the dog owner, and the community at large. Please refrain from altering one of the major staples and joys of our city. The impact to our city's reputation and growth is at stake.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 971    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 14:39:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi -

I have a dog and live in San Francisco, very close to Baker Beach. I'd like to request that you keep the current off-leash allowances on Baker, Crissy, and Fort Funston. One of the wonderful things about living in San Francisco is our ability to take our dog to certain areas in the GGNRA. We're very respectful of the many places where dogs are not allowed, but really value those few places where they are welcome. There are even fewer places where they are allowed to run and play off-leash, and the beaches I mention are some of those which are left.

Thank you for your consideration,

Fiona Smythe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 972    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 15:12:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived at Muir Beach since 1963 and I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and coastal trail etc.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 973    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,07,2014 15:58:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This letter is being written to respectfully express my strong opposition to Alternative F, the preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I wholeheartedly support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

We regularly take our dogs to Homestead/ Four Corners; Oakwood Valley Fire Road and the Miwok Trail from Country Road. Our dogs desperately need places where they can run and be outdoors. Losing access or off-leash access would pose a major hardship to the quality of our dog's lives as well as countless other residents. We have been using these trails for over 20 years and as with nearly all dog owners we encounter, are highly respectful and protective of the environment- including clean-up of waste, keeping dogs on leash and on trails, and being very conscious of keeping dogs away from any children or adults who seem uncomfortable. In all our years, we have never had any incidents- and in fact, have found dog owners to be highly aware of taking control of their dogs.

While we certainly acknowledge that some people especially children may be scared of dogs and that there are some irresponsible dog owners, we strongly feel that there can be some provision to assure that all dog owners have had some obedience training classes for dogs.

In addition, dogs are already off-limits on a very high percentage of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining very small areas where dogs can walk. As far as we can tell, there have not been any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. It is our understanding that the Golden Gate Recreation Area was originally granted and established in order to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It was set up with the intent of being primarily used by the residents of Marin County, who live in the area, pay taxes and support the local environment. The GGNRA is not located in a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite, thus necessitates a different management strategy than other National Parks.

As long-time Mill Valley residents, we would be hit especially hard by these what seem to us unnecessary restrictions. We are open to valid reasons to further protect our environment and provide safe and inviting outdoor trails and space for all Marin residents and visitors. However, these measures do not seem to address any legitimate concerns- which if presented, we could discuss other possible solutions. That seems to be the reasonable approach, one that considers not just Marin resident dog-owners but all residents.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Leah Lazar/ Glenn Fleisch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 974    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 16:14:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My concern is the area of East Beach of the Crissy Fields area. I use that area regularly and seldom do I NOT have an issue where I have to be on the guard for the 'Dog Racing' events. The dogs are so excited to be out and about that they begin to race up and down the beach in a small pack. The includes dogs 'checking you out' and running away with sand flying around most notably in your food. My 4 year old was terrified of the beach for a few years. She didn't like the idea of the larger dogs that were about her height checking her out. It got to the point we abandoned a number of trips based on the stress level of the dogs. I love dogs but when I'm out trying to enjoy the beach area with my family the wild racing dogs they just destroy the event for us. It would be great for any of the plans EXCEPT for plan 10-A to be enforced. Thank you for allowing me to comment on the plans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 975 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog and kids to all the areas you propose to restrict, and this will decrease our quality of life.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Don't take this away from families and responsible dog owners!

Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 976 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,07,2014 17:17:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the revised Dog Management Plan in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. As a responsible dog owner and lover of the bay area's beautiful parks, I believe it is a terrible idea to limit the access of dogs in these areas. These parks are meant to be enjoyed by the public - - limiting the access of dogs in these areas will result in less use in

---

these areas, not more. We take our dog to one of these parks literally every day - - we have \*never\* seen dogs (or dog owners) not behaving responsibly. This is part of the bay area's heritage - - a way for residents and their dogs to enjoy the gorgeous area where we live.

Please don't take away something so valuable to our local quality of life. A visit to any one of these areas will show how much these dog-friendly areas are currently enjoyed.

Best,

Stephanie Stafford

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	977	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,07,2014 17:37:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog owner, it is unacceptable to me to have more and more areas unavailable for dog walking. We should keep Alternative A, the current proposal to allow for off-leash dog walking.				

We are responsible dog owners who pick up after our dogs, and we should have the ability to allow them to play on the sandy beaches and allow them to access and appreciate nature, just as we do!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	978	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,07,2014 17:40:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear National Park Service,				

Please, no restrictions on our green space. I am a long-time San Francisco resident and request that you do not implement the proposed restrictions on land use at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissey Field. We live in one of the most beautiful cities in the world, and imposing restrictions on how we enjoy the land with our friends, families, visitors and pets will undermine our city, and create an unfriendly environment. I have a dog and live less than one block from Ocean Beach. If the proposals go through I will have to drive to a different part of the city to enjoy green space. I will be a contributor to pollution, traffic, and burden parking for residents of a different neighborhood. This proposal will undoubtedly stress the city resources. Please consider that the green space you're proposing limited access to is in an urban environment full of people and their pets. We need access to be healthy, happy, and maintain balance with our neighbors throughout the wonderful city we all call home.

Regards,  
Meghan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	979	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,07,2014 17:47:24**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service,

I have a high energy dog that loves to socialize and play with other dogs, unlike fenced in dog play areas where dogs with behavioral problems cannot be avoided, my dog is able to socialize and play with other well socialized dogs. This is why off leash, open space play areas are important. I utilize at least one of these recreation areas daily. As the population of San Francisco grows, as it is expected to, these areas will be more and more important to San Franciscans. Please don't impose these restrictions upon us.

Thank you,  
Paul Monti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 980 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,07,2014 18:00:39**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I recommend that the ENTIRE Baker Beach area be kept off-leash friendly. There are enough beaches in the Bay Area that require leashes. Also, when you concentrate the dogs into one area, some owners get more slack on cleaning up, which is unfortunate. Contact me, if you'd like any other input or have questions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 981 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,07,2014 23:01:03**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I am very opposed to GGNRA proposed Dog Management policy. I disagree that dogs compromise visitor safety or damage the Recreation Area environment. GGNRA does not have the data or research to support these claims.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 982 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Pacific Grove, CA 93950  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,07,2014 23:50:30**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow people with their companion dogs on the trails and beach. It is unfair to people with dogs to change your policy and close these public spaces because a person is with their dog. There are very few places to walk with a dog now. Making it impossible to have a dog seems like a political agenda....not in the public interest. thank You Joan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 983 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Brisbane, CA 94005  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 05:23:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm Urging the GGNRA to keep the existing areas now dog friendly to continue to do so and maintain or allow dogs be off leash with full access to the existing land areas they now enjoy today and in the near and foreseeable future.

I meet my 75 year old mom with her dog a Queensland Red Heeler an Australian Cattle Dog at Crissy field on the weekends to walk with. Queensland Red Heelers dogs are some of the longest living dog breeds, so its important they get a good workout by being able to run freely. We have enjoyed this activity for many years. The walk takes us over 2 miles. This keeps me and my Mom healthy. With the dog off leash he can run in the sand and surf. This keeps the dogs health maintained, as we simply can not run at the proper speed needed for the dog if he had to be leash bound. For both of us its the most beautiful area we have seen and Crissy Field for us with its stunning views and landscape is an amazing place to be. Historically the area has worked well for many families and dog owners generally very respectful of each other. It simply would not be fair to the dog owners and other folks impacted who use San Francisco parks to lose Crissy Field's status as a dog friendly park. My Mother and her dog are very healthy for there age and it is because she has the dog she has to get out and walk this dog everyday. I feel this is a great social resource that can and should be shared. In my experience we have always have had good and positive time at Crissy Field. There are many good reasons to keep the park off leash dog friendly and I hope I was able to express at least one today.

My kindest regards,

Danny Ames

---

**Correspondence ID:** 984    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94011  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 10:16:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of INCREASED dog access within the GGNRA in San Mateo County, both on and off leash.

I oppose further restriction of dog access and elimination of off leash areas.

Further restrictions of our open lands will reduce the quality of life we currently enjoy in San Mateo County. The areas that we are allowed to take our dogs to are already relatively few. Dog owners tend to be nature loving people who enjoy the outdoors. In many cases, they are the primary users of some of these areas. There are already many dog free options and there is no good reason to add further restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 985    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 10:57:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** There are already very few areas that dog owners can take their pets, especially off leash. This would be devastating to dog owners who actually care about the health and well-being of their pets.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 986 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and I have recently started hiking on a few trails, only to discover my dog is not welcome on most. This is a very disappointing situation. I moved to this area because of the availability of outdoor recreation and the dog friendly environment, only to find out that it is being taken away. In my experience so far, it is the humans, not the dogs, who create the issues in our outdoor spaces.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Come on Marin, don't make me have to take my dog to the city to hike or hang out on the beach. I am certain I will not use the GGNR if I cannot take my dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 987 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 11:32:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are already so few places to bring your dog and to further restrict more parks is unfair. 99% of dog owners are responsible and pick up after their dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 988 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** San Francisco Resident and Crissy Field Dog Group Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 12:20:12

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have walked my dog at Crissy Field for 9 years and think most dog walkers are responsible and considerate of the environment and fellow park users. Accordingly I think the current Option A works reasonably well and could simply be supplemented with clearer regulations and enforcement. This does not seem to have been considered.

That said understanding some modifications are desired I think Option E is the most reasonable alternative to Option A. It provides a mix of no dog, on-leash and off-leash alternatives that would accommodate a range of park users, including dog walkers with limited mobility. I think the further reduction in designated dog access areas proposed in other options including the preferred Option F could result in overcrowding of dogs in designated areas and thus could possibly cause more impact to vegetation in those areas. In addition I think the fencing proposed in Option F while making boundaries clear would be visually unfortunate and would prefer clear signage and enforcement.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 989    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94705  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 14:32:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to urge you to allow dogs to continue to use Muir Beach off-leash. I respectfully request that the beach area itself at Muir Beach be made a ROLA.

The justification given in the Fall 2013 Draft Dog Management Plan for requiring dogs to be on-leash on Muir Beach is the need to protect sensitive habitat (p. 113, and Table 6, p. 256). However, that report does not establish that dogs, which have been using Muir Beach under voice control since 1979, have damaged the environment or harmed wildlife at Muir Beach. To the contrary, Table 14 (p. 315) reports only one dog-related incident of wildlife disturbance over a four year period. And the beach itself has not been damaged by dogs playing there.

I can understand the desire to protect Redwood Creek, the lagoon, and the dunes. I have no objection to making these areas off limits for dogs. I also have no objection to requiring dogs to be on-leash on the bridge and path leading to the beach, as they currently are. I am ONLY talking about the beach itself, where dogs have, for years, had great fun playing, together and with their owners. Please, please, allow dogs to continue to play off-leash on the beach itself, while restricting their access to other, more sensitive areas as necessary.

Carl Shapiro  
80 Gravatt Drive  
Berkeley, CA 94705

January 8, 2014

---

**Correspondence ID:** 990    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 16:30:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** For over thirty years I have shared the joy of walking my dogs off-leash at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and occasionally at Crissy Field. This has been of great benefit to my dogs, enabling them to be well socialized around other dogs, and people. Dogs and humans interact well in these areas and I have seen or heard only a handful of inconsiderate or rude interactions in all that time; far fewer than I can experience walking down the street! Fort Funston is a place where I find community. It gives those of us who love dogs as much pleasure to watch our animals romp and play as it does parents watching their children at a playground - both delightful, refreshing experiences in a day.

Over a number of years there have been rumblings and outright threats about the closure of huge areas now available for off-leash. At first this seemed like a rumor mill but then became serious. People rallied to voice their strongest objections, and I recall being so outraged that I attended a meeting at the Officers' Club in the Presidio, along with hundreds of other people, and stood outside in torrential rain because this was so important. There seemed to be a modicum of peace for a short while and then the rumblings started again, growing ever more ominous.

My particular area of daily use in the GGNRA is Fort Funston, but I am concerned for the estimated three million Bay Area residents who have dogs living as part of their home. At this time we have about 1% of the GGNRA where we can have dogs off-leash and now that is to be reduced to .1%! This makes no sense in an area given by the City for the express purpose of recreation; recreation that clearly includes walking with our dogs off-leash. It is as if the City had given \$100 for recreation and we have been told we can only use \$1 of that for traditional recreational use. The new plan reduces that to about one cent! In whose sense of fairness and responsible management does that seem acceptable?

As I grow older I am even more in need of adequate off-leash areas to walk my dogs. Gone are the days of hiking along the streets to be able to give the dogs enough exercise. There are small areas in some of the local parks, but dogs, like people, do better when they are not too cramped together. I have three dogs, two inherited by the deaths of dear friends, and two of them are over 120lbs! They need a lot more space than the tiny wee dogs that enjoy sitting on their owners' laps.

I appeal to you to reconsider this restrictive plan for the GGNRA.

Sincerely,  
Sister Ruth Hall.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 991    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Oakwood Trail in Tennessee Valley. We clean up after our dog and have her on voice command off-leash, while bringing leash in hand. We have never had an incident with a hiker or runner as we pull her out of the way for others to pass. At least 90% of the individuals who use this trail are walking their dogs. Those who have dogs that need to be on-leash seem to be stalwart about keeping the dog on the leash.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely



upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Humans are a much bigger threat to the environment which you are trying to protect. They cause more physical damage to the flora and natural plantings of the GGNRA. Are you going to ban us as well?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 992    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 16:56:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained

---

**Correspondence ID:** 993    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 17:01:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sample Letter

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley, Muir beach and coastal trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely

---

upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 994    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly hike with friends who have dogs along the Oakwood Valley and Miwok trails. My family is planning to adopt a shelter or rescue dog, and we have been looking forward to hiking these trails with our new pet. Now I have to wonder - should we bother to rescue a dog from a shelter if we need to take daily drives in search of places to walk it?

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Please move forward with the No Action Alternative - and help my family save another rescue dog.

thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 995    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To consider denying taxpayers the pleasure of enjoying a run on the beach with their dog is just plain pathetic. Your potentially restrictive agenda is not only insensitive and ignorant of the respectful habits of dog-lovers, but it is an insult to the very people who pay your salary.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely, James A. Herwitz

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	996	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,08,2014 17:24:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	997	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,08,2014 17:34:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I take my dog throughout the Headlands at least 3-4 times/week (Miwok trail, Coastal trail, Wolf Ridge, Rhubarb, etc.) and want to continue to do so.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-

specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 998    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs/Madams

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley and Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Please take our comments into real consideration.

Thank you  
sincerely

Rachel Gaunt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 999    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 18:34:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the thought and work that has gone into this.

---

As a dog owner, a small not particularly brave woman over 65, a lover of peace and quiet and beauty at the beach and when hiking, and an advocate for our natural environment - I found the document to be educational.

I am only commenting on Marin as I don't have the experience and knowledge to speak to the other areas included in this plan.

After reading the document I am left with that a case can be made for increased leashing and banning of dogs.

However, by using similar logic, an equally strong case could be made for banning (leashing?) the enormous number of noisy, messy, and often unsightly people (including banning their polluting cars and unmuffled motorcycles).

I could almost make a case for banning those smelly, shrieking shorebirds, but that is going too far.

Point is, even though we are getting more crowded and have to find creative ways to live closely together, for the most part I don't think more banning and heavy restrictions is the way to go. It is likely to produce more instead of less angry people and confrontations. Rather, I would like to aim for more opportunities and structures to support it working for everyone...humans, dogs, and wildlife.

1) Waste on the beach/more about poop than I ever thought I would have to say

A friend of mine who lives at Stinson Beach gathered all the trash on the beach for two days and took photos of the accumulation. It was disgusting. I have the photos if you are interested.

I run that beach a couple times a week with my dog and while there are occasions when I find myself cleaning up after other dogs (and cursing under my breath while doing so), the trash pick up I do is manifold the bigger job. Most of the trash is plastic (some glass and styrofoam) - and as to environmental impacts, we all know that plastic and the ocean and sea birds is a terrible combination.

Yes, even one dog poop on the beach is nasty, but providing convenient bags and trashcans makes a difference as well as posting unmissable signs that have an impact. (Eg I read that in Bristol, England they put up signs with toddlers picking up dog poop, smearing it all over themselves, and even eating it. This seems overkill but I am betting you know an advertising agent ((or can have a contest)) who'd create clever signs to effectively remind people to clean up after their dogs including perhaps mentioning a hefty fine.)

I know we already have bags and trash cans at Stinson, and despite my occasional cursing, in my experience it is working well there. If it is worse than I realize, I suppose you could add signs that give a phone number to report a description of the dog and owner any time you see waste being left (a picture of the dog and owner could even be sent via text). Since even the best owner can be distracted and miss a poo in progress, I would think first a warning then a ticket etc.

Meanwhile - even though people leaving trash is a bigger problem...I would really miss the beach if we were banned.

2) Dog walkers

My experience is that "6 dogs under voice control" is almost always an oxymoron, three is sometimes stretching it.

### 3) Noise

It seems to me that non-stop barking is no fun. Hurrah for creative signs saying so and enforcement. Loud music fits in the same category for me.

Kids laughing and yelling ...I think we should continue to allow. But who knows, if we did a phone survey maybe we'd find kids drive 56% o people crazy? I say to heck with those 56% o the people. Sometimes the majority is just plain wrong, and I think that is important to remember when looking at your survey results.

### 4) Fencing

The new fencing at Muir Beach is wonderful! In fact, all the work done at Muir recently is much appreciated and well done. In particular I appreciate the fencing, the dogs can run and not impact the wildlife or the dunes. Best of both worlds. Job well done! Thank you!

I noticed on a run by the water in Sausalito they had added a similar fence by a lagoon the birds like, and it works incredibly well. Even when my dog went up to the fence the heron and egrets close on the other side of the fence just looked at her nonchalantly and continued their feeding or dozed back off. If the birds know they are protected they seem to settle right in on their side of the fence.

I hope this attractive solution will be used wherever feasible.

### 5) Dogs scaring people

I appreciate that people can be afraid of dogs.

I am a scaredy cat. Mostly when I am hiking or running I get scared that the nice guy coming is actually a mad killer/rapist or that I will get eaten by a mountain lion (I've seen two, mountain lions that is, no mad killers) or a shark or stalked by a family of coyotes (this happened).

Like the people who avoid places because of dogs, I used to avoid places because of the fears above. With my dog I feel safe and I go where I did not before. (Though she is no use with the sharks, so I am still staying out of the water)

There are miles and miles of trails and lots of beach areas already where dogs are required to be on a leash or are banned. Perhaps we can gently recommend to people who are afraid of all dogs that they enjoy one of the many areas that are dog free or where dogs are leashed.

Any good dog owners will be responsible for making sure others feel safe around our dog(s), and there will be a few jerks who also own dogs. Let's take action against the jerks.

### 6) Dogs hurting people and especially children

This is just not ok and should legally be treated as such. This should include dogs attacking other dogs.

### 7) Protecting wildlife and natural habitats from the dogs

For the most part it seems like the wildlife is flourishing (coyotes, mountain lions, deer, bunnies, otters, hawks, certainly the gophers and moles..)

Where endangered wildlife needs protecting we should do it, eg fencing around stream beds or nesting/feeding areas when dogs are allowed nearby.

Re the Snowy Plovers - As I understand it only 4% o California's Snowy Plovers are in Marin and all of theses except one pair are safely protected at Pt Reyes and that this has been the case historically (in other words, the dogs have not chased them off).

That's it for me. You can see I feel strongly about this. Please forgive my loquaciousness.

I, like many people in Marin, live a happier life with my dog beside me. And neither she nor I would be quite the happy, quiet, friendly citizens we are with more restrictions instead of fewer.

Thank you for your generous listening.  
And please forgive my typos.

Linda

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1000	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	tax paying citizen Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,08,2014 18:35:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Oakwood fireroad, Alta trail, Miwok trail. I can walk or bike to several of these areas with my dog by my side on a leash.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1001	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,08,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

As a responsible dog owner, I exercise with my dog every day, come rain or shine. I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Fireroad and Trail, Alta Trail, Orchard and Pacheco Fire Roads, Miwok Trail, and Coastal Trail.

â€”

I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. You have no site-specific, peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate the claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog-walking since the original pet policy in 1979. The GGNRA is not a wilderness national park like Yellowstone and shouldn't be managed as if it were.

Again, I support the No Action Alternative!

Sincerely,  
Melanie Barti  
Sausalito, Ca

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1002	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,08,2014 18:47:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I strongly AGREE with the NPS proposal to further limit off leash dogs and areas where dogs are allowed. It is too bad that dogs spread diseases, such as the recently reported outbreak of distemper in the Tam Valley neighborhood, and are generally hard on the environment. It is high time that the National Parks started to defend the habitat within their boundaries, as the last remaining homes of many of our native species. The purpose of these parks is to preserve our natural places for future generations and these proposals are right in line with doing that. As our area has grown, we have decimated habitats throughout Marin, causing the disappearance of many of our native animal and plant species. As a long time resident of Tam Valley, I am appalled and saddened by this. Dog owners are a passionate group who love their dogs as family members and don't get it that dogs cause harm to the environment, especially off leash. I have seen all kinds of dog mischief out on Oak Valley trail and fire road, as well as Muir Beach. This includes digging, chasing animals and running through posted streams. Some owners are good about cleaning up after their dogs, but others think that dog poop is biodegradable and so it is "OK" to leave or throw into the creek, with or without bags. They don't realize that not only diseases, but parasites and medications are spread throughout the environment every time a dog leaves poop behind. Not only that, but the scent will linger and encourage other dogs to mark the same area. I know it is a difficult decision to stand by, especially under the organized onslaught by dog owners, but PLEASE stand your ground. Once this is in place, dog owners will just have to find or create other alternatives for their pets that wont destroy the public lands and their delicate environs. Thank you!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1003	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---



**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 18:48:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly AGREE with the NPS proposal to further limit off leash dogs and areas where dogs are allowed. It is too bad that dogs spread diseases, such as the recently reported outbreak of distemper in the Tam Valley neighborhood, and are generally hard on the environment. It is high time that the National Parks started to defend the habitat within their boundaries, as the last remaining homes of many of our native species. The purpose of these parks is to preserve our natural places for future generations and these proposals are right in line with doing that. As our area has grown, we have decimated habitats throughout Marin, causing the disappearance of many of our native animal and plant species. As a long time resident of Tam Valley, I am appalled and saddened by this. Dog owners are a passionate group who love their dogs as family members and don't get it that dogs cause harm to the environment, especially off leash. I have seen all kinds of dog mischief out on Oak Valley trail and fire road, as well as Muir Beach. This includes digging, chasing animals and running through posted streams. Some owners are good about cleaning up after their dogs, but others think that dog poop is biodegradable and so it is "OK" to leave or throw into the creek, with or without bags. They don't realize that not only diseases, but parasites and medications are spread throughout the environment every time a dog leaves poop behind. Not only that, but the scent will linger and encourage other dogs to mark the same area. I know it is a difficult decision to stand by, especially under the organized onslaught by dog owners, but PLEASE stand your ground. Once this is in place, dog owners will just have to find or create other alternatives for their pets that wont destroy the public lands and their delicate environs. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1004    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Fire Road, Alta Trail, Homestead/Four Corners, Muir Beach, Orchard and Pacheco Fire Roads, Rodeo Beach Loop and the Miwok Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide RECREATIONAL activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is NOT A WILDERNESS area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1005    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Citizen Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 19:02:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My wife and I take our dog and two sons to baker beach all the time. We get there by walking through the Presidio from our home in the inner Richmond. Our dog is leached all the way there and getting off the leach up arrival is a joy for us and our dog, Cosmo. This should remain the same for us and all generations. Please do not deprive dog owners of their rights to let their dogs and families fully enjoy a leachess experience when already we are constrained in a majority of the city....!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1006    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to all the trails and beaches that are under threat to be closed for dogs.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Dogs give so much pleasure to humans and it would be a shame if the owners were restricted from enjoying the out doors with their animals. Many of us would consider our dogs to be our best friends.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1007    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 22:14:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The SEIS does not adequately address dispersion issues. The SEIS does not adequately address the environmental and social impact of forcing large numbers of people and dogs into much smaller areas. Reducing the amount of area available for off-leash will significantly degrade the park experience for people with dogs. It will increase conflicts. Even more importantly, the SEIS does not

---

address the environmental and social impact on small, neighborhood parks in cities like San Francisco next to the GGNRA. Because the GGNRA is located immediately adjacent to one of the most densely populated areas in the United States (San Francisco), it provides much needed recreational open space for Bay Area residents. If that open space is lost to recreational access, people and their dogs will move to the much smaller city parks and they will not be able to absorb the hundreds or thousands of people with dogs each day that will be kicked out of the GGNRA. As further proof that the GGNRA did not consider impacts on city parks in San Francisco, the Preferred Alternative suggests the nearest legal off-leash area in San Francisco to Fort Funston is Lake Merced. That off-leash area has been closed to off-leash for years and has been turned into a native plant restoration area and habitat for the endangered red-legged frog among other animals. Yet this is where the SEIS suggests people with dogs go.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1008    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 22:19:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a frequent user of the Miwok trail between Tennessee Valley and Hwy 1. My family and I live near that trail and we take the dog for walks almost everyday. I walk that trail at different times during the day and I must say, if I see 3-4 people (mostly others with dogs) thats a lot of people. For the most part I go days in a row seeing nobody at all. I have no idea why you would restrict dogs on this trail. It makes no sense. In addition, Muir Beach is a great place for dogs. It isn't a beach for sunbathing and the water seems too treacherous for swimming, so walking with your dog seems perfect. Please consider the thousands of Marin families that are responsible dog owners and need a place near their homes (in addition to a dog run) where both 2 and 4 legged creatures can exercise together. I'm sure this knee jerk reaction to restrict dogs comes from a few loud individuals that have had a negative experience on a trail with a dog. But if we're doing our homework on this, I think you would find that hikers and other users of our trails within GGNRA have more complaints about the bike riders as they are always more aggressive and rude than any dog or dog owner.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1009    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,08,2014 23:41:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I respectfully request that dog-walking access in the GGNRA not be restricted beyond what is currently allowed. The recreation area is for all to enjoy, including dog owners, and the original purpose and point of the GGNRA is recreation. It should stay that way. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1010    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sunnyvale, CA 94086  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 00:10:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We live in Sunnyvale, one hour south of Fort Funston. When we first went to Fort Funston it was specifically because we got a dog and researched where he could run off leash. When we

---

got there it was pure elation, and our dog had fun too. The dogs in the free environment act naturally, respecting each other as most of us humans do. Putting a leash on a dog is like "road rage" to a human. The people who bring their dogs to this beach are conscientious, kind, respectful humans who pick up after their animals. Those that don't would most likely relieve themselves and not pick up after themselves, so this is not a dog issue, but a human concern. If the issue is protecting certain natural environments, humans should also be disallowed, which would be a completely different issue altogether, how to restrict mammals from disturbing the natural environment.

To keep SF beaches "pristine to visitors" we need to keep the beach as is. It is a beautiful mix of canine and human and nature that brings a smile to everyone's face that visits. It is absurd that all the dog owners who pay taxes shouldn't be able to continue taking their family members to their favorite beach.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1011	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,09,2014 06:28:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I live in San Francisco and enjoy taking my dog to the GGNRA parks, especially Crissy Field. I only go to parks where my dog can be off leash and under voice control, because it is critical that she run and play to get adequate exercise.				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am opposed to fences that surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like jails and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not to do them.

SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the "best professional judgment of NPS staff" to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have

demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for "proof" that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

SEIS says there has to be a no-dog area at all sites where off-leash dog walking is allowed. For example, the SEIS says Muir Beach is too small to have both an off-leash and a no-dog area, so therefore there cannot be an off-leash area at Muir Beach (p. 113). There's no similar idea that sites that are no-dog also have to include off-leash areas. This shows the inherent unfairness of the SEIS.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1012	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,09,2014 06:34:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I live in San Francisco and enjoy taking my dog to the GGNRA parks, our favorite is Fort Funston. It is important for my dog to run and play off leash every day in order to get enough exercise to stay healthy.				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am opposed to fences that surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like jails and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) in the GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.

SEIS still does not consider management tools that could mitigate alleged impacts from dogs in the No-Action Alternative. For example, dog training classes, dog-horse workshops, and poop cleanup days could all mitigate concerns about dog safety and pathogens in feces that are used to argue that the No-Action Alternative will not work and therefore the GGNRA must restrict off-leash access.

SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that in many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities. (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to & expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1013    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sunnyvale, CA 94086  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 10:29:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am not a dog owner, but I love going to dog-friendly beaches and watching the pups play! It would be a shame if there were no beaches open to these important family members.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1014    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94621  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 11:17:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** One of the most pervasive problems in national parks is the presence of marijuana growers. High traffic keeps these guys at bay. Dogs have to be walked every day. Which means that they are in a park every single day, creating safety zones wherever they go. The trade off is a little poop, trash cleanup and the occasional dust up. Weighed against pollution from fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, water theft from streams and dangerous heavily armed criminals wandering around, it seems like a relatively inexpensive means of protecting an area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1015    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 11:31:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think dogs are detrimental to the park. They are dirty and disruptive to the taxpayers looking for peace and quiet in a national park.

Dog walkers are the worst offenders. The beaches along Chrissy Field have been ruined by their continued presence.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1016    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 11:39:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a native San Franciscan with a degree in Biology and a lifelong commitment to environmental issues. I also walk my dog every single day at Fort Funston and can't imagine my life without the opportunity for the continued recreation promised us when we voted to transition management of Funston and Ocean Beach to the Federal government. I am a disabled, retired middle-aged woman who feels safe in the presence of the dog community. My gait is unbalanced enough that trying to walk my dog on leash is relatively dangerous. Please stop seeing those of us who walk at the Fort or at Ocean Beach as the enemy. I stay on paths and can make it down to the beach on some days (wouldn't be able to do that if I was clinging onto a leash). My dog stays near me and is certainly not destroying the beauty and integrity of the land...I wouldn't tolerate it. As a day-to-day observer, I can say that the biggest impact on the park is by those profession dog-walkers whose packs are way too large. Focus on reducing that wear and tear and let's see what evolves. Let me hobble along with my best friend...

Sincerely,  
Lauris Jensen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1017 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 11:45:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am strongly opposed to any changes that will limit the already restricted dog laws in the GGRA. I support alternative A - the No Action alternative. Not only am I a dog loving resident of Mill Valley, but I am a dog trainer. For 20 years this has been my profession and I worked many years at the Humane Society. I am on the trails, specifically Miwok every day, for pleasure or with clients. On an average day, I may see a few people, at most. The majority of the people i see have dogs and they are well behaved and responsible. I moved to Marin from the East Bay as a way to continue to build my business and improve my family's lifestyle. The changes you propose would dramatically affect my personal and professional life.

Do not further reduce the small percentage of space that I can enjoy with my dogs and my clients.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1018 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94942-0462  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 12:20:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** These proposed changes don't allow for the kind of access and availability dog owners need.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1019 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 12:55:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please, Please, Please don't restrict dogs on Crissy field and beach.

This is a treasure for all people (and dogs) to enjoy. The park must get a significant amount of additional usage because of all the dog lovers that happily bring their dogs to the park.

We have been going to the park for many years to run or play with the kids on the beach. We have never had a problem with dogs being there off lease.

We love it. The dogs love it.

Please don't change it.

respectfully,

Jim Stafford

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1020    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sunnyvale, CA 94086  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 13:42:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to request that you keep the Fort Funston and Crissy Field sites open to off leash dog activity. The VAST majority of dog owners are very responsible people who pick up after their dogs and make sure that they only permit their dogs to go off leash if the dogs are well-socialized to other people and other dogs. My dog, and those with which she plays are happier and healthier for being able to romp and play, something they cannot do while on leash. Most off-leash dog parks are small, poorly maintained (at cost to the communities), and the limited size creates potential problems.

The fact that some people are afraid of dogs, or simply don't like them, is no reason to restrict the enjoyment of the thousands of local citizens who want to enjoy the outdoors with their dogs. My guess is that restrictions may be ignored by many, and policing dog policies is a poor use of NPS or local law enforcement resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1021    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 13:49:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have submitted comments on this COMPLETE waste of your time and my money on previous occasion. Just wanted to let you know that this plan will bring protests the likes of which haven't been seen since the '60s. I know because I will organize whatever it takes to overturn your

---



bureaucratic power play. Picture thousands of people lined up at the federal courthouse in SF to contest their citations for walking their dogs off leash... Picture thousands more marching (with their dogs) to those specific sites you identify as being no longer "off leash." I will personally solicit civil disobedience from those kindly people who now take their dogs to city dog parks to gain numbers...

While I have been a critic of NPS for eons, this ill advised and ill fated mission of yours sets new standards... While my personal favorite was the boneheaded idea to re-integrate raptors to the Muir Beach headlands by baiting them with frozen quail, all the while trying to expand the quail population in SF, (the raptors with new appetite for the quail were killing quail in SF by the thousands... ) the dog ban will be new and different...

I have lived in Marin for 60 years... and I am old enough to remember how to organize a protest... just watch.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1022	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,09,2014 14:16:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dogs with me when hiking.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1023	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94707 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,09,2014 15:44:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am especially concerned about the protection of wildlife aspects of the proposed rules. For as long as I have been watching and sometimes monitoring the Snowy Plovers in the Bay Area I have seen the population continuously decline. One small step is to prohibit dogs from the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area, and require dogs to be leashed at the Ocean Beach Snowy Plover area.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1024	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Mil Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Miwok Trail, Overhill Road off Camino Alto in Mill Valley, Muir Beach, Stinson Beach, Rodeo Beach and Railroad Grade.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I am a responsible dog owner who cleans after my dog. I truly hope my dog and me have the freedom to use the trails and enjoy the outside so nearby my home.

Sandra Vogel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1025    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 16:05:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am concerned that the Draft Management Plan does not adequately address the problems created by the rapid growth in dog walking within the GGNRA. This is particularly a problem at Ocean Beach where dogs interfere with the nesting Snowy Plover. Simply requiring dog owners to keep their dogs on leash will be ineffective without enforcement. Dog owners already routinely ignore leash requirements because of inadequate enforcement. Without increased enforcement they will also ignore leash requirements at the Snowy Plover habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1026    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Trail and Muir Beach. My dog Daisy is blind and it is nice for her to get out into the fresh air and be able to run in a safe place. I live in Marin County to be able to enjoy the

outdoors with all members of my family.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space as part of their lifestyle. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1027	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,09,2014 16:25:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This comment relates to the portion of Stinson Beach that is currently dog friendly.				

The status in place now is working just fine. A portion of the beach is designated for people without Dogs; a portion of the beach is designated for people with Dogs.

Why is our government spending tax payer dollars conducting voluminous studies attempting to change a beach that is currently friendly, in separate areas, to both people without dogs and people with dogs? What is wrong with the present status quo? Why does the U.S. government now have to create all of these studies and attempt to change the rules of a beach that has worked well for all of these years?

Dogs need a place to run; to walk; and to have some fun. The current management of the beach provides this need. Why change it?

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1028	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,09,2014 17:37:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin headlands.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1029	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118-3523  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 17:37:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First, thanks to the staff for working so hard on this project. The issue has become very complicated. I think the entire park area should be open ONLY to dogs on leash (except in a fenced area for off-leash dogs only) and that no one should be walking more than 3 leashed dogs at a time. So I prefer Option D, but my second choice would be Option B. Option F allows too many dogs being walked by commercial dog walkers- -there is no way anyone can walk 6 dogs at a time without forcing pedestrians off of the path as they pass. Also, there should be no dogs off leash on Baker Beach. The GGNRA is currently overrun with dogs and owners who can't (or won't) control them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1030    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 19:34:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As the owner of a well behaved and obedient border collie who does extremely well on fire roads and the beach I object to any further restrictions to where dogs can go in the GGNRA.

Please do not enact this,  
thank you,  
Dore Collier

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1031    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 20:46:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live two blocks from Land's End Trail.

I have been walking my 2 dogs off leash in the GGNRA in the Land's End area, as well as other areas of the GGNRA, on most days for ten years. I have not encountered any problems or issues with these outings.

During these walks hundreds of people of all ages have come up to me and asked me if they could pet my dogs. During these walks hundreds of people have smiled at me and asked me about my dogs or told me that my dogs are cute, or that they enjoy seeing my dogs.

During these walks I have encountered thousands of off leash dogs of all sizes. I have not had any problem with these dogs.

Only two times in these ten years has there been a person who has shown concern that my dogs were off leash. Both of these people mistakenly thought that it was illegal for my dogs to be off leash and that was the basis of their concern. My dogs were not even near them or threatening them in any way. When a person looks at my ten pound dog, who is standing next to my feet, from fifty feet away and tells me they

have a problem with my dog. I KNOW that the problem is theirs, and that it is a mental problem.

It is very important to me to retain the off leash dog walking rights in the GGNRA, in the areas that it has historically been allowed, for my health and for the health of my dogs. I feel that you are mis using your authority when you make rules trying to take away the rights of American citizens for no good reason.

I understand that you wish to take "recreation" out of the title assigned to these lands, and bring these lands into regulatory compliance with other lands known as national parks. I can see that you are posting signs that say Golden Gate National Park instead of signs that say Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I think this is a very poor judgement on your part; to mistreat American citizens and their dogs in this way, without justification.

These Golden Gate lands border large, heavily populated urban areas. They are not in a wilderness.

It seems you have attempted to show justification for your actions, but it does not appear that any of the justifications you have put forth, or cited in your papers, environmental or otherwise, have merit or factual significance to them. Your statements appear vague and speculative. It also appears that your papers are superfluous, as if you are trying to confuse people and create ambiguity, in order to achieve your mis directed purpose of taking away the rights of and oppressing American citizens.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1032	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,09,2014 20:47:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Each person is responsible for the care and health of there dog- -Just as they are responsible for there own actions. Removal of dog waste is there responsibility- -It must be taken home or taken to a wast container. If a dog is vicious -it must be contained Respect your neighbor and gently remind them -if they are not respecting others health and welfare Dogs are a beautiful gift - -of love to our universe. We have the opportunity to be thankful and encourage them to enjoy there lives				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1033	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,09,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a native San Franciscan, avid hiker and financial supporter of both national and state parks. The new anti dog proposal has made me halt my funding to both since a large part of how I enjoy these parks is with my dog. We make daily visits to Fort Funston, and several times a month go to Crissy Field. These are the only areas where people and dogs have enough space to really let go and run/play without worry about cars or bikers. City parks are too small for adequate exercise. On my daily visits I meet people without dogs, visitors to the city and of course, other dog owners; almost always the visitors are excited to see my dog and want to pet him. On the occasions that someone is not dog friendly,				

---

I use voice recall and my dog doesn't bother them. There is room for everyone to enjoy our beautiful SF nature. The quality of my life and in fact of all the visitors to these parks will be severely and negatively impacted if this plan goes through. Please see my below comments and include them as substantive comments in opposition to this narrow minded plan.

Oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions.

SEIS still lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not to do them.

SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on

the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

SEIS says there has to be a no-dog area at all sites where off-leash dog walking is allowed. For example, the SEIS says Muir Beach is too small to have both an off-leash and a no-dog area, so therefore there cannot be an off-leash area at Muir Beach (p. 113). There's no similar idea that sites that are no-dog also have to include off-leash areas. This shows the inherent unfairness of the SEIS.

SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA document on the GGNRA website). They say they received over 4,700 comments, but never say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS says: NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas. (p. 100). But there's no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.

SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The SF Supervisors and dog walkers asked for a thorough analysis. What we got was cursory at best.

SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a minuscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) in the GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.

SEIS still does not consider management tools that could mitigate alleged impacts from dogs in the No-Action Alternative. For example, dog training classes, dog-horse workshops, and poop cleanup days could all mitigate concerns about dog safety and pathogens in feces that are used to argue that the No-Action Alternative will not work and therefore the GGNRA must restrict off-leash access.

SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that in many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities. (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to & expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972)

SEIS will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. The only site-specific

consensus agreement to come out of Negotiated Rulemaking was to allow off-leash dog walking on a trail in Oakwood Valley in Marin. This was included in the DEIS. However, it was removed from the SEIS (Oakwood Valley is now proposed to be on-leash only) because the GGNRA decided that there would be no off-leash dog walking on any trail. All the money and work that went into Negotiated Rulemaking was wasted.

SEIS still will not allow any off-leash dog walking on New Lands acquired by the GGNRA in the future, even if dog walking occurs has traditionally occurred there.

SEIS cites several surveys of visitor use and visitor satisfaction, including two done in 2011 in response to DEIS comments, that were so poorly done that their results are essentially meaningless. A 2008 visitor use survey at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field used people who intercepted people at these sites and asked about their park usage. However, the interceptors were observed by several people to actively avoid talking to people walking with dogs, hopelessly skewing their results. A 2011 visitor use survey at Fort Funston and Muir Beach, done specifically in response to DEIS comments, only counted people as walking dogs if they had a leash in their hand. People walking with a friend and the friend's dog were not counted as a dog walker (because they did not have a dog of their own with them), even though they were only walking there to walk with the friend's dog. A 2011 Visitor Satisfaction Survey was so confusing respondents didn't know if they were being asked about their satisfaction with current conditions at GGNRA sites or with the severe restrictions proposed in the DEIS.

SEIS still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who don't want to be around dogs. This criticism was made of the DEIS too and apparently ignored.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1034	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,09,2014 23:55:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. If there are problem in certain areas, they can be addressed more creatively on a one-off basis.				

For example - I have been walking at Oakwood Valley and Miwok trail (and more recently Rhubarb) since moving to Tam Valley 12 years ago, the last 10 years with my dog. I have never had or caused a problem at any of those places. Oakwood Valley is full of non-native Eucalyptus, so it is hardly a pristine wilderness area, or likely ever to be (unlike Muir Beach for example). That site especially is heavily used by the people who live in the immediate area. The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Cramming everyone and their dogs (which almost everyone seems to have) unto some tiny corner of open space will create vastly more problems that it will solve. I have no issues with some space being restricted, but adding the additional restrictions makes no sense and it totally counter-productive.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1035	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,09,2014 23:55:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been using the Ft. Funston dog walk area for 15 years. I have not seen an overall decline in the cleanliness of the park, the wildlife or plants in the park, nor have I seen any fights among dogs or people using the park. I have seen many examples of people within the community coming together in a friendly atmosphere, being neighborly, and in some cases becoming friends.

I understand that part of the concern is the impact on flora and fauna at the park. There are many areas in the park that are marked off for multiple reasons and access is blocked off. My experience has been that people are respectful of those boundaries. I suspect that the flora and fauna are doing just fine in those areas. If a raccoon can a home under my deck, I am sure various animals can thrive in a protected area.

This is a public park paid for using tax funds. Like many other public service, the rising costs of labor, lawsuits, and the increased bureaucracy create a budget deficit. However, the cost of the above will not be affected by eliminating off leash access. Rangers will still have to patrol/service the park, lawsuits will still occur, and the bureaucracy will still exist.

One possible solution to offset the cost is to require dog walkers to obtain park permits. They are essentially using public land to operate a private business and they make money from that business. This would be a "business use fee" and could even be applied for commercial sightseeing buses that bring tourists to Ft. Funston.

It would seem that restricting the off leash dog walk area would be in contrast to the intent, and possibly the letter of, the granting of the land to the city. This would also seem to be denying a service to the community. There are many areas for people to walk alone or with a leashed dog, including Ft. Funston, but there are very limited areas for people to have their dogs off leash.

Please, leave the park as is in terms of allowing off-leash access. Let's work to find a creative solution that allows for the future viability of the park while maintaining the long standing tradition and character of Ft. Funston.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1036    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san mateo, CA 94401  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 06:10:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in response to the proposal of limiting the space and off leash access to dogs at Fort Funston. I think this is ridiculous this property was given to San Francisco County with the understanding that the dogs and owners would be able to be off leash under voice control.

This is not right for GGNRA trying to take back land that was given to the dogs in the late 1970's. San Francisco County needs to stand tall and not let GGNRA take this land back or alter access for leash .

This will also hurt DOG Walkers business ALOT. DOG WALKERS are an IMPORTANT PART OF

---

PEOPLES LIVES.

THANK YOU

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1037    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Recreational Groups  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. I regularly take my dog to Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, Lands End, Sweeney Ridge as well as city parks throughout the bay area. Part of my job is to help at-risk youth reconnect with the community as a whole. I believe that recreation and access to nature is critical to feeling integrated in a community. I walk with my elderly parents, at risk youth clients, disabled young adults, and young children. Being able to walk my dogs in these areas provides all of us with a premise for recreational use of GGNRA land. When my first dog died, I became acutely aware of how important the presence of a dog was to bring these people out to enjoy our parks. The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. As a person who uses my dog as a tool in educating at-risk youth about positive recreation opportunities in the Bay Area, I am very worried about the impact of your proposed dog management plan. On both access to recreation for all and the environmental impact by way of dog owners having to find alternate places to bring their dogs.

As I mentioned above, having a dog provides a reason to go out and enjoy the beautiful landscapes of GGRA. When I am out working with or walking my dog, I see the most diverse group of people out there doing the same: all ethnicities, social classes, ages, and (dis)abilities. GGRA dog friendly areas are some of the rare places where all of these people connect through their dogs. When I am out with my African American or Hispanic youth from Hunters Point, the Excelsior, or the Fillmore and they are handling my dog (it teaches them responsibility and leadership skills), they are sometimes spoken to by older white women from the Marina who typically cross the street when they encounter these same youth on the sidewalk. Remove the dog from the equation, and you remove that connection.

I live in Bernal Heights just blocks away from one of the few off-leash city parks in San Francisco. The park is already very well frequented, and I dare not imagine the devastating environmental impact your plan would have on our park. Simply put, if you restrict dog access the way you outline it in Alternative F, the dogs that frequent GGRA land are not going to magically disappear, they are going to have to be walked somewhere, and the city simply doesn't have the infrastructure to handle that influx of dogs in its city parks. The parks would be ruined, and recreation really would become inaccessible to non-dog owners who weren't frequenting GGRA sites anyways and are now unable to enjoy city parks. Not to mention the fuel emissions of those responsible dog owners who would decide to seek friendly trails in East Bay Regional Parks.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. Please keep GGRA open and welcoming for all!

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1038    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 10:39:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a homeowner in San Rafael for 22 years now. I am a volunteer dog walker at the Marin Humane Society, which is how I ended up with two rescue dogs. I'm also a fitness instructor and have a clear understanding of the need for regular exercise in both humans and even more so, with dogs.

I see that so clearly at the Humane Society. After the dogs are cooped up in a cage, we walk them on leash, into a fenced area, designated by the Humane Society, then let them loose, as Mother Nature intended. It is so healing for them to be able to embrace that free-spirited part of them.

I so appreciate the opportunity to allow my dogs to run as nature intended, in open space. I can't even imagine it any other way. They run so much faster than I do and I'm pretty fit for a 53 year old. I can't imagine, people less fit, having to keep their dogs on leash at all times. It can be VERY challenging when they are leashed and just not natural for them. I have a lot of empathy for dogs, as you can tell.

And of course, I do recognize that there are dog parks. Which is great, but very different from a trail head. They don't get nearly the exercise at a dog park as they do running free and some dogs aren't so comfortable being in such close proximity with other dogs. My dogs will sniff and of course, pee more than exercise when in a dog park. It's a very different experience for them.

We really love the Sleepy Hollow trail that so many other dog owners have come to appreciate. It's a very harmonious experience for all.

I do understand everybody has different needs, which is why there are plenty of trails with no dog access. And I do understand that some dog owners can be irresponsible. I wish that weren't the case. I often will pick up other doggies poopies to make it a more pleasant experience for those that are not dog lovers. I'd like to see that change. Perhaps with this recent threat of losing their rights, they will be more responsible. Perhaps we could have a campaign for people to pick up after other owners dogs in order to protect our rights? I'd hate for them to ruin it for us, who are responsible dog owners, those that pick up after them, for those that train them to be under voice command, etc.

For the love of dogs, I hope that you will consider their needs and not punish them for a few irresponsible owners and a few not so dog loving people that want to have all parks to themselves. Lets share the beauty of California in a harmonious way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1039    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Honolulu, HI 96813  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 12:06:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Aloha -

---

During our recent visit to San Francisco we stayed in the Marina District. The kids (ages 3 and 7) loved walking down to Crissy Field. Their favorite place to play became where Crissy Field Marsh flows into the bay.

During one of our visits, we were over run by large dogs off-leash. I guess it is pretty well accepted by dog owners to take their dogs off-leash near this stream to allow the dogs to exercise.

The dogs made a number of close runs by our children and other children playing in the same area. This greatly frightened the children and we eventually left. The dog owners seemed not to care that the dogs were scaring the children or running by quite close (within a few feet; one dog actually licked my child).

I support rules being put in place to require a leash for dogs on the beach at all times. Even the most friendly dog can be scary to a small child or an elderly person. There is no way a person can quickly tell if an off-leash dog is safe or not.

I urge you to consider this issue and enact appropriate rules before someone is harmed.

Take care,

Mark Anderson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1040	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,10,2014 13:01:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not ban off leash dog walks at Ft. Funston and at Pine Lake. As a native to San Francisco, and as a dog owner, it is important to all members of our community that these areas be opened for dogs and humans alike to Share exercise and freedom.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1041	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,10,2014 13:10:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Bay Front Park in Mill Valley as well as Rodeo, Muir and Stinson Beaches.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. I haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

---

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you,  
Mary Gribbin Feegel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1042    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 13:11:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Bay Front Park in Mill Valley as well as Rodeo, Muir and Stinson Beaches.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you,  
Tom Feegel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1043    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 14:02:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a home owner I have been a resident of Muir Beach for over 5 years and prior to that, a frequent visitor to this location for many years. One of the reasons I invested in property at Muir Beach was to become a member of this unique community and to enjoy the local surroundings with my dog and friends with dogs. I walk twice a day locally.

I am therefore deeply committed to Muir Beach and its surrounding trails remaining dog friendly and I am opposed to the suggestion of a leash law being imposed.

In the years that I have walked my dogs on the beach and surrounding areas, there has never been a time when I have come across problems with other dogs or dog owners disrespecting the environment or creating problems for others in their enjoyment of this area of natural beauty - to the contrary in fact.

Many who use this area recreationally have approached me with their children or dogs to socialize them and have expressed pleasure in seeing the dogs play and run freely. Allowing dogs off leash in Muir Beach enhances the enjoyment of this area for others it certainly doesn't hamper it.

I believe that imposing leash laws at Muir Beach would create problems that don't currently exist for both residents and visitors alike and their dogs and it would have a negative impact generally.

Please DO NOT impose a leash law at Muir Beach!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1044	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Address:</b>	private, Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America						
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	none Unaffiliated Individual						
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member						
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,10,2014 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please take no actions to change the GGNRA rules at the beaches of Marin.						

Please enforce the existing rules established in 1979 and avoid any rules restricting access to dogs and other pets. There are restrictions enough already throughout the county regarding this matter.

BTW, the photo on your landing page regardint his matter is heavily biased against dogs / dog owners with what is clearly a photo of several professional dog walkers with their charges. Why?! I've never seen so many dogs in such a small beach area (let alone any area!) in my 20 years here. We, the majority are tax paying, rule abiding families with dogs. We are not professional dog walkers with five dogs released to roam freely on our beautiful beaches.

Don't change the rules to penalize everyone. Address the problems with enforceable rules and citations.

Do not make my personal information available to the public.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1045	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,10,2014 14:39:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please continue to allow dogs off leash at Baker Beach.				

I would be pleased with use of "Alternative A" which allows dogs to be off leash on the entire beach.

Thank You.

-Michael Levy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1046	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94707 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 15:22:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs and their owners have overrun parts of the GGNRA. The presence of dogs is very detrimental to wildlife and especially shoreline and marsh habitats. Pets have no business in GGNRA, especially unleashed dogs, and they should be prohibited except to very limited sections of the GGNRA. Off leash dogs are a menace to nesting birds and other wildlife whose ranges have already been severely restricted. I urge the NPS to protect our natural resources by severely limiting, or banning, dogs from GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1047    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Greenbrae, CA 94904  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 17:04:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE This has NOT been thought through properly, is NOT supported by any clear evidence and is just yet another endless onerous additional limit on our civil liberties.

STAY with the 1979 Pet Policy.

Again, this is in support of the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1048    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Forest Knolls, CA 94933  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 17:16:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

The GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk with their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County! Also, it could force me, a woman, to walk in isolated areas that don't feel safe.

I moved to Mill Valley in 1985 and Forest Knolls more recently. I think the efforts to discourage people

---

to walk in the beautiful parks that attracted us here are way off base. We need to get out in nature for our, and our dogs, well-being.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1049    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 17:25:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a user of various parts of GGNRA and it is one of the reasons why I love living in the Bay Area. As a person residing in a large metropolitan region, open space is imperative to healthy living. I believe we should have more. But we are lucky for what we do have now & I am grateful for it. I have friends who are dog owners & friends who are dog walkers. I fall into neither category. But I respect the daily requirement needed to maintain a pet.

GGNRA offers folks like myself and dog owners a chance to get out and enjoy a less urbanized environment. However, in order to enjoy this park space one must feel safe and comfortable. Many dog owners keep their pets on a leash while in the park. Some dog owners let them run free. A dog needs its exercise. But any dog not on a leash should not be far from its owner and should be very responsive to its owner's commands. The one place where I have witnessed this scenario ineffectually has been in GGNRA in Marin; the Headlands. On several occasions I have seen dogs run off trail, through the brush, chasing wildlife. Owners have called to no effect. I believe this is not healthy for the local fauna as it does not allow them the safety of living in their homeland environment. In San Francisco, I have seen this far less except with the dog walkers.

My main concern with this current issue at hand is with the dog walkers and their canine clusters. At Ft. Funston a friend & I were both harassed by one dog walker who told us it was his domain to bring dogs to this park because he was there everyday and we were not their everyday (we had both felt intimidated by one of his unleashed pets and asked him to leash it). In fact, there were so many dog walkers that day I have not returned to Ft. Funston because it turned out to be a very unpleasant experience constantly surrounded by packs of dogs.

This past weekend at Crissy Field a friend and myself saw a dog walker with ten dogs on the beach, off leash. We did not feel she could control them all. One dog ran separate from the group & with her eyes on the other nine did not see the one dog defecating on the sand. None of the dogs were unruly when she passed us and they all seemed to be having fun but I did not feel safe or comfortable.

I believe that dog owners should be allowed to walk their dogs in GGNRA and that there should be designated areas for off leash and on leash as well as parts where no dogs allowed. This will only work if rangers are out there to issue tickets for abusers. I never see them out in Marin....never, and I am there once every two weeks. Dog owners disregard rules if no one is out there to enforce them.

Dog walkers, however, I feel should not be allowed to use GGNRA for their private enterprises. I feel it is unsafe for the general public and overall not great for the park's natural environment. I do not think dog walkers can control their packs at all times nor do I feel that their responsibility to their job/employment should rest within the park's borders.

I would feel comfortable with dog owners or walkers using the park for dogs, no more than 2 at a time. I would be ok with a dog owner or walker having three dogs at one time in the park as long as they were leashed. I believe one or two dogs can be controlled and more than that, not so much.

I do not think GGNRA should have doggie runs either. The city, if it wants, can create doggie runs (and not on existing public park land).

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1050    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 17:41:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not reduce off-leash dog walking in the Bay Area. Please return to the original 1979 Pet policy.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1051    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

We spend at least 5 days a week on the trails of GGNRA hiking with our dogs. Dog owners on the trails are very respectful of nature and keeping their dogs under voice command. Over the decade that we have lived in Marin, we have never had a problem on the trails with other dog owners.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Marin residents rely upon this open space. We pay for this access and enjoyment through our tax dollars.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1052    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Trabuco Canyon, CA 92678  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 17:58:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family visits Muir Beach several times a year and we enjoy bringing our dogs along on our vacations. It is a privilege to be able to take our dogs down to the beach and let them run in the surf leash free. If you invoke a leash law some of the charm and wildness to the local beach will be lost. It is so enjoyable as a dog lover and nature lover to be able to share the beauty with our furry friends without the constraints of a leash. In all my visits I have never seen anyone abusing the privilege. People

---

with dogs are very aware and probably more careful than most to clean up after their pets. I have never encountered a problem with other people or dogs on the beach. Please don't take away this simple pleasure that has disappeared from most public trails.  
No Lease on the Beach :)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1053    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 18:50:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the proposed plans for management of the GGNRA, especially the restrictions to dog access.

If the portion of the GGNRA contiguous to San Francisco cannot be managed as intended when it was created - as recreational space for a crowded and water-locked city - I would definitely support its assignment to another entity that could better focus on the unique conditions of this resource and the unique needs of its natural constituency.

In San Francisco, our leaders and bureaucrats are constantly pushing for more housing, more jobs - while my neighborhood is already the densest in the country outside of Manhattan. Taking away use of the GGNRA open space for my main sport - walking my dog off leash - will significantly reduce my quality of life, especially as I get (even) older.

Urban dog ownership has skyrocketed to new levels over the past 2 decades. Why? I believe the fact that many baby boomers are aging out of other forms of exercise, coupled with a greater tolerance for dogs at work, shops, etc.. Perhaps the tension of our crazy world needs this sort of antidote. But, while we recognize a host of new sports - mountain biking, kite sailing, snow boarding - we have not recognized the new role that dogs have in our urban lives. There are national standards for the number of baseball diamonds, tennis courts and play areas but nothing about accommodating dogs in urban settings.

The smug and inexorable march forward with this policy ignores the desires of a large and critical constituency. I cannot imagine the Conservancy would be as successful if all dog owners withdrew their support.

Truly progressive and forward thinking would recognize the uniqueness of these parks and this opportunity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1054    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94601-4830  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 20:16:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs visiting national parks & national recreation areas (eg, Golden Gate National Recreation Area) need to be on leash at all times. there should be fencing around off-leash areas and i strongly feel dog walkers should not be allowed to conduct their business (& it is a business) in any national park or recreation area.

---

i personally object to dogs off-leash in all parks except in fenced areas. i regularly walk in various parks & recreation areas in Oakland, San Francisco & other parts of the Bay Area. I am offended by dogs bounding up to me, sometimes jumping on me, in their totally natural excitement & curiosity. i get enough of that walking the streets of Oakland. I would prefer not to hike or try to commune with nature in an area with off-leash dogs.

I wish dog owners would extend love of their pets & love of dogs to all creatures & recognize how fragile wildlife is. for example, annual bird counts show decrease in songbird populations in many sites. i wish dog owners would recognize all wildlife is severely stressed by loss of habitat. i wish they would not visit national parks & national recreations area with their pets at all.

i do understand the joyfulness of an off leash dog & maybe there need to be more dog parks in urban areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1055    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley , CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 20:59:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my objections to limiting the access of dogs to trails and beaches in Marin County CA. It is already difficult to find places to walk dogs and particularly to have them run unfettered and unleashed. I do not have a dog personally, but have dog sat for others occasionally and have been frustrated in my lack of flexibility of where to take them. Please stop this over regulation of park areas.

Sincerely,

Ron Chin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1056    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,10,2014 22:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern,

Thank you for considering to keep the Oakwood Valley/Alta Vista trail dog friendly. I live in Sausalito with two dogs. I am a bird lover and involved in marsh restoration. It is wonderful to have a trail, such as Oakwood Valley, that is a designated off-leash zone where my dogs can get the exercise they need. I understand that dogs can have a negative impact on wildlife, therefore it is vital to have designated zones for them. Without designated zones dog owners let their dogs run in sensitive habitat - this happens already and would increase if Oakwood Valley/Alta Vista becomes off limits to dogs or leashed dogs only.

I urge you to continue to grant dog owners off leash access for their dogs on Oakwood Valley/Alta Vista, it is one of only two spaces (the other being Rodeo Beach) in southern Marin.

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
A 12 year Sausalito resident and business owner.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1057    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** OAKLAND, CA 94611

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 22:58:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am so sorry to hear that NPS Muir Beach is considering putting a leash restriction on dogs. There are so few places for owners and their dogs at the beach to recreate and enjoy the beauty of a beach environment with the family. I think everyone with dogs is respectful at the beach in cleaning up after their dogs, I've never seen an issue with aggressive dogs and the ability to hike with them on the weekend and then go for a dip really is a great benefit. I can't imagine Muir Beach without dogs - it's such a gem and perhaps NPS should work on the parking situation there vs. outlawing dogs. I have been a \$ park supporter for many years and it's largely because I enjoy these spaces with my dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1058    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 09:31:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern,

Dog restrictions in the GGNRA need to be stricter and enforced. Crissy Field and Ocean Beach have become huge dog parks and no longer serve the purpose they are intended to. The garbage cans at Crissy Field contain so much dog waste that you can smell them from several yards away. Also, I do not believe that any dogs should be off leash at all in these areas as they are a menace to wildlife and other park visitors. I have witness several dog fights, one at Ocean Beach that resulted in a dog dying due to another dog attacking it because the owners couldn't control the animals. The purpose of the GGNRA is to enjoy the outdoors and wildlife and provide a respite for threatened wildlife. This is an area that all PEOPLE are supposed to have access to and enjoy. Not just dog owners. Increasing restrictions and enforcing them will allow all people, including dog owners to be able to enjoy the area. Dogs have completely overrun these areas. It is time for PEOPLE to take back control.

Anastasia

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1059    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Dog owner. (Murphy) Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 10:38:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a long time San Francisco resident (1960) I have been a frequent user of the Presidio open spaces. The U.S. Army was a wonderful neighbor, keeping the lands safe and open for

---

community use. This precedent has not been followed by the U.S. Park Service. While some service members have been courteous often personnel have been rude and surly if not physically threatening when I was exercising my dog. Quite frankly as a well-mannered older woman I posed no threat and their bullying behavior and attitude toward a city resident was not necessary.

This same attitude toward City residents is exhibited in your proposed off-leash rules for dogs. The city of San Francisco and the Presidio open space areas have a long history of tolerance and acceptance of the needs of our four-legged residents. Your new restrictions do not respect legal and customary precedence nor show the fair-mindedness typical of San Francisco laws and customs. I respectfully request that the lands be left for off-leash running for dogs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1060	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,11,2014 11:09:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I did a little experiment today. I decided to see what it would be like to walk my dogs as if the changes had already been made. I did not go to any open space areas, and instead, walked them through the avenues. It was an enlightening walk, and something I would encourage the people making these decisions to consider.

First, the only place for my dogs to eliminate their waste was either on the sidewalk, or, on the vegetation that my neighbors were so beautifully trying to create outside their homes. I also felt awful that I was not able to completely clean off the solid waste from the sidewalk, and imagined much more in the future as everyone else begins to walk their dogs away from open spaces. Just as any environmental impact caused by change, forcing dogs into a new area would have an impact, and it seems like it will be a huge inconvenience for the humans.

Additionally, I noticed there were not any garbage pails along the way. I know there used to be some, but it looks like they have been removed. Although I carried my waste bags, I noticed some people had not, and the sidewalks had the occasional bag left behind. I can only imagine how much this would increase with the proposed changes.

I also found my dogs to be an inconvenience to others who were simply walking to the store, walking their children, etc. Although my dogs were leashed, and also nice, non-aggressive dogs, I know to others they may appear intimidating. People were visibly uncomfortable by our presence, and there wasn't much space for us to move on the limited space on the sidewalk.

This is just something to keep in mind when making these decisions. I realize a lot of research goes into these decisions, and I hope the future of where dogs will go and its full impact, will be considered.

Furthermore, I would like to add that having an open space, like Sutro Park, has allowed the neighborhood to gather. I would not have met all the people I have met in my neighborhood, had I not had a dog, and then met many of them with their dogs, at the park. We have built a strong, community, discussed safety issues, kept track of each other, and built a very nice community. As a single woman, transplanted from the East Coast, this community building has been invaluable. When I broke my foot, people noticed my absence and checked in. Likewise, I've been able to check in with others who have needed a helping hand. Without a place to gather, initiated by getting our dogs out, much of the community feel will suffer. This would be a shame.

Thanks for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1061 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 12:24:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a long time San Francisco resident (1960) I have been a frequent user of the Presidio and of the ocean beaches that surround the city of San Francisco.

The U.S. Army was a wonderful neighbor, keeping the lands open and safe for community use.

This precedent, unfortunately, has not been followed by the National Park Service. While some NPS service personnel have been courteous, often NPS personnel have been rude and surly if not physically threatening. Quite frankly, as a well-mannered older woman, I posed no threat to them and their bullying and attitude toward a city resident was unnecessary and frightening.

This same attitude toward city residents is exhibited in your proposed off-leash rules for dogs. The city of San Francisco, the Presidio and the public beach open space areas have a long history of tolerance and acceptance of the needs of our four-legged residents. Your new restrictions do not respect legal and customary precedence nor show the fair-mindedness typical of San Francisco laws and customs. I respectfully request that off-leash running for dogs be allowed on San Francisco beach and park lands now under the jurisdiction of the NPS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1062 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 13:23:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I hope you will preserve the off-leash voice control areas for the dogs on our beaches and Crissy Field. It is very important that animals have places to run, socialize off-leash with other dogs for many reasons. I'm a former dog guardian who no longer has a dog, and I still really enjoy seeing the dogs play out there and interacting with them. I think the dog owners are the ones that get out and use these areas the most and should therefore have a say.

If there is some compromise that can be reached where there are sections of beach that the dogs can run free, that would be a better option and would prevent further confrontations from those hostile towards dogs and their guardians. Where there is a car/bike/pedestrian traffic safety issue concerned it makes sense to have strict leash areas but not so much near the shoreline where there are not that many people.

Leashing on trails where people are running with their dogs can be a trip hazard. It might make more sense to have certain days or times for dog use and certain days/times for restrictions instead of blocking off entire areas from them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1063 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 13:24:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We live in one of the most beautiful places in the world. Our dogs should be able to experience it with us. Dog owners should be responsible for their dogs and should be able to have them enjoy the area with live in with us. We are very much against taking away access to dogs on many of these trails. Not as many people will hike, visit with their animals and explore the beauty Marin offers.

Don't put even more restrictions on responsible dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1064 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 13:59:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have two dog that i regularly walk off leash on the Alta Vista trail above Marin City (foot of Donahue St.) and both of the legs of the Oakwood Valley trail. If i have enough time i combine the two for a wonderful long hike. These and the Rodeo Beach to upper parking lot are the only trails within easy reach for us to go to on a regular basis to give my dogs the proper exercise they need. At the same time i am getting the proper exercise I need and can enjoy the beautiful surroundings. (who wants to huddle in a dog park...)

My dogs are under voice control and I monitor their pooping and pick up and hike out their droppings.

I understand and appreciate the notion of leaving park areas off limits for dogs since even their scent might influence nature. Both of these areas however should remain voice control off leash areas.

They are close to urban settings and provide a safe environment for the animals to romp around. We are lucky in Marin that there is so much park and recreational nature, that it is possible for us to have both.

The issue of dog walkers with great amounts of dogs that are impossible to control is another one. I would be in favor of a limit for off leash dogs per person.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1065 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 14:37:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I walk my dogs on fire roads near and around Mill Valley and some are GGNR areas. I also love to take them to Muir Beach. I am retired so many days I go are week days. Sometimes we walk empty trails for hours, never seeing another person, dog, or deer. My dogs do not chase anything but their ball. If we do see people - they are usually walking their dog. So why should all this space just be unused? It is unreasonable and I wonder at the sense of it. We, dog owner are here because of what you are tryig to take away. I will fight for the right to use this land I grew up around and walked for 50 years. Believe me.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1066 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 16:23:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a nature loving dog owner I've long appreciated the seeming balance that exists within the diversity of GGNRA properties so that approximately 1% or so of the overall land is open for dogs and dog walking while the rest is set aside and protected. Sure, there were times I wish I could walk my dog in areas marked off but I think many dog owners feel as I do it is fair and reasonable to have the Pet Policy rules that are in place since 1979 and in keeping with enabling legislation for the National Recreation Area.

What causes me to write now is my understanding that proposed regulations would drastically reduce (perhaps by 90%) the access that dog walkers presently enjoy in the GGRNA. Not only that, but there seems to be an overall aim by the present leadership of GGRNA to reduce or eliminate dog walking from future lands that may be gifted or acquired.

I am concerned that I read a statement ascribed to the current director of the National Park Service, Jon Jarvis, that he would rather give up properties than have dogs running loose on them. Without the benefit of full context I can't know how literally this comment was intended but as a woman who spent many years as a manager in local government I do know from experience when the head of an agency makes a statement like that to his/her team, the team has a way of making the vision of the boss come to be. And I think the news articles and charges we've been reading over the past years in regard to lack of data, abuses of data and poor science cited in reports used by the GGRNA is very troubling. Clearly when reports consist of vague notions and mixed evidence it is not surprising staff might pick and choose what they can to support the goals and broad statements made by their leadership. When a staff report is requested with an outcome in mind, reports can be and typically are bent toward the desired outcome.

In this case, from my reading and from the recommendations so far, it seems the current leadership of GGRNA has a bias to significantly cut back on the approximately 1% of leash dog access currently afforded by the 1979 policy. The impact of the recommendations come across almost as though dog walking on and off leash is not recreation worthy to protect now or in the future. The outcome of the new report seems to be less about fine tuning, e.g., addition of dog waste pick up bags and waste disposal, fencing, and more about an assertive take away of the privileges enjoyed by dog walkers for more than 20 years without compelling reasons.

Not all people enjoy dogs or being around them and it is understandable, as is the case currently, that restrictions exist to give dog lovers and those who prefer to avoid dogs access to enjoy scenic parklands. That has been done fairly effectively and people have become used to those existing restrictions I believe. I can at least speak for the areas I most frequently use myself which include Stinson Beach, Muir Beach, Ocean Beach and Chrissy Field. I enjoy variety in my walks and appreciate being able to choose beautiful areas to take my dog for off leash and leash walks. Good signage and continued good markers for public education reinforces appropriate restrictions to keep things comfortable for all. Dog owners often look to each other to recommend not only most convenient and suitable areas for walking but those most beautiful and those where the other dog owners are responsible and friendly. Much is about education and establishing good habits. To create so many substantial geographic restrictions when a large community of dog walkers has come to enjoy and rely upon the use is a take away from this community that seems unbalanced and unwarranted.

I am object to the very premise that dogs are generally damaging and problematic to GGRNA resources and visitor safety. Should all people be banned because a few of them litter or vandalize? There are methods to deal with nuisance dogs and nuisance people that do not require across the board bans of both. I oppose broad restrictions on park use based only upon speculation of what might or could happen and anecdotal accounts that feed only a certain point of view. Before broad dog use restrictions are



implemented I urge serious, fact-based study, recognition and acknowledgement of the active use of GGNRA park areas by the multi-generational dog walking community, not only opinions from the organized groups, but those countless numbers of us who are regular users who appreciate the out of doors with our canine companions. I believe the majority of those in our community, dog owners and those who are their friends, families and companions want to preserve or even enhance quality opportunities for off leash dog play and running as well as on leash walking. I believe public opinion and an objective study will bear this out.

Dog walking and responsible dog play is encouraged by reasonable accessibility as is currently the situation in the recreational areas controlled by GGRNA. There is evidence and testimony outside the current study but not mentioned that communities with more off leash exercise areas for dogs appear to benefit from better behaved dogs in the community overall. Has this been researched, considered or pursued as part of the decision making process in regard to community impacts? How can the study purport to have no negative impacts on the community when these aspects are ignored? And isn't there research that shows restricting dogs to small areas and overcrowding of trails with dogs leads to more acts of aggression and problems? Has there been any reasonable attempt to determine what percentage of park users walk dogs or accompany a dog owner on walks as part of their use of the current recreation area? Is there any rational look at current or future use patterns vis-a-vis dogs and dog related recreation on these GGRNA properties? Could it be that dog owners and their families represent the majority? Without a reasonable basis and more credible information, it seems there is no compelling reason for drastic restrictions on permitting responsible dog owners access to much of the land that is accessible at present. I strongly oppose implementation of the new dog management policies as unsupported by need or fact and as detrimental to the recreational needs and desires of a substantial number of recreational users.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage its properties as the recreation areas they have been intended to be, I support these areas being transferred to another entity better able to manage them whether it is the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management or some other entity that broadly supports outdoor recreation. For those more urban sites such as Ocean Beach or Chrissy Field, if the GGNRA is not able to keep them dog friendly as they have been for so many years I would suggest consideration of the feasibility that they revert back to the City and County of San Francisco where I believe good access to recreational dog walking is broadly supported in the community.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Hurley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1067	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94611 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,11,2014 17:05:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I support the proposed dog management policies. It's not that they are perfect, but they would be a big improvement over the chaotic scene that often occurs presently. We need a balanced approach for uses of the park- -protecting some key areas such as the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area and the Ocean Beach Snowy Plover Area. There will still be many places that dogs can be walked without infringing on other park users' activities.

---

We need to respect those who don't want dogs interfering with their picnics and walks, and we also need to protect wildlife.

This is not about dog lovers vs. non-dog lovers, it's about balancing various uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1068    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 17:11:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am concerned that our Parks are not allowing enough rest time for the wild animals. The snowy plover and other birds are harassed by even good dogs. There should be more clear separation of areas for wildlife, people without dogs and the off leash areas. I feel that then pro dog walkers who use our parks should be closely monitored and that part of their business taxes should benefit the park systems. I also feel that the pro dog walkers should be fined if they are abusing the system. Regular dog walkers, dog owners should also be warned and then fined for violations.

I feel that wildlife should have night time free of additional light pollution and public events like skateboarding, movie night, evening concerts and all evening events should be disallowed. Daylight hours in all of our public parks are the only appropriate times for public events.

Thank you. Christina Braun

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1069    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 17:13:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Living in an urban area, parks and other natural areas are essential to physical and mental health. In California, there are few places citizens can go to freely exercise with their dogs - not state parks, not national parks, not many county parks. Most natural areas are not open to dogs already. I go to Ocean Beach, Chrissy Field and Fort Funston regularly with my dog. We jog for a few miles or hike for even more. These activities provides me great physical and emotional stimulation that I would not be able to experience in a small dog park or a restricted off-leash area.

Please allow me, my family and friends to continue to make urban living sustainable by having easy access to these large park areas in the company of our off-leash dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1070    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 17:34:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is an extraordinarily long document at over 1500 pages, not including the several hundred additional pages in the appendixes. While on the one hand, this speaks to the amount of effort the NPS has invested in addressing this issue, on the other it does make it extraordinarily difficult for the average citizen to participate at an informed level.

I would suggest that the central issue behind this is that the National Park Service's vision for managing the Recreation Area according to wilderness area rules is inconsistent with the desires of the public. This has caused significant non-compliance and resistance to efforts to NPS policies, which in turn exacerbates the conflict.

Preamble aside, I would like to register support for Option A in the attached maps: no change from current practice. I have reviewed the data on dog incidents, and do not see a strong justification for restricting usage. I was not able to find a definition of "dog incidents" in the documentation, and would be curious to know what level of severity is represented by this categorization. Nevertheless, the overall levels did not seem at all high relative to the usage of park lands by dog owners. Ocean Beach, with its high overall levels of incidents, is probably the least 'noisy' data, and that shows dog incidents being below 15% of the total on a consistent basis. Crissy Field for the last 2 years of data have also been below 15%. Without knowing the proportional use of the lands by dog owners it is difficult to know with certainty how this compares, but considering the fact that well above 15% of households own dogs it would seem that this data does not support increasing restrictions on dog usage in a broad-based fashion.

I would also request that fire roads universally allow voice control, assuming no presence of endangered species in the vicinity.

Restrictions on citizens' use of public land should face a very high hurdle. We all want to preserve these lands for future generations, and I recognize that multiple uses of the lands need to be accommodated. But it is inappropriate to treat urban recreation areas as wilderness areas. Please hew as closely to current allowances for dog owners to enjoy their public lands as possible.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1071	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,11,2014 17:39:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

More than one-third of Bay Area residents have dogs and we now know the importance of off-leash recreation for dog's physical and mental health, as well as the importance of the significant social communities that develop where people recreate with their dogs off-leash. The current conditions at Fort Funston are acceptable and should not be changed. There are no other comparable places to Fort Funston for owners to take their dogs off leash in the Bay Area.

I oppose off-leash restrictions because dogs will not be able to enjoy the park the same if leashes are required or if fenced-in play is the only option (which is sometimes stressful for dogs), as leashing dogs can result in aggressive behavior in dogs.

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

Let me introduce myself, I am a 3rd generation native San Franciscan and I have owned and operated a dog walking service here for 8 years. I depend on the income from this small business to financially support myself and it allows me to remain living in my hometown. Fort Funston is where I take a pack of dogs daily for their off-leash exercise.

I find your "preferred alternative" for Fort Funston to be too restrictive and oppose it based on the premise that there no justification in the SEIS for major changes to the dog walking policy's at Fort Funston. I support the formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy and insist that you consider this as the preferred alternative solution for Fort Funston because your management plan violates the terms of the deeds that transferred San Francisco lands to NPS.

Public input was not sought or considered enough in the creation of the plan. SEIS still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who don't want to be around dogs. This criticism was made of the DEIS too and was ignored.

SEIS still does not consider management tools that could mitigate alleged impacts from dogs in the No-Action Alternative. For example, dog training classes, dog-horse workshops, and poop cleanup days could all mitigate concerns about dog safety and pathogens in feces that are used to argue that the No-Action Alternative will not work and therefore the GGNRA must restrict off-leash access.

SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that "In many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities." (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - "The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to ... expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972)

Fort Funston is not a pristine park - Fort Funston will never be Yosemite or Yellowstone or Crissy Field, for that matter. If you were to deny access to people with dogs, the park would be empty most of the time, except for a few hang-gliders and horseback riders. People do not come to Fort Funston to stroll the paths, the terrain is too rugged for the average sightseer and has an ugly component caused by the high winds and sand-swept strong coastal conditions and the ice-plant that is necessary to keep the sand from blowing on the highway below. Other parks in San Francisco are more tourist friendly, have more picturesque views and are more appropriate for attracting the average visitor. Crissy Field is an example of such area where I can actually see how the dogs might impact the visitor experience and I do agree that the dog access should be restricted there.

#### NO STUDY TO SUPPORT Restricting Dog Walkers Pack Size to 6.

There should be some reasonable restrictions on the number of dogs that dog walkers are allow to walk off-leash at one time. I agree that 15-20 at a time is too many. However, I do believe that your suggest number limited to 6 is impractical and unfair. The San Francisco city supervisors already reviewed this issue and concluded in 2012 that restricting the number to 8 makes it possible for dog walkers to make a living wage. Below that number, it would be really hard to live in this city. Dog walkers in San Francisco play a vital role in helping families to be able to own a pet that brings them such unbelievable happiness and joy. Restricting dog walkers to fewer than 8 dogs off-leash impacts our ability to make a living wage and provide this service to San Francisco families. Matching the city park limits is the best decision for all concerned and the supervisors and Mayor Ed Lee have all voiced their concerns that if you do not match the city, you will be causing impact to nearby city parks.

The SEIS is not valid because it does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks.

This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The SF Supervisors and dog walkers asked for a thorough analysis. It is my belief that reducing off-leash dog walking areas will negatively impact other dog parks or adjacent lands through overcrowding and you have not adequately analyzed the impact.

The SEIS will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA is an impractical restriction.

"Some commercial dog walkers complained that they cannot control their dogs on leash on trails, and suggested that the trails should be off-leash for the dog walkers safety."

Restricting our ability to walk dogs off-leash on trails or near our parked vehicles creates problems as well. There are reasons that we do it the way we do it. For example, grasping several dog leashes at one time hinders the dogs ability to eliminate waste. Many dogs need to run a bit to get their systems moving and some need to turn in circles, while some are embarrassed and like to look for shelter to hide, just as humans do. We cannot change this, this is a fact of life for dog walkers. It is physically impossible to reach down and pick up litter while holding on to 6-8 leashed dogs. Others want to poop, others are charged up and want to play with the dog standing next to them or a dog several feet away and some just want to run to the beach and jump in the water! And this is all occurring as we are bending over to pick up the litter. Could you make it work? I sincerely doubt it!

By the time we get to the park with a truck full of dogs, they are excited and are high with energy, which makes it nearly impossible to walk them all leashed. Again, this is why it is so important for dog walkers to be able to let their animals out of the vehicles unhindered. Because they are powerful animals, it is a safety concern that we do it this way. Walking a pack of 6-8 dogs leashed directly from the vehicle and down the trails is a dangerous proposition. There is a much greater possibility that dog walkers can become injured in the process by excited dogs lunging, twisting and pulling them down the treacherous paths, than if the dogs are allowed to descend the paths on their own. Holding on to several leashed dogs going down a hillside is dangerous because we do not have the use of our hands and limbs to save us from falls. It would make our jobs so dangerous that it would exclude many of us from utilizing this area of the park, limiting our usable space even further.

There should be NO Fences!

Another reason I oppose the SEIS Preferred Alternative is because you propose to install fences around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and squeeze too many dogs into a small area at Fort Funston. By reducing and limiting the areas in which dogs can access off-leash, you will be concentrating many more people and dogs into a confined area which will escalate tempers of both humans and animals. By leaving the NO ACTION Alternative in place, you actually increase everyone's ability to get along peacefully. Dogs and People do not do so well when they are forced into smaller areas where "their space" is invaded by others. It will not be a pretty sight. Just imagine a concentration camp and that is what it will be like.

The SEIS is not valid because the MONITORING BASED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY contains a Poison Pill that nobody wants!

I also oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based

Management Strategy because it unfairly carries a "poison pill". The MBMS is still based on compliance. It still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

#### Invalid assumptions regarding Protecting Wildlife

One of the main objectives of the Management Plan states that it is to protect native wildlife and their habitat, which includes harassment or disturbance by dogs. Other uses of GGNRA lands (e.g. hiking, biking, hang-gliding, horseback riding) have a greater impact than dog walking and their access is not being limited or addressed. Birds and other wildlife have the rest of the California coast to make their home, while San Francisco needs a place to exercise a growing dog population.

We talked about ground-nesting birds being at risk because of off-leash dogs in the area, yet raccoons, coyotes, and humans are just as detrimental. The birds don't appear to be scared of dogs. If you ever watch a dog swimming or running towards one, they wait until the last minute before moving, and then only move a short distance away. The birds appear as if they're teasing the dogs. The birds, in all honesty, seem to be playing with the dogs.

Any of the areas where dogs would be restricted on the premise that dogs are impacting wildlife are currently doing well, despite the fact that dogs are present there. It has not been shown that removing dogs from the GGNRA will have a beneficial impact on wildlife in the park. Wildlife has adjusted over time to dogs so they are no longer viewed as a threat, and dogs are not impacting wildlife. The SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. A SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the "best professional judgment of NPS staff" to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for "proof" that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

Bottom line it seems that the biggest concern is for people who do not like dogs and I think they should avoid Fort Funston since they know there is a possibility that they might run into dogs and go to the MANY other places that they can enjoy where dogs are not allowed. Fort Funston should be the "Dog's Place" where they can enjoy the 1979 Pet Policy - with no restrictions!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1072	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,11,2014 17:46:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have two energetic and wonderful and coming dogs. I live in mill Valley. I rely on having access to off leash areas. I am always considerate and I make sure that I pick up after my dogs.				

---

Too many areas are already restricted for off leash. There are not many places I can take my dogs currently. Please do not restrict any more areas. It's not fair. Dogs need to have places to run and be free. We all need to share this community. Have negligent owners learn the rules of having off leash dogs. Post signs to be respectful. Issue citations. Offer more dog poop bags. But please please do not restrict any more areas. It will be cruel to owners and dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1073    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,11,2014 18:14:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly OPPOSE Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog, Ruby to Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Again, I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

Lastly, the SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1074    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** FAIRFAX, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,11,2014 18:17:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Continue the dogs off-leash policy @ Muir Beach. And if you don't - meaning you enforce a leash law there because I know you've already decided that to be the case - then return me every tax nickel I've contributed that went to rehabbing Muir Beach. I hate to see the public taken for fools as you "extend the comments period". Give me a break. It's a charade called promoting false hope. Muir Beach is lovely. But enjoyed much more thoroughly watching dogs on it and bringing a smile for all who are there to witness it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1075    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 18:20:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to oppose further restrictions on dogs in the GGNRA. I believe strongly in the need to protect the areas, but I do not believe that on leash dogs cause any more harm than human encroachment has caused, and in fact, there is no comparison whatsoever. I advocate enforcing existing regulations but not further limitations on tax-paying local residents who wish to have their dogs accompany them on specified outdoor trails and other locations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1076    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I am furious about further limitation of dog-friendly areas in GGNRA. We, the people, live in Marin because we love recreation. This NOT a rural area. I regularly take my dog to Alta Trail. The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I want you to honor the spirit of the park as it was chartered and let our dogs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1077    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 20:30:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS OUR DOGS LOVE THE PARKS AS WE DO!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1078    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**



**Received:** Jan,11,2014 21:57:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support The GGNRA plan to begin to regulate the completely unregulated off leash dog use in the parks and on the beaches. As a father of 2 young children I am often frustrated and forced to find 'somewhere else' to take my kids because of un managed off leash dog recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1079    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a San Francisco resident of almost six years and I strongly oppose the restrictive dog management plan the GGNRA is considering. For both dog owners and non-dog owners, the new plan would greatly diminish the quality of life in the Bay Area.

The Preferred Alternative is far too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

Â· I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

Â· I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Â· The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Â· The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Â· The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

Â· The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

Â· The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all.

This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Â· The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1080    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 00:23:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Crissy field and Muir beach as well as other trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1081    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 00:26:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** OUR national parks, recreation areas were created for both the preservation of the United States' ecosystems and the experience of the same by the people. It is an unfortunate fact of life that rules are required to maintain Homo sapien behavior within acceptable bounds. Oddly, nowhere is this more obvious than in the Bay Area where we pride ourselves on being so intelligent and the "pace setters" for the United States.

Why are we spending such huge and unnecessary amounts of time because of the whining of a few dog walkers? Follow National Park rules: dogs are on leash. I have been told that even in Southern California on the beaches, police really do police the areas and KEEP people keep their dogs on leash.

This is only a people problem, not a dog problem. The troublemakers, the complainers, are those Homo sapiens who use their dogs as projective means, i.e. they take pleasure in letting their dogs run anywhere, everywhere as the dogs simply do what the poor Homo sapien wishes they could do- -have no boundaries. We have spent far too much time and resources pandering to these people. Put down the rules, AND MORE IMPORTANTLY, ENFORCE with fines. That seems an excellent way to add to the financial

resources of parks while protecting and enhancing our parks.  
John and Janet Fiore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1082    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, of the published alternatives, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I am a resident of Central Marin and work in Southern Marin. I regularly take my dog to the following areas under GGNRA control: Muir Beach, Oakwood Valley Trail, Oakwood Valley Fire Road, Miwok, Alta Trail, Rodeo Beach, Rodeo Beach Loop. Very often the only other people I see on these trails are other people walking their dogs. This use by my family and my dog and other dog owners is I believe completely consistent with the founding goals of the GGNRA - to provide recreational opportunities for local residents and visitors.

I've never encountered any hostile dogs, though I accept they must exist. As do hostile humans, and other predatory wildlife - they can all be controlled via existing enforcement mechanisms. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, so using logic and mathematics alone one can conclude that they cannot possibly be having a detrimental impact on the area as a whole. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. The public as a whole must agree since their comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan as proposed back then.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite and it is most certainly not a wildlife preserve or sanctuary such as the Mojave National Preserve or the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. So again I reiterate my support for Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1083    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to many of the GGNRA trails and beaches.

---

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Most people who walk their dogs on the trails do it every day, rain or shine. They are your prime users. The complaints you get from people about aggressive dogs are there just that day. One day a year maybe. Do not let the noisy few dictate what thousands of others can do.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1084	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I have been a responsible dog owner in Marin County for nearly 30 years, and I am also a strong environmentalist. While I appreciate and understand the desire to protect wildlife, it is also critical that we continue to allow and actively encourage recreation on public lands. This includes allowing dogs, which are companions and parts of many Marin County families.

I regularly take my dog to the Miwok Trail, the Coastal Trail the Oakwood Valley Trail, to Muir Beach, the Alta Trail, the Pacheco Fire Road and the Rodeo Beach Loop.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1085	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94945 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,12,2014 10:32:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Plan F, in favor of Plan A. In Marin, where great things happen with regard to the environment, we get carried away with our "good deeds," at the risk of losing our soul. That is a sign of misplaced power. To access the incredible outdoors is a right that was provided us through access to Park Service trails way back in the 70's. To limit access is to virtually exclude those who most frequently use our trails- people with dogs- and to deny us the joy of where we chose to live. Will future generations be deprived of a freedom we once enjoyed?

I am in favor of leash laws in many of these spaces and cleanup responsibilities of dog owners, but please be cautious about acknowledging the fears of a few uptight do-gooders, at the cost of the right to access and joy for all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1086    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 11:22:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I 100% OPOSE these proposed restrictions I have always had a dog. GOOD dogs are GOOD because they are well exercised and allowed to BE DOGS. The people who oppose this open space must not be dog owners because they are completely out of sink with how special these creatures are wired. Saying things like "they can play in dog parks" is like holding them prisoner in our beautiful world. Dogs need their exercise. I get MY exercise walking my dog. We MUST do all we can to keep these spaces open. Kids have play grounds&.it is like saying they can only play with in the fences of a playground. PLEASE&do not limit the space dogs can walk FREELY.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1087    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 11:49:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi. I realize you have a tough job at hand. There is no way you can make everyone happy. My comment is to please consider leaving Fort Funston as it is now and not reduced to less off leash area. Rather than slightly reducing each dog area (Chrissy Field, Ocean Beach, etc.) make cuts in off-leash areas where they matter most and leave as is some areas. Everyone knows Fort Funston has dogs so if those people don't want to be around dogs, let them go to Ocean Beach. Pick and choose your battles - and I think Chrissy Field and Ocean Beach have a lot more non-dog people who just want to relax without being bothered. But give us dog people at least 1 spot where we can still go without having to worry. Don't treat all areas the same, please.  
Thanks for listening and good luck.

Heather Sears  
San Francisco dog owner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1088    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 12:39:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to add my support to the NPS policy of limiting dog and "off leash" dog access to NPS (GGNPS, Open Space) parks and beaches .

I hike, bike, and recreate almost daily on Southern Marin open spaces. The negative impacts from dogs and dog walkers is a regular and unpleasant experience. I have been bitten by small white fluffy dogs (off leash) with owners who swear that that has never happened before. I have been pushed to trail edges by dogs running ahead of or catching up to their absent owners. This is very, very common with trail runners who conveniently don't see where their dogs take a dump either. I have been given patches of poison oak after said dogs brush past my calves and ankles. I have been "greeted" by jumping, barking, "friendly" dogs who are clearly not under anyones control. These owners don't see the problem with this behavior because they welcome dog interaction. Many of us do not. I don't want a dog nosing my hands or pants or running across my beach blanket to see what I'm eating. This is considered a friendly and positive experience by dog enthusiasts who just don't understand that it's anxiety producing for parents of babies and small children, frail or older folks or non-dog lovers.

I haven't even mentioned the trail short-cutting that I see dogs doing on switchbacks, the crazy amount of dog excrement on and around trails, (and why should we have to pay for a company to pick that up ) as well as the number of times I've seen dogs chasing an animal off trail...who knows to what end.

I'm not sure what the NPS can do about enforcing the leash laws. I have hiked with dog walking friends who are otherwise law abiding people who take off the leash when they deem it safe (from a ticket) and make a point of warning other dog owners if they've seen a park service employee. But I do hope that they continue to recognize the negative impacts and restrict dog access. Most times people have to get in their car and drive to an appropriate site to swim, fish, ski, kayak, rock climb, roller-blade, or fly a kite. What is the objection to driving to an appropriate area to exercise and socialize one's dog?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1089 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 13:51:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands!

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of OUR public lands!

I urge you to RETAIN THE LONGSTANDING 1979 PET POLICY!

GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area; THIS REQUIRES A DIFFERENT MANAGEMENT APPROACH THAN WILDERNESS AREAS LIKE YELLOWSTONE OR YOSEMITE!

Mark Polite

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1090 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115-4360  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 14:02:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Fort Funston as is, regarding walking dogs there. It's a wonderland for humans and dogs and to lose the current use of it would be a tragedy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1091    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94966  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 14:07:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

As a responsible dog owner I hope that the National Park Service will reconsider its stringent stance in limiting off-leash access to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I consider myself, like many others, respectful of the public land, native plants, and animals that are also trying to thrive there.

Please do not punish all pet owners for the disrespectful few who do not control or pick up after their animals.

All of us, regardless of pet ownership, have a stake in being able to enjoy the Golden Gate National Recreation Area - the time I could spend in the GGNRA would be very limited if I were not able to bring my dog or let him exercise off-leash. Please allow us to keep that precious 1% of off-leash that is currently available.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1092    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 14:52:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

It would be such a shame to ban dogs from the GGNRA. I am a native and a current resident of Mill Valley and one of the perks of living here and owning a dog are the trails and beaches. I am a respectful and responsible dog owner and always pick up after my dog, stay on the designated trails and never encroach upon the natural habitat.

I support the No Action Alternative in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Oakwood Valley, Marin Headlands & Homestead.

The SEIS contains no peer reviewed, site specific or monitoring as required by law to initiate such a drastic change to the use of our public lands. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not properly address the concerns voiced in 2011 & those comments ran 3 to 1 against the plan.

As you know the GGNRA was established to give us outdoor recreational areas in a urban environment and should be treated as such. There should be a different management approach for the GGNRA than wilderness areas like Yosemite or Yellowstone. Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

My family, my friends, myself and our dogs really hope that you consider these points and make a decision that is fair for us and our K-9 companions. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

---

Mari Walsh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1093    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** 198 Stanford Avenue Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 15:06:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having moved to Marin a couple of years ago after living in many other states, I've been amazed by how restrictive the existing dog policy is. I can't imagine making it even more restrictive. I lived in Portland, Oregon most recently and always went for walks on the weekend with my dog. We'd pick different trails each weekend and would never even have to think about whether our dog would be permitted to join us... it was never an issue. My family still loves to walk on trails each weekend but now we almost never bring our dog - - he's not permitted in most of the areas where we walk. He loses out on the exercise, and my family loses out on the joy of having him with us.

We just returned from having taken our family, including our dog, to Muir Beach... one of the few areas that I know our Beagle is welcome and where he loves to run around, to everyone's delight. I was disappointed to learn that Muir Beach is one of the areas where the new dog policy will restrict dog access. I'd sincerely ask you to reconsider this change.

We have an amazing outdoor area around us, and one of our greatest enjoyments has always been to share that with our family's dog. I wish that the discussion would be around expanding dog access, but I would at least ask you to not restrict it further.

Regards,  
Brad Rodrigues

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1094    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94945  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am vehemently opposed to Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

A big reason why I stay in Marin is because of the access for my well behaved voice controlled dogs. I regularly take my dog to many of the Marin County beaches. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. As a 32 year Marin Resident I rely upon this open space.



Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1095    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 15:53:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to support the proposed revisions to the dog management policies in the GGNRA. I am an avid hiker and runner who uses the GGNRA regularly with my family, and I also own a dog that enjoys outdoor adventures, so I am definitely a "pro-dog" person. That said, I think that the current liberal policies for off-leash dogs have gone too far within the GGNRA, particularly since it encompasses such special and sensitive habitat areas for birds, native plants and mammals. Many dog owners disregard postings in the sensitive areas that prohibit dogs, and I know that budget cuts limit enforcement of regulations. I think the pendulum has swung too far.

I have been distressed to witness irresponsible dog owners let their pets chase (and maim in one case) the wild shorebirds that enhance the beauty of the beaches at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. I have been angered by off-leash dogs at Crissy Field whose inattentive owners allowed them to urinate on my personal belongings that were on the lawn and torment my dog that was within my control on a leash.

I think that a happy medium can be found in GGNRA that provides better protection of visitors and the environment from unleashed dogs. Perhaps you can add more designated "dog play areas" where dogs can cavort off leash, without running amuck among the bicycles, picnicking families and migrating wildlife.

As someone who is very supportive of the Save The Bay campaign, I am very appreciative of the efforts that have been taken to restore habitat to wildlife while also providing enhanced access for public enjoyment. Please don't allow unleashed dogs to diminish those efforts that are so important for future generations.

With appreciation,

TF

Glen Park, San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1096    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 15:53:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Miwok Trail and many others.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling

---

reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1097    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 15:56:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love dogs, but I think that we deserve at least one public beach (as the proposed Ocean Beach) that is reserved for human beings alone. I walk/run Ocean Beach at least five days a week and every dog owner that I view feels that they are exceptions and allow their dogs to run off leash. I have had large dogs run up and frighten me when sitting quietly on the beach.

On most days there are more dogs than humans on the beach, and it is impossible to walk barefoot anymore for fear of stepping in dog waste. Even wearing shoes I am not able to keep my eyes on the ocean and the surrounding beauty, but must constantly look down to watch what I am stepping in.

I saw the sign posted about this Plan on the Great Highway entrance to Ocean Beach at the stoplight at Lawton St.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1098    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 16:59:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to add my support to the efforts to open up more of Marin County for dog walkers to walk their dogs without a leash as long as the dogs are under voice control.

I am one of many, many responsible dog owners who would like to enjoy the beautiful surroundings with our dogs, who we consider an important part of our family.

My dogs are well trained. We always pick up after them. The more public lands that are available for us to walk with the dogs without a leash the better!

Thank you for taking the time to consult the public. I have never commented on a plan like this before, but being free to walk my dogs is very important to me so I am happy to know that my views are being taken into consideration.

Thank you,

Tom Hadfield  
Mill Valley, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1099    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 17:10:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the GGNRA's plan to restrict the presence of dogs at most park lands. Not everyone is a dog owner or even a dog fan. I'm sure I don't need to reiterate the reasons dogs should be leashed on any parklands, and not even present at all in the wilder areas.

I know you are going to get a lot of comments from dog owners and dog lovers on this, since there are several online campaigns aimed at getting people to submit pro-dog comments. I urge you to stay the course, thus helping to ensure a good user experience for everyone, and preserving wildlife and its habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1100    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 18:11:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm writing to strongly oppose the GGNRA dog management plan preferred alternative. I walk with my dogs on a regular basis at Fort Funston and Crissy Field, and the preferred alternative will negatively impact me, my family and the entire San Francisco community.

There is no justification in the dog management plan for the major changes included in the preferred alternative. Rather, I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. I am sure that places like Stern Grove will be inundated with dogs if the preferred alternative is implemented.

The GGNRA is a national recreation area, not a national park. But the dog management plan misrepresents the GGNRA's enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

Recreation is the reason the GGNRA was created, and recreation must continue to be its guiding principle.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1101    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 18:17:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the NPS recommendations presented in the Draft Dog Management Plan. I am a resident of Homestead Valley and frequently hike in many of the areas effected by this plan. While I love dogs, I have all too often encountered dogs in prohibited areas where sensitive habitat and wildlife are impacted by off-leash dogs. Now that the ecosystem at Muir Beach has been restored, it would be a shame to have off-leash dogs hinder the reestablishment of the flora and fauna that is intended. I'm also very pleased to see the proposal for on-leash requirements at Oakwood Valley. I frequently encounter dog walkers with far more than 6 dogs running off trail and into the woods and creek beds. Combined with poop bags left along the trail, walking here is no longer very enjoyable. I am also please to see that the NPS preferred plan would keep dogs off the N Miwok trail - a place where I have frequently seen bobcats, coyotes, and lots of birds.

It is important to have resources in place to monitor and police the regulations in the final plan. Somedog walkers seem to think that they're special and that it's no big deal if they let their dogs off leash or take them to places where they are prohibited. It's not all that uncommon to see a dog or two on the Tennessee Valley Trail - a no dogs allowed trail. I will generally point out that dogs aren't permitted because of the sensitive ecosystem, but the response is generally unpleasant. And with not one to hold these people accountable, it they will continue to flaunt the rules.

Dogs do need places to run and play, but not at the expense of public safety or the protection of sensitive habitats that will be enjoyed by generations to come.

Thank you to the NPS professionals who have compiled the data and are working to ensure sound requirements for dogs in the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1102    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,12,2014 18:22:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You are trying to take away what is one of the best and unique things left in the bay area, a place that doea not let us take dogs EVEN with leashes on most parks! Dogs NEED a place to be off leash, in order to be healthy and able to mingle and socialize with other dogs. Ive been here for years and have never heard of complaints from other beach goers, even those without dogs. It is such a special place that allows humans and animals to be free in such a beautiful place! Everyone is super aware to clean up after their dogs and if there is some dog dirt that is somehow forgotten, the culter of the regular beach goers there tend to pick up ANY dogs waste that is found.

I have never seen any evidence of the concerns expressed in the 2013 SEIS. I fully support NO Action alternative in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands.

If it isnt broken, dont fix it! Please RETAIN the 1979 pet policy!!!!!!

This area is a recreation area designed to give outdoor space for us pet owners to escape densely popuklated areas with our dogs, please dont take this away from us. You already have 99% cosed off to

---

us already!

I feel our tax dollars could and should be better served than to mess with this!

regards

Rej Bourdages

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1103    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 18:25:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs should be required to remain on leash at all times in wildlife areas. Dogs should be prohibited completely in areas designated to protect any threatened species. Dog owners are often irresponsible and single minded.

PLEASE keep access restricted and leash laws in place for the sake of wild life.

Thank you,

David Gannon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1104    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 18:54:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner, hiker, beach user, mountain biker, and outdoor enthusiast. I like having areas where I can take my dog and hike, but I am concerned about the potential impact of off leash dogs on trails and in areas such as Muir Beach.

In walking my dog through water district lands (leash required), open space lands (leash required except on fire trails), and other such areas, I often wonder about how seemingly law abiding dog owners turn into anarchists when it comes to their dogs.

I have seen too many dogs who run out of visual sight of the owner. I have seen too many owners who may believe that their dog would be under voice command, but the dog does not come when called. I have been in nature reserves (leash required) areas where dog owners have frantically called to their dog for over a half hour and were still looking for the dog when we walked by. I have been told by dog owners that leash requirements do not apply because everyone takes their dog off leash in particular areas. I have had dog owners who look at me like I am being unfair when I ask them to call their dog. And I have had a dog or two take a nip.

At Muir Beach, I would support a return to the original plan of keeping dogs away from the beach altogether. There are other beaches that are more open, where it is more appropriate to allow dogs. But if dogs were allowed, I would want to see them on leash, with those restrictions enforced.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1105    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,12,2014 19:05:07**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My husband and I moved to San Francisco last year and a big consideration was to be near somewhere we could let our dog off leash regularly. With my mutt, I run in the Presidio alternate days, visit Chrissy Field on the other days and go to Baker Beach and Fort Funston several times a month. I am concerned that such a progressive city is proposing to cut out one of its highly attractive feature for no reason. I am not aware there are any negative impacts from off leash dogs. The proposed ban will stop off leash from places that have been allowing it for years (in Marin). I am also concerned that any future lands purchased will automatically ban off leash, even if it has been allowed before.

In my experience, dogs, especially my own, are much more social when off-leash, are much less aggressive, and fight less.

Finally, the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population". A great number of these people have dogs and enjoy the park, outdoors, exercise, and restricting them in their enjoyment seems outside the aims of a park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1106 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Jose, CA 95126  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,12,2014 19:27:31**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the plan in it's current form. I think it would be a mistake to approve this incredibly restrictive dog management plan.

The GGNRA is not a National Park, it is a Recreation Area. Recreation needs to include our canine friends and their owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1107 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,12,2014 19:41:33**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

**Correspondence ID:** 1108    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 19:43:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1109    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 19:44:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We recently moved to Mill Valley. I am a responsible dog owner who cleans up after my dogs and greatly appreciates the ability to walk my dogs off-leash.

One of the reasons we joined this community was because of the wonderful array of beautiful dog-friendly trails in the area. The ability to enjoy national parks with our dogs off-leash and under voice control is one of the incredible things that sets Marin apart.

I want to voice my strong support for the expansion of off-leash dog areas and the belief that this is an important aspect of our community.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1110    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,12,2014 20:32:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the freedom to have dogs under voice command and off-leash in the GGNRA. I am an avid hiker. In the many contacts with dogs, both on and off-leash, there have been hundreds of well-behaved, well-controlled dogs both off and on-leash. I would love a non-emotional count of the number of aggressive dog attacks vs the many well-behaved dogs on trails. I also do not have

---

a controlled study of this, but would guess that the dogs causing problems are in the vast minority, yet, get all the press.

I have a dog that is controlled under voice command, stays close to me and is submissive to other dogs. He needs places to be able to roam and look about. Due to his submissive nature, dog parks are not a good option for him. So, the idea that open space should be on leash and owners should just take dogs to a dog run, is not a good solution.

I strongly support Alternative A and other motions that would allow dog owners to take control of their pets and determine which dogs should remain on leash and allow others to be off leash.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1111	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,12,2014 20:45:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am against more off leash dog restrictions in San Francisco.				

I walk my dog at fort funston twice a week as do many many people, if you haven't been there on a sunday afternoon or almost any day when people are off work, please take the time to check it out for your self, you will see how meaningful this space is to the 180,000 dogs and the owners who live in this city. It brings quality of life to a very busy crowded city. The people i bring there love the beauty of the place and the dogs walking. It is important to have space for animals to roam and burn off energy especially when they have to be on leash almost all the rest of the time.

There are already tons of beach areas for people without dogs and lots of places for birds to nest. In this city I have to live with coyote enthusiasts, native plant enthusiasts, bicycle enthusiasts etc. The part of the GGNRA that is off leash is miniscule relative to the amount of space that is restricted. I would hope the city could afford the same respect to me and my love of dogs that I have to afford all these other groups.

Are these restrictions really necessary?

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1112	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	St Louis, MO 63116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,12,2014 21:19:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a former resident of San Francisco and used to live right near Golden Gate Park. Stop turning the city into a police state and allow "man's best friend" the freedom he/she deserves!(with the owners always behaving responsibly, of course).				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1113	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---



**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,12,2014 22:23:08**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Thank you for managing this process.

I support dogs on leash in public areas, I do feel dogs off leash under voice command is very important. If pet owners let their dogs go into unauthorized areas that should be fined.

Please do not restrict any additional areas for dogs. Marin is a very unique area and the laws and considerations MUST address this area not others that are different from Marin.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1114 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,12,2014 22:28:45**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** here we go again,I feel that we dog owners are getting squeezed again.pretty soon dogs will not be allowed anywhere anymore.I am deeply concern that it's humans that are destroying the environment and planet.dog owners need places to take our dogs for exercise.it's healthy for both dog and owners to go on walks.we dog owners are getting fed up with the GGNRA.they should be more accomadating to dogs.people are adopting dogs more and more,we need to be able to enjoy the beauty of the outdoors as well as anyone else.there are a-lot of responsible dog owners.it has always been that we are judged wrongly due to the irresponsible few.one would say that people are more destructive than any animal or wildlife so maybe people should be banned instead.let's hope not and that we can continue to enjoy the beauties of the outdoors with our pets.it should be an american right.

thank you,

Nancy Yeeting

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1115 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,12,2014 22:53:25**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** please keep the current and consider more locations to let dogs be on and off leash. we need to continue to get people of doors and keep dogs active and part of our community

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1116 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,12,2014 23:10:55**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am commenting in support of continuing to have the off leash dog beaches and all areas of Fort Funston. Recreating with dogs is overly limited in the area already. Allowing people to play with their dogs off leash at the beach and on trails is a beautiful use of recreation space.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1117    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94942

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 01:16:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't know how much all this analysis is costing tax payers, but I do believe it's an unbelievable waste of money. Doesn't the Park Service have anything better to do than cater to the whims of the anti-dog crowd? Why don't you just designate one or two beaches for them to have without having to worry about other people's pets?

Personally, I believe the beaches should be left to voice control. Just adopt stiff fines for violations - innocent until proven guilty - like with humans. The owners who clean up and raise friendly dogs should not be penalized because of a few bad apples. And by the way, I don't currently own a dog - it's not worth it with this kind of legislation pending.

What has happened to the Park Service anyway? You get a little power and a lot of money and suddenly you become so heavy-handed? Marin fought to create these parks many years ago and did not expect them to be managed this way. People have enjoyed exercising their pets in these parks for 50 years and it's not okay to take away this privilege.

What's next? No smoking? No drinking? No snack foods? How about restricting certain swim wear? What else can you try to regulate in our parks? PLEASE - enough with regulating anything you can think of!

If certain people hate being around dogs, give them designated areas to go and leave the rest to us - the real majority on this issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1118    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 08:28:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Overall, I am extremely concerned with the reduction in liberties in this document. I do not own a dog, but do not want to impose on others with dogs that want to walk them. I prefer the alternatives that maximize the access for everyone, with and without dogs.

Regarding off-leash access, the document references conflicts an wanting to reduce conflicts by banning dogs. That would certainly reduce the possibility of this type of conflict, but reducing liberties for all because there are a few people causing conflicts is always the wrong solution. It would be fare more equitable to hold the people causing conflicts to be responsible for those conflicts. Increase fine for owners of aggressive dogs who are not able to control them. But don't punish the owners of well behaved dogs who are under full voice control?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1119    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 09:53:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I own a home here in San Francisco and have a dog that we rescued from a shelter and like to walk and hike with each week. I'm very concerned with the proposed plan to dramatically reduce where people can walk and hike with their dogs on GGNRA lands, including: banning dogs from the vast majority of Fort Funston, the East Beach at Crissy Field, and most of Ocean Beach; limiting off-leash dog walking in Marin County to Rodeo Beach; and prohibiting off-leash dog walking anywhere on GGNRA land in San Mateo County. Families with dogs should have equal access to all GGNRA lands. Please reconsider your intention to restrict my family's access. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1120    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 09:58:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner living next the the Alta trail, having off-leash trails to walk on has numerous health benefits for myself and my dog. In the 5 1/2 years I have been walking my dog daily on Alta trail and Oakwood Valley trail, I have encountered nothing but other content dog owners enjoying the GGNRA. I also recongnize that the majority of trails are not available to dogs and I respect this. The GGNRA was established to give recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. Because of this it requires a different management approach than National parks.

I am writing this comment to tell the GGNRA to retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy for the following reasons:

"The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or viatl monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands".

Changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filled in 2011 and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan.

I support the "no action alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands.

Please don't force people in to their cars in search of places to walk our dogs! Please recognize that the Recreation Area is also for people with dogs!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1121    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 11:12:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello GGNRA-

My name is Sarah and I've lived in San Francisco all my life. My husband and I are avid hikers and a few years ago decided to rescue a dog. We soon learned that we could no longer go to many of our favorite

---

trails with him. This is why it is so important to us to have space in the GGNRA lands to take our hiking buddy. It's really is just not the same walking a dog on leash compared to off leash. Our dog is well trained and stays with us on the trail.

I am especially concerned about the Hill 88 hike in the Marin Headlands. This is the only place in Marin that we humans can get in a good hike with our dog! A small dog area does nothing for us getting exercise!

Because the current plan that is being put on the table, I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please, leave GGNRA lands alone! I am a tax paying SF resident and want to be able to walk my dog off leash!!

thank you,  
Sarah Breivis

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1122	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,13,2014 11:19:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Save off-leash at Fort Funston and other parks where it exists. My dogs cannot get any exercise being kept on leash all the time. Few people will walk at Fort Funston beach without a dog anyway! I live next to Esprit park on Minnesota Street and that must allow off-leash also. Limited hours is ok too, since most people run their dogs during 4-7pm.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1123	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,13,2014 12:11:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Why fix what is not broken? Please allow dogs on trails and roads where there are allowed now and do not restrict them from free run on beaches. Voice control is working and there is no need for further restrictions.				

thanks,  
Pam

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1124    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 12:31:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have three dogs that, like I, live for being out on the trail in wide open spaces. I am an avid trail runner and will only run trails where I can take them with me. Half of the pleasure of running for me is to see the pure joy they exhibit when I take them out on the trail. The GGNRA was established to provide this outlet for creatures like us that live in such a densely populated urban area. To deny them access to these trails, is effectively denying me access to them as well. I am originally from the East coast, and moved out here primarily for the access to open space that did not exist on the East Coast, as well as the extremely unfriendly dog policies in effect back East.

Please don't turn Marin county into an unfriendly pet area. I am also a realtor, and good trail access, where people can walk their dogs factors large into many a home buying decision for my clients.

In my opinion, humans are far more harmful to the natural environment then dogs will ever be. Do not take away some of the last places in the area where they are allowed to reconnect with their 'inner wild dog'.

Thanks,  
Michelle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1125    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 12:43:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose Alternative F, the dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access in the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I am a Marin County resident and regularly take my dog, Piri, a small terrier mix who loves the Headlands, to Muir Beach and Rodeo Beach, and hike with him along the Coastal Trail, Wolf Ridge, and Miwok Trail. I am respectful of the heavy dog restrictions that exist all ready and do not take my dog on trails where he is not allowed.

As its name implies, the GGNRA is a recreation area, not a national park or wilderness area. People should be allowed to "recreate" in a variety of ways including walking, running, biking, and with their dogs. I can understand making certain trails off-limits to bikes and certain trails off-limits to dogs, but dogs are all ready allowed on VERY FEW trails in the GGNRA, and it feels very punitive to dog owners like myself to restrict them even further.

Walking the Coastal Trail between Muir Beach and Tennessee Valley with my dog is one of my greatest joys, and being out there with Piri makes me so appreciative to live in Marin County. I will be deeply

---

saddened and disappointed in the park service if this is taken away from us.

Sincerely,  
Rachel Alt  
Sausalito, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1126    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 12:54:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner, I would like to strongly express my desire to retain the GGNRA pet policy as it has been for decades. GGNRA is a unique resource in our otherwise very dense Bay Area, and the loss of off-leash access to its trails and beaches would seriously impact the quality of life for residents, a huge percentage of whom have dogs. Permitting access to Rodeo Beach does not adequately address the issue of access for dog owners. The research done to date is insufficient basis for such dramatic proposed changes, and I encourage more thorough study- -as required by law- -before any modifications to policy are enacted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1127    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 12:54:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1128    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Jackson, TN 38305  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 13:41:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** test

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1129    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 13:51:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Marin & GGNRA dog-friendly and dog-supportive. The trails are the ideal place for walking dogs, and the majority of dogs on the GGNRA trails stay on the trails, do not adversely effect the vegetation or environment, are friendly, and are enjoyed by the majority of trail users.

The trails and open space are what draw so many people to Marin and GGNRA. Please keep them friendly to our 2 and 4-legged friends alike!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1130    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to muir beach, the dog-friendly trails around muir beach and Oakwood Valley in Tennessee Valley.

It is already so difficult to find places to walk our dog - Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

We moved to Mill Valley to enjoy the beauty and be able to quickly access the trails and beaches and for us, a big part of our enjoyment is hiking with our dog.

Please keep these spaces open for us.

Sincerely,

Tiffany DeFrance

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1131    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 14:55:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't support increased restrictions on dogs in Marin County, and urge the federal government (as well as state, county and municipal governments) to allow off-leash dogs on all beaches and trails, so long as dogs are within owners' voice control. The opinions of a few have catalyzed an already onerous level of restrictions on our public resources, and to increase such restrictions further is only encouraging intolerance. In those areas where habitat restrictions are needed, rope off those areas in accordance with a publicly-approved natural resource management plan. Otherwise, allow the public, and their pets, to enjoy their (publicly-owned!) resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1132    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 15:52:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner for almost two decades and an avid supporter of protector our environment, I am strongly convinced that retaining the GGNRA pet policy as it has been for decades is wise public policy. GGNRA is a unique resource for Bay Area residents and losing this valuable resource as an off-leash access would seriously impact the quality of life for many of its residents. Permitting access to Rodeo Beach does not adequately address the issue of access for dog owners and I believe that the research to date is insufficient basis for such dramatic proposed changes. I encourage GGNRA to retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy and undertake additional studies before any modifications to policy are enacted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1133    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95128  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 16:17:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I bring my doberman to Fort Funston weekly-he loves running on the beach and playing with other dogs.  
It is important for dogs to have an opportunity to exercise leash free and explore nature as well as socialize with other dogs.

It is really healthy for my dog, myself and my friends to hike outside enjoying the beautiful scenery the Bay Area has to offer.

I only hike with my dog where he can be off leash. I do not go to any of the trails he needs to be on a leash because it isn't fun for him.

I think it is important for everyone that there are places for dogs to be off leash -when my dog comes

---



home from a day at fort funston he is happy, relaxed and sleepy. Dogs need exercise just like their owners. And they need places that make it an adventure.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1134    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 17:55:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Tennessee Valley trails. I am a responsible pet owner who cleans up after her dog and who obeys signage. Please do not take away what little open space we have left.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1135    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Menlo Park, CA 94025  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 20:11:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strenuously oppose the ban on dogs in areas where they were previously permitted. At minimum they should be leash in those areas on leash. Off leash access should be kept to a maximum.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1136    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 20:17:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow dogs off leash at Muir Beach. Dogs and their owners love to visit Muir Beach! There are so few places where families can go and just have a nice time and bring their family pet. Dogs really enjoy romping at the beach. It would be such a shame to cut off this fun place for dogs and their owners to go. There are other beaches for people to go to if they really don't like dogs!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1137    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 20:20:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Elizabeth Gaynor and I live in San Francisco, Ca (94115). I use most of GGNRA's off leash locations. Kylie my labradoodle dog is superbly trained and always comes back when called. Moreover she is an extremely active dog that requires quite a lot of exercise. In the three years we've had her we have NEVER seen a problem with dog owners disregarding the wetland rules at Crissy Field and very rarely see dog owners who don't pick up after their dogs. In fact we more often see humans littering as opposed to throwing trash away. The ability to take our dog off leash is one of the brightest parts of our weekend and provides her with the exercise she needs to stay healthy, fit, and happy. Moreover it is a wonderful family excursion that is irreplaceable.

With that being said, I oppose the GGNRA plan because it does not incorporate any of the suggestions made by others. It is far too restrictive and is not based on any scientific fact. I pay taxes in this city and deeply resent that my wishes are not being heard. Let's remember that there are more dogs in the city of San Francisco than children. More often than not I hear foreigners at Chrissy Field explaining in wonderment at all the beautiful dogs and based on the number of people who enjoy the area it does not seem to inhibit the number of visitors. Finally, if GGNRA significantly reduces the amount of space dogs have to run undoubtedly there will be more dog-dog problems as the dogs are squished into spaces that are far too small to accommodate the number of dogs using said space.

We should also remember that the Board of Supervisors opposes the plan and that the land was deeded to GGNRA under the condition that the space would be used in the manner that city residents wanted it to used.

Further:

â€¢I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â€¢I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

â€¢I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

â€¢The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

â€¢The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much

smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

â€¢The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

â€¢The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

â€¢The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

â€¢The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

â€¢The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1138	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,13,2014 20:22:45
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** My name is Mario Yovkov and I live in San Francisco, Ca (94115). I use most of GGNRA's off leash locations. Kylie my labradoodle dog is superbly trained and always comes back when called. Moreover she is an extremely active dog that requires quite a lot of exercise. In the three years we've had her we have NEVER seen a problem with dog owners disregarding the wetland rules at Crissy Field and very rarely see dog owners who don't pick up after their dogs. In fact we more often see humans littering as opposed to throwing trash away. The ability to take our dog off leash is one of the brightest parts of our weekend and provides her with the exercise she needs to stay healthy, fit, and happy. Moreover it is a wonderful family excursion that is irreplaceable.

With that being said, I oppose the GGNRA plan because it does not incorporate any of the suggestions made by others. It is far too restrictive and is not based on any scientific fact. I pay taxes in this city and deeply resent that my wishes are not being heard. Let's remember that there are more dogs in the city of san Francisco than children. More often than not I hear foreigners at Chrissy Field explaining in wonderment at all the beautiful dogs and based on the number of people who enjoy the area it does not seem to inhibit the number of visitors. Finally, if GGNRA significantly reduces the amount of space dogs have to run undoubtedly there will be more dog-dog problems as the dogs are squished into spaces that are far too small to accommodate the number of dogs using said space.

We should also remember that the Board of Supervisors opposes the plan and that the land was deeded to GGNRA under the condition that the space would be used in the manner that city residents wanted it to used.

Further:

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space." The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1139	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Alan Gaynor and I live in San Francisco, Ca (94115). I use most of GGNRA's off leash locations. Kylie my labradoodle dog is superbly trained and always comes back when				

---

called. Moreover she is an extremely active dog that requires quite a lot of exercise. In the three years we've had her we have NEVER seen a problem with dog owners disregarding the wetland rules at Crissy Field and very rarely see dog owners who don't pick up after their dogs. In fact we more often see humans littering as opposed to throwing trash away. The ability to take our dog off leash is one of the brightest parts of our weekend and provides her with the exercise she needs to stay healthy, fit, and happy. Moreover it is a wonderful family excursion that is irreplaceable.

With that being said, I oppose the GGNRA plan because it does not incorporate any of the suggestions made by others. It is far too restrictive and is not based on any scientific fact. I pay taxes in this city and deeply resent that my wishes are not being heard. Let's remember that there are more dogs in the city of San Francisco than children. More often than not I hear foreigners at Crissy Field explaining in wonderment at all the beautiful dogs and based on the number of people who enjoy the area it does not seem to inhibit the number of visitors. Finally, if GGNRA significantly reduces the amount of space dogs have to run undoubtedly there will be more dog-dog problems as the dogs are squished into spaces that are far too small to accommodate the number of dogs using said space.

We should also remember that the Board of Supervisors opposes the plan and that the land was deeded to GGNRA under the condition that the space would be used in the manner that city residents wanted it to used.

Further:

â€I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. â€I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

â€The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

â€The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. â€The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

â€The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. â€The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of

needed recreational open space." The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1140    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,13,2014 21:19:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to submit my comments on the revised 9/26/13 Draft Dog Management Plan. I appreciate the work that NPS has put into this document, but feel the proposed changes are too restrictive towards dogs and their owners.

My main comment is that the Draft Plan undervalues the role that dogs and the opportunities to walk them play in the public enjoyment of the GGNRA. A very high percentage of the users of many trails and areas in the GGNRA are walking their dogs. Without that opportunity, these people (not to mention their dogs), would be stuck inside or on city streets. Providing public opportunities for exercise and the enjoyment of nature and the outdoors is central to the mission of the GGNRA and of the NPS. The Draft Plan is overly restrictive, and would in many cases eliminate the primary factor that gets people into the parks.

My specific comments on some of the proposed area regulations are:

No reason to limit Homestead Trails to on leash only. Use of these trails is relatively light and I would guess the majority of users of these trails are in fact dog walkers. I have heard of no conflicts between dog walkers and other users, and see no reason to limit dog walking on these trails.

No reason to limit Muir Beach to on leash only. This has historically been a major outlet area for dog owners, and should continue to be so. It may be that some fencing should be installed to protect sensitive habitat, but otherwise dogs should be allowed to run on the beach, as they are now.

No reason to limit Miwok fire road south of Highway One to on leash only. This is a major, wide fire road, with plenty of room for multi-use.

And finally, thanks to the drafters of the current plan for continuing to allow (as I understand the Plan) dogs off leash on Ocean Beach north of Stairwell 21. Ocean Beach is a true treasure in San Francisco, easily accessible, and with a long history and culture of freedom and multiple use. Those who do not want to share space with dogs (a small minority), can easily take a left and walk south of Stairwell 21. Please keep Ocean Beach accessible to dogs off leash!

Thanks to GGNRA for the open space it provides to the Bay Area, and to our dogs for getting us out into it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1141    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,13,2014 22:45:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I fully support restricting unleashed dogs in the parks. Today I was at Ocean Beach and when I walked up the hill to the street I saw a sign saying that I was in the protected area for western snowy plovers (which I saw none of today, whereas when I moved here 12 years ago, I use to see them frequently). There was no difference along the areas of the beach that are supposedly protected, the dogs were running loose everywhere (I've also seen them loose in the netted area at Crissy Field). Dogs, like their human owners, are very destructive and do not stay out of "protected" areas, whether they have a fence around them or not, unless on a leash. Their human owners are often not paying close attention to what they are doing, and besides the harm to wildlife and plants that they cause, they can also be dangerous to people. Though most dogs are friendly and only cover you with muddy paw prints, some dogs are not - I have been snarled at and threatened by two different off-leash dogs in the past year - one in Golden Gate Park, which I managed to scare away by yelling at it, another at Fort Funston, where the dog did not back off after I told it to. I had to yell at it's owner, sitting some distance away - talking on her cell phone and not paying attention. She foolishly told me to just turn around and walk away from the dog. I did not feel comfortable turning my back on a threatening animal nor did I think it had more of a right to be there than I did. I had to keep "bothering" her until she finally came over and got the dog! People are often distracted and not paying attention to their pets, and I shouldn't have to fear for my safety because of it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1142 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Nicasio, CA 94946

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose Alternative F, and support Alternative A. My husband and I have two dogs that we rescued from local shelters. We try to walk them frequently for both their physical and mental health. Alternative F would bar us from trails where we regularly walk our dogs, such as the Oakwood Valley Trail, and some of the Marin Headland Trails, and would restrict off-leash, voice control use on others that we walk them on, such as the Oakwood Fire Road and the Alta Trail. We also walk our dogs on the beaches near Crissy Field, and are concerned about dogs being banned entirely from the East Beach.

It is very distressing to lose the use of so many trails. There are already so many in Marin, where I live, on which dogs are restricted or banned. The Oakwood and Marin Headlands trails are especially important because in the summer they are among the few areas in Marin open to dogs where the weather is cool enough to allow us to safely walk ours on warm days.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support dramatic restrictions of the remaining 1% that are being proposed.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area and access for all users, including people and their dogs, was a cornerstone of the

original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. For these reasons, I urge you to reject Alternative F and adopt Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1143    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 09:31:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support for the continued allowance of unrestricted (off-leash) access for our dogs/pets/family members in San Francisco. Please do not restrict or reduce our off-leash dog parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1144    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** New York, NY 10128  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 09:49:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:  
I am a dog lover/owner who is currently living in NYC but is from the San Francisco. My plan was to move back to the Bay Area in the next few years and I have been so excited to take my dog to some of my favorite dog friendly beaches and parks back home. When I heard about what was going on with these possibly new laws I knew I had to at least try to speak my mind.  
As much as NYC is an amazing city the one thing that is hard for me who owns a large dog is how unfriendly the parks and outdoor space is unless you can afford to rent or own a car and get them outside of the city. Even then the beaches here are off limits for most of the year and it is very sad for my water loving Chocolate lab. I think one of the things I was most proud of being from the Bay Area was how dog friendly our outdoor space is/was. We have some amazing parks not only for people but for dogs to enjoy off leash. I have heard of all the change going on in San Francisco with the astronomically high rent costs and the once artist filled city is now changed for the worse. Again living in NYC I'm no stranger to that story. However the one thing I would hate to see change is the regulations for animal lovers and nature lovers to be able to enjoy the breathtaking location of the Bay Area. Please reconsider this current idea to change these dog friendly laws!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1145    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 09:49:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner and am in favor of the off lease restrictions proposed for Muir Beach. The last thing I would like to see is dogs running off leash on the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1146    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94966  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1147 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 12:09:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and the Miwok Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1148 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 13:20:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I wish to encourage off-leash access to two of the beaches covered. My dogs love to run with other dogs on the beach and into the water. I have heard that these beaches were open to off-leash dogs before the GGNRS became the agency in charge and would like to encourage the historical precedent already set.

I believe Muir Beach would be good to go with plan 5-E that designates the southern portion of the beach

---

to dogs off leash.

At Crissy field I again wish for the dogs to run free and into the bay waters. I support plan 10-A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1149    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 13:39:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and other areas.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1150    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 14:29:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My comments will pertain specifically to Chrissy Field, between the St. Francis Yacht Club and Fort Point.

This area is one of the great promenade walks in the world. It is a gathering venue, attracting residents and visitors of San Francisco for active and passive recreation. Included in the class of people who frequent Chrissy are those who run their dogs. This group has been using the area for many years prior to the GGNRA. The group is sensitive to the pristine nature of the beach and as you know, self-regulates litter management (picking up their pet's waste). The group does this voluntarily without question. I have been walking/running my dogs at Chrissy for years and like so many of those who comment on the leash law as proposed, I am amazed that this has become an issue. I understand that National parks restrict dogs and that the Park Service is a creature of conformity but I argue that The Presidio is unlike the other National Parks. It is a unique urban park and thus treated as such. People walking their dogs, on or off leash, interacting with others without dogs, sunbathers, runners, bicyclers, etc. It is a system that not only works, but enhances the Chrissy Field experience.

To impose a leash law would remove a certain character from the venue. This is not about dogs; it is about people.

If I might offer one point: Should the GGNRA feel compelled to leash dogs, a compromise might be to offer a time when dogs are off-leash. The use pattern for off-leash activity is early morning (dawn to 10 AM) and in the late afternoon. Follow

the current use patters and seek a compromise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1151    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to various GGNRA trails and beaches. I ALWAYS keep my dog on leash, clean up after my dog and have control of my dog. Most dog owners doe likewise. There are some 'bad apples' in the bunch but this proposed legislation should not be directed solely because of the 'bad apples.'

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I do think that there should be stiff fines/penalties to dog owners who do not control their pets or who fail to clean-up after their pets. Perhaps this will encourage everyone to appreciate the opportunity to continue using GGNRA trails and beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1152    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 15:29:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I walk with my dog every morning. In order to be able to walk and work a full day I need to work as early as possible or after work. I would not feel safe walking without a dog at these times.

I appreciate nature and the community of other walkers I see out there. We are all very vigilant of cleaning up after our dogs. I always pick up any extra poops I see. Everyone else is as well. On Alto trail I often walk in about 3 miles and then turn round and walk back. In those cases when my dog poops I bag it and leave it for my return trip. Never once has the bag been there. This gives you an idea of how vigilant dog people are. There are so many trails for horses and bikes but so few for dogs. I love to see my dog run with other dogs. They are social animals. Please don't take the trails away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1153    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 15:31:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I regularly hike GGNRA trails around Tennessee Valley and Mill Valley. In the past year or so the increase in the number of people on the trails with dogs off leash is tremendous. I see 5 to 20 of them on almost every hike I take. All the trails I hike are either completely off limits to dogs or the dogs must be on a leash. I have pointed this out to dog owners many times, and not a single one has put their dog on the leash as a result of "learning" that their dog is required to be on a leash. Many times the owners feign ignorance or treat me as if I'm doing something wrong by pointing out their disregard of the regulations. I've called dog dispatch a few times, but they never seem to be available to come give out citations. If there isn't any way to enforce the current leash regulations then no dogs should be permitted on the trails at all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1154    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 15:33:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Oakwood Valley Trail and Rodeo Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1155    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Marin and San Fran, CA 94941

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,14,2014 15:55:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please not draft the Draft Dog Management Plan as it now stands. We are a dog and good dog owners society. Please do not close any areas to dogs to run free.

Thank you

Pat Clark

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1156    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 16:04:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner in the city, we have limited areas to exercise our dogs. The elimination or severe restrictions of dog walking will impact large numbers of dog owners in the Bay Area.

The planned changes are not supported by sound science nor supported from public opinion of residents and users of the areas with proposed changes.

I do not support the draft changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1157    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Ross, CA 94957  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Optional Points to Make (choose as many or as few as you want):

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits

---

the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1158	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117
-----------------	-------------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,14,2014 16:40:08
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think it is a bad idea to restrict off leash access to dogs, especially in large parks like Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Bernal Heights and McLaren Park. Dogs need and thrive on the freedom to be able to run around off leash. This is when dogs are the happiest and get the most exercise, which is so essential for a dog's well being. Let's not forget the effect this also has on tax paying dog owners. Humans get much needed exercise too taking their pets to these larger parks that provide lots of walking/running/hiking for both dog and humans, Take this all away and we are left standing in small, overpopulated and heavily congested city parks. Parks that are already heavily accessed by city residents and their dogs.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1159	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122
-----------------	-------------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,14,2014 16:46:51
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Banning dogs on Ocean Beach SPPA is not the best use of our limited urban open space. People who live in the area need an area to walk their dog that is within a reasonable walking distance from their homes. Ocean Beach provides this for many residents who would have to otherwise drive somewhere. The alternative of Ocean Beach Trail is really not a fair trade off. It is too narrow to accommodate pet owners who have shy, fearful or even aggressive pets. It is easy to maintain separation from other animals and people while on Ocean Beach. On the trail, it is impossible. In addition, I love to see the Ocean when I walk my dog, On Ocean Beach trail, you can't even see it. I will have to take my dog home if I want to look at the Ocean-that is ridiculous.
------------------------	---

---

Since this area is not a designated critical habitat why does it need such a draconian rule? The national park service currently does not treat this area as if it needed extreme environmental protection. On the beach currently, between Lawton and Kirkham, there is a broken pier pylon (festooned with 40-50 rubber tires), a large grey plastic box (maybe it's a broken pier bumper-now it just collects trash) and a rotting seal carcass. Each of these things has been lying on the beach for MONTHS! If the sea birds were as delicate as some of the EIS suggests, surely this is not good for them. In fact, I am sure some environmentalist can use the same speculative approach in the current EIS to show these items are damaging to the birds.

If a new rule is put in place to ban dogs from Ocean Beach SPPA, how will you know if it was successful in achieving the desired goal with respect to snowy plovers? The EIS already states there are many factors (none of which include dogs) influence the number of snowy plovers that overwinter on the beach. So, if the number goes up or down, you won't even know if the dogs (or lack thereof) had anything to do with it.

I attended the open house at Fort Mason and spoke with a Ranger. I mentioned I was confused about the need to ban dogs since I see tons of snowy plovers on the beach every day. The Ranger said they probably weren't snowy plovers since they are really hard to find and hiding out in the dunes. If I can't find them when I am looking for them, how is my leashed dog going to even have the opportunity to disturb them? If they are hiding out in the dunes, then just ban dogs from the dunes. I never see any dogs up there anyway (I do see lots of people hanging out on the dunes).

The Ranger also mentioned the proposed rules were necessary since lots of people were violating the current law. Then why not just ENFORCE the current law? If you don't have the resources to do so, you won't have them under the new law either. So, the reasoning that it is easier to enforce the preferred alternative is not true.

In summary, my opposition to the proposed rule changes is simply because the reasons given are speculative and don't seem to match my experience. I am on the beach almost every day. There are just a few people and dogs there each time I go, lots of birds, and no dogs chasing them.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1160	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fairfax, CA 94930 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to ALL of the beaches with dog access in the bay area.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.



Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

WE.. as dog owners feel strongly about this and want to continue walking in these areas for our enjoyment.

Kim Burggraf

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1161	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fairfax, CA 94930 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to ALL of the beaches with dog access in the bay area.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

WE.. as dog owners feel strongly about this and want to continue walking in these areas for our enjoyment.

Kim Burggraf

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1162	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,14,2014 16:59:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We support Alternative A. Beaches bring out the best in kids and dogs, and when kids and dogs are happy, parents are happy. Keep Baker Beach open to dogs off leash!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1163	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,14,2014 17:19:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog Libby to the few options available for off-leash running. I can't imagine marin county with even fewer.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1164	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail where there are many hikers, alongside people who regularly enjoy the trail with our dogs. I worry that closing access to this trail will cause our local public parks to be overrun with off-leash dogs trying to get exercise alongside small children, picnickers, etc. it will become a madhouse with lots of upset parents and dog owners. This seems unreasonable to me when dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1165	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Tiburon, CA 94920 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,14,2014 18:08:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

Living in Marin County and walking trails and fire roads for the past 40 years and having owned a dog, I want to say that there are many places for dogs and owners to have outings. Our GGNRA is a real gem for the people in the Bay Area and it is used more and more. We must keep the area for use by people old and young as pristine as possible. Dog owners should be willing to walk on leash in small parts of the area, but I am against off leash running of dogs in any of the region. The fire roads in the area are littered with waste and not fit for children to roam. Wildlife needs safe areas to be. I think we need to keep to a minimum the areas for dog use in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1166    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 18:21:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't like the fact that that this area is the one place that dogs can go off lease by ocean in San Francisco And you are taking that away. There are more dogs than children in San Francisco and you are limiting the animal and owners recreation to run free. Do not like this plan. Too restrictive. Make an area of fort Funston 1/2 where no lease and dogs are welcome

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1167    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 18:53:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposal to further restrict dogs being able to travel on trails in the GGNRA is totally unreasonable. What is the positive gain by the proposed restrictions...nothing in my opinion! What is next eliminate people from using the GGNRA. Those of us that love the companionship of their dog especially while hiking in such a beautifully special place as the GGNRA do not deserve to have the dog restrictions enabled.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1168    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The greatest joy I have in being a dog owner in Homestead Valley is the open space available to hike with my dog.

I am concerned about the GGNRA proposed dog management plan. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of public lands.

The GGN RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

I strongly support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy!!

Sincerely,

Roberta Sarnoff

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1169	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,14,2014 22:25:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am a mother of two kids and have lived in San Francisco since 1988. My kids and I take our dog to Fort Funston every weekend. It's a great time for my kids and I to get away from the electronics, be outside and enjoy seeing our dog - Freckles - in her favorite place in the world! We have been going there for years and now that my kids are teenagers there aren't that many things that I can get them to do with me. But we all love Freckles and enjoy seeing her jump and splash in the waves, so it is a special place for all of us. It would be awful if you took that away from us.

During the week I take Freckles to Ocean Beach, Fort Funston and sometimes Crissy Field, usually 5 times a week. Freckles, like all living things, needs space to run and be free. Putting her on a leash, particularly at Fort Funston, would be cruel and would be like telling kids that they couldn't run on grass but could only walk sedately.

I am a member of the Sierra Club, but I DO NOT AGREE with their position on this. I understand some of the issues with the birds, but if you want to really focus on protecting the birds you will also need to restrict people from GGNRA areas too.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1170	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** December 30, 2013  
Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
RE: Draft Dog Management Plan/Daft Environmental Impact Statement  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am a 3 generation San Franciscan and have enjoyed taking my dogs to the Presidio, as well as other local public parks, since I can remember. As a responsible dog owner, and citizen of our great city, the

off-leash areas have provided my family and our pets great joy over the years. The off leash areas are crucial for their health, socialization, and recreation.

In prior years, I brought my late dog "Steve" to Crissy. Steve had a degenerative spine disease-walking for him was very difficult. At Crissy, I was able to take Steve in to the water where he could float and swim unencumbered by gravity. The access to the water not only gave him a better quality of life, it enabled to him to live a longer life as well. I often see similar scenarios now-handicapped pets able to wade and/or swim in the bay at Crissy. It would be a shame to take that away.

Now I go to Crissy Field, virtually every morning, with my 3-year old rescue dog "Georgia"-usually from 9:00 AM-10:30 AM. Except for the rare tourist (and they usually want to pet the dogs!), it is only dogs and their owners/walkers using this beach each and every morning. The dogs have the chance to run and play together, and swim in the gentle surf. If you were to take this valuable asset away from us, the beach would be empty in the mornings-an unused and sadly wasted resource.

I have read through your proposals to severely limit off-leash areas for our dogs, and then searched for the reasoning behind them. There were no facts I could find to suggest that having dogs romp on the beach in any way threatens the wildlife or environment at Crissy Field. The dogs do not breach the cordoned off areas that are restricted nor can they get near the wildlife in the marsh on the south side of the walking path. We dog owners and walkers are "regulars" at Crissy-always cleaning up after our pets and making sure they do not enter any of the restricted areas.

To quote from the ASPCA on the benefits of socializing and exercising dogs: "They {parks} promote responsible pet ownership; give dogs a place to exercise safely, thus reducing barking and other problem behaviors; provide seniors and disabled owners with an accessible place to exercise their companions; and provide an area for community-building socializing." in my opinion, keeping these off-leash areas available-as they are now- will benefit both the dog and non-dog owning public.

I hope you will consider letting the off-leash areas remain as they have since the Pet Policy was established in 1979. If there must be change, please consider available options that would have the best interests of both the dog and non-dog owning public alike. Allowing specific off-leash hours (perhaps sunrise to 11:00 AM; 4:00 PM to sundown) or keeping the west beach off-leash and restricting off-leash on the east beach would appease both groups.

I urge you to go to Crissy Field yourself in the morning to witness what I see every day. Happy, well-socialized dogs and their responsible owners enjoying one of our city's greatest and most beautiful treasures.

Respectfully,

Nancy Dickson

1941 Webster St.

San Francisco, CA 94115

CC:

The Honorable Nancy Pelosi

United States House of Representatives

235 Cannon House office Building

Washington DC 20515

Secretary Ken Salazar

Department of the Interior

1849 C Street NW

Washington DC 20240

Mr. John Jarvis

National Park Service

1849 C Street NW

Washington DC 20240

Senator Dianne Feinstein

United States Senate

331 Harte Senate Office Building

Washington DC 20510  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
112 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington DC 20510

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1171    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Dec,02,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Douglas Holsclaw 274 26th Ave. #20s San Francisco, CA 94121

evilgenius2@yahoo.com 415-831-7771

Gary Moore

President and CEO

Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

201 Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123-1304

Oct. 1,2013

Dear Mr. Moore,

I received a mailing two days after your first public meeting regarding the Presidio Exchange. After all the years of planning that went into this that seems like a pretty significant error. The fact is I am afraid to attend your meetings, anyway, because of how aggressive dog-owners are in shouting people down whose ideas they don't like.

I was also confused by the email I received a couple weeks ago stating it contained a PDF link to the new proposed plan. I tried to find it, but only found that the plan is in public libraries? Really, is that true? In this time of technological wonder you can't send out the plan? One has to go to the library. This seems like a very bad idea and a decision that will keep many people from reading the long-awaited plan.

I am disappointed that your mailing, touting the great new plans for the space didn't mention the three most contentious issues of space planning. Dogs, dogs, and dogs. I have lived in San Francisco for 32 years. For the first 30 I often took a morning walk in the Marina and Chrissy Field area. I used to see Joe DiMaggio talking his morning walk as well. I wonder if even Joltin' Joe would feel safe taking a calming morning stroll with the risk of pit bull attacks so common place.

It was never a good idea to consider dog toilet space and space for children and families to lie in the grass or play a good duel use of space. This is obviously a bad idea.

Your plan needs to include a dog free area. Maybe a 220 track, where citizens can take a health walk and children can play in the grass without tear of attack. There is plenty of space. A little of it needs to be saved for the majority of the people - non dog owners.

Now unlicensed dog walkers use publicly owned and maintained space to make a living without paying for the privilege of dumping tons of urine on Chrissy Field. If I put up a card table and tried to sell sodas without a license I would be ticketed and chased away, because someone else has the refreshment concession, yet tons of urine and feces can be dumped in a park, free of charge.

I stopped going, it was too stressful to be surrounded on the walking path by dozens of off-leash dogs, wet and excited, jumping, barking and nipping at each other. I have also been jumped on, pawed and nipped at from behind. When one reminds walkers that this is not an off-leash area one gets the same response, uniformly "Fuck you!" I'm not bothering to be polite and say "the F word," because I feel you should hear the truth.

I would come to your meeting if I could find a copy of your policy and if you could assure my safety if I expressed these opinions. Can you guarantee the safety of a non dog owner? Let me know.

I feel these years of process have been a waste of time if I am still afraid to go to Chrissy Field. I have

written in the past, even sent photos of off-leash dogs. And I get a dated mailing that doesn't even mention the issue that has driven so many San Franciscans from one of the most beautiful views in the city. One of the Seven Man made Wonders of the world is now a doggy toilet for vicious breeds.

Congratulations.

If anyone asks, or cares - I think there should be an area of Chrissy Field that is fenced in by your beautiful Native California grasses, where dogs are not allowed. People are allergic to dogs, people are afraid of dogs, some people have PTSD from childhood maulings, and some people just don't like dogs and would like a public space to be free of their poop, barking and entitled walkers and owners. I'm one of them. A former Chrissy Field user who hasn't been there in two years for one reason. FEAR.

In San Francisco a person with "social anxiety" can get a permit to take their dog anywhere, restaurants, grocery stores.. . but if a person has social anxiety around dogs they are told - fuck you, get over it. This philosophy seems to have carried into your organization.

Please put me on a list of people to be informed if there is ever a dog-free zone at Chrissy Field and let me know if you can guarantee my safety if I come to a community meeting or if I can write a letter that can be read without the being present.

Sincereley,

Douglas Holsclaw

CC Presidio Trust Board of Directors

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1172	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	1870 Jackson Street, #502 San Francisco CA 941 09 January 6, 2013 Superintendent Frank Dean National Park Service Bldg. 201, Fort Mason San Francisco, CA 94123 RE: GGNRAIDog Management Policies Dear Superintendent Dean,				

Over a 30 year period, our family had the pleasure of owning two dogs, consecutively. As we lived in the City, we wouldn't think of allowing our dogs to run freely without a leash. I never observed that the dogs felt "deprived". When walking them, if we came to an "open area" where unleashed pets were allowed, we untied them. I visit Crissy Field frequently - I am a birder - and it appears to me that the areas zoned for dogs are more than adequate.

There have been times when I have chased dogs out of the Lagoon area and have suggested to the owners that they keep their dogs under better control. Most owners appeared contrite. I think that if the regulations are clearly stated, if there is no inconsistency among the boundary makers for the various areas, if monitoring is frequent and firm, then dog owners, on the whole, will comply. You will always have that minority that becomes emotional to the extreme when it comes to their pets. I think that the National Park Service has bent over backwards to please both sides - actually, many sides: seniors (such as me), dog owners, birders, families with small children, dog walkers, runners. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area serves visitors with a wide variety of interests. As visitors, it is our responsibility to respect and protect this beautiful environment for all to enjoy.

Thank you,

Alice Abbott  
Member, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1173    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Nov,05,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** December 30, 2013

Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Building 201

Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Dear Mr. Dean,

I am writing to you because I wish to state my displeasure and disappointment with the Dog Management Plan being developed by the National Park Service for their various holdings within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

All of the five alternative proposals in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, shown as Alternatives B through F, either remove completely or limit off-leash and on-leash areas from the lands under the GGNRA's stewardship. In my opinion the restrictive NPS "Preferred Alternatives" are not called for. Even the least restrictive alternatives seem needless, at least at the sites which I visit.

I visit Fort Funston and Ocean Beach in San Francisco, and Mon Point/Quarry in Pacifica, regularly with my dogs, and I have witnessed, for the most part, only joy...their joy as well as our own. We of course, as their guardians, are responsible for our dog's behavior, as we are for our own. Are dogs destructive of the natural environment? They can be...but the same can be said for us. I strongly believe that there are places where dogs do not belong, as I also believe that there are places where people do not belong. But neither Fort Funston nor Crissy Field is the Denali Wilderness.

As you know, dogs are by nature social beings...perhaps even more so than us. They ' and we ' benefit by their being allowed to experience life ' to romp with their fellows ' in a natural setting such as Fort Funston, freed for a few moments from the "no dogs allowed" conventional restraints which a dog and its caregiver faces on a daily basis.

We can never remake the Bay Area to look like it did some 300 years ago. But I do not see why we can't both protect the fauna and flora, as well as provide realistic open space for people with dogs by perhaps making the restrictions seasonally effective, in order to protect migrating/nesting birds and other wildlife. Sensitive vegetation/soils, sand dunes, and even historical relics, can be fenced off from both dogs and people.

I ask you to do whatever you can to leave our dogs the open space in which they can be dogs. Please help to find a more "compassionate" plan of action which will continue to allow us to share the natural settings which we are fortunate to have here in the San Francisco Bay Area with our dog companions.

Yours Truly,

Gene Chasey

731 Chestnut Street, Apt. 111

San Carlos, CA 94070

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1174    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA unknown  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---



**Received:** Dec,27,2013 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

I am so sick of dogs @ Rodeo Beach, Stinson Beach pissing on my lunch and fishing gear I have kind of given up fishing there. I reported to Rangers there and they don't seem interested. I have lived in Marin 75 years and I have never seen it this bad. Dog shit @ Stinson is terrible. People just leave it in the sand and kids play with it - so gross!

Thanks - But there is more Dog lovers in Marin and they get what they want.

Mel Colombo

San Rafael

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1175 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Inner Richmond, CA unknown

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent -

The purpose of this letter is to express my thoughts about the Dog Management plans for the GGNRA.

1. name one park in GGNRA that is for dogs and their owners.

2. no dogs on beaches

3. dogs only on a few trails, they must be on a leash.

4. no dogs in the coves of Land's end, Baker Beach, Chives Beach (Sea Cliff area).

5. no dogs on beaches at Crissy Field - this is for birds sea life. I have seen seals on the beach. Dogs should not be allowed.

6. Increase fines.

Thank you,

Kathryn Hyde

Inner Richmond Resident

415.752.1023

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1176 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Sup,

I have visited Crissy Field for 50 years with my dogs! I would so hate to see this have any more changes than already have.

I am a 4th gen San Franciscan 5th Californian and San Francisco needs its beach for dog use. They need a place to get out pent-up energy - the children love to play with the dogs there also.

We don't need anymore aggressive dog behavior - changing the present rules will have a great impact on this. Leave Crissy Field alone. If anything change it for the reckless bike riders!!

Thank you,

Susan Jordan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1177 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dec. 31, 2013

Superintendent Frank Dean

GGNRA

Fort Mason

Bldg. 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

Attn: Dog Management

Dear Superintendent bean:

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for Dog Management in GGNRA. I am a responsible SF dog owner with 2 dogs. Most of the time I walk them in the SF City parks. However, it is always nice to know we can take them to Ocean Beach, Fort Funston or Crissy Field which we have done numerous times.

Nancy Pelosi has come out in support of off-leash dog walking in the GGNIA. According to official comments by SF Dog: there hasnt been any consideration of how city parks will be impacted by the proposed new plan restricting 90% of whats available now. Should the restriction occur, all the SF city parks would be deluged with hundreds of dogs. This would ruin the already crowded city park experience for everyone.

The 1980 GMP was based on recreational objectives as well natural, historic and scenic values. It was not written as a 'national park experience. These places - Ocean Beach, Fort Funston - are within city limits. We are not talking about a wilderness place like Yosemite. I support the No Action Alternative as the only beneficial and reasonable choice vs the draft GMP other Action Alternatives.

One last comment: again from the 12-8-2011 SF Dog official comments: apparently there is no evidence that the Western Snowy Plover or Bank Swallow have been impacted by dogs.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lancaster

723 Clayton St.

San Francisco, CA 94117

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1178    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 08:32:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is a great joy for me to see dogs playing and people so enjoying their time with their dogs. We need this time together on beaches and trails to be out in nature together. We all benefit! Do not take this joyful interaction away!

Chris Cliff

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1179    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Bill and Ursula Moffett

3745 Washington Street

San Francisco, CA 94118 0

December 26, 2013

GGNRA Superintendent

Building 201

Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123

Attn: SEIS

Attached is our letter of May 26, 2011 which still represents our views. The new option for Crissy Field, represented by Map 10-E, is a very reasonable compromise. Requiring leashed dogs at the East Beach shows your desire to finalize this process. If you need our assistance in dealing with the Crissy Field Dog Group please contact us.

Yours very truly

Bill and Ursula Moffett

Bill & Ursula Moffett

3745 Washington Street

San Francisco, CA 94118

May 26, 2011

Frank Dean, General Superintendent

GGNRA

Building 201, Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94 123-0022

Dear Mr. Dean:

We were part of the original group that established the Crissy Field Dog Group at Joan Booth's house over 10 years ago. We helped organize the protest at the Golden Gate Club around 2001 including notifying the NPS police of the anticipated large turnout. Nearly all of the original CFDG members are no longer involved in the organization, partially because the many public meetings stretching over 8 years were so unproductive, but mainly because the very small group of CFDG's current leaders won't listen to reasonable compromises. Their insistence that the Promenade should be a ROLA defies all logic. Most of us would like to see the East Beach open in the early morning, particularly for the adjacent residents during the week; however, we understand this could be a management issue. An informal survey of weekend dog walkers, including a lot of former CFDG members, support the above position.

We want to be sure that NPS will partner with the CFDG to guarantee that the preferred alternative will never be rescinded. You must agree that dog litter at Crissy Field has been greatly reduced in the last 10 years, partially because of the pickup bags provided by CFDG at numerous locations. Most CFDG members even clean up after the dogs of tourists or inconsiderate local dog owners.

The draft EIS indicates there will be a huge increase in the budget for policing dogs. Hopefully this is not a subterfuge to achieve Yosemite standards of no dogs. Many years ago I worked on the planning for a police/fire station at 35 Keyes in the Presidio and I know first hand the efforts of police leaders to create huge many layered bureaucratic organizations with lots of policemen. We would hope that you would instruct officers to talk to offenders and only issue tickets as a last resort to repeat offenders. Signage needs to indicate an enforceable standard for "voice control" such as 30 or 60 seconds. If the NPS wants the off leash area to be successful for us dog owners I would hope that tickets

would only be issued on very rare occasions and the rules be loosely enforced, especially at the Central Beach and early mornings or late afternoons at the East Beach.

We need clear well placed signage to make the preferred alternative work. Wherever parking is available there must be signs. Signs at the lagoon bridge would be effective. At the many paths which access the Central Beach we need signage indicating this area is reserved for off-leash dogs. The signage plan should be coordinated with CFDG and offered to the public for review.

Again, thanks for coming up with a reasonable preferred alternative for dog management at Crissy Field.

Yours very truly

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1180	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Dec,12,2013 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form
-----------------------------	-----------

**Correspondence:** Dogs have taken over Crissy Field. It is unsafe for people especially children and the elderly. Some dogs are aggressive and scary. They run free. At the very least, leashes should be required in all areas. The best solution is to allow dogs only in certain fenced off areas on the field and not on the beach. This is an urban park. Let the dogs go to a more remote open area with fewer people. Your job is to protect people, not animals. The dog owners are controlling the process, they are too powerful. Individuals like me have less of a voice. GGNRA is negligent in not protecting people. Dog owners say that the problem is limited to a few individual owners dogs that the problem self-corrects. This is nonsense. I was attacked by dogs several times and jumped on dozens and dozens of times. Not once did any other dog owner assist or intervene. And no officer was around. Please protect the needs of people, especially vulnerable populations.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1181	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Dec,02,2013 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter
-----------------------------	--------

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA Superintendent

RE: Dog Management Dog.

I wish to comment on the plan you have put forth to the public regarding off-leash dogs in the GGNRA.

I totally oppose off-leash dogs anywhere within the GGNRA.

The national regulations should apply here just the same as every other Federal Park.

You say the pet policy of 1979 makes it mandatory to have some off-leash areas. In 1979 there weren't nearly as many dogs in San Francisco as there are now so the impact was slight. The current dog population in San Francisco is estimated at 120,000.

Since the city itself does not enforce the leash law, and the vast majority of dogs do not have a license, the dog community has taken this to mean they are entitled to do what they want everywhere.

Dogs dominate SF City Parks. It is a most unpleasant situation. Please don't let the "political machine" of the city influence how you conduct Federal Regulations.

Many of us have been unable to use the GGNRA because of all the off-leash dogs. We are taxpayers too and are entitled to a safe and pleasant experience in the park. The sheer number of loose, barking dogs has

made it a nightmare to use the GGNRA. I have been jumped on by dogs, startled, and have to look down when I walk to avoid stepping in dog poo.

I see no reason that any exception has to be made for dogs in the GGNRA.

Trying to attend dog meetings to put forth my point of views is too scary. I have been to the dog policy meetings in San Francisco and they boo and hiss at you. They call you names and are out of control. It is a mob mentality.

The management of the GGNA is Federal. Why should there be special exceptions not given to dogs in other national parks?

Please do not be bullied into this. You have a lot of support from those of us who feel left out of the park because of the dogs.

Sincerely,

Miriam A. Moss

830 Congo Street

San Francisco, California

94131

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1182	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	December 27, 2013				

Dear Superintendent,

When you refer to "continued concern" of some stakeholders for the reason to again extend the comment period I hope you realize how that comes off as less then credible.

Shame on you for caving into the "progressive" politics of the city and the bully tactics of the dog community by giving them even more time to ruin the experience for the rest of us in the GGNRA.

I for one am tired of being forced out of the GGNRA due to all the off-leash dogs dominating the entire GGNRA

The Federal Government needs to get a backbone and apply the same rules here as they do in the rest of the United States.

Sincerely,

Miriam Moss

830 Congo Street

San Francisco, CA

94131

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1183	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	dorchester, MA 02121				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,15,2014 09:53:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** My nephew lives in San Francisco and spends time everyday in your parks with extremely happy dogs. He sends me their pictures. I feel a little jealous of the dogs playing freely. I do believe there should be some fenced in areas for dog owners who would feel more comfortable in that environment. But, every fenced in area is the same as saying "Off limits" to non dog walkers. Therefore, there should be many non fenced in areas so everyone can enjoy nature in a natural way.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1184    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 10:01:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please uphold the present laws that allow dogs off leash in the GGNRA. It is a joyful experience to allow my small, well behaved dog off leash. I hike about 3 times a week and I have only once encountered another dog that threatened my dog, nor has my dog ever been a threat to other hikers or their animals. I have felt that the majority of other dog walkers were polite and careful about their dogs. I realize that I am only one small voice, but I have lived in Marin most of my life and feel that our trails are a wonderful treasure to be enjoyed by all. A dog on leash never gets the amount of exercise that it can when set free. Please do not make laws based upon a small group that complains the loudest. Thank you for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1185    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 10:11:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog all over the Marin Headlands.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thanks,  
Philip

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1186    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

---

**Correspondence:** December 29, 2013

Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent

Golden Gate national Recreation Area

Fort Mason Building 201

San Francisco, CA 94123-002

Dear Mr. Dean,

We oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative of the Dog Management Plan and urge you to adopt the NO ACTION plan.

As a life-long San Franciscan and Marin County business owner I have owned many dogs and found great joy in sharing my environs with them. Dogs require daily exercise, and especially for medium and larger breeds, open space and being able to run off-leash allows them the opportunity to play and exercise. Exercised dogs are better-behaved dogs too!

The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) is flawed in many ways that inequitably impact citizens and their dogs:

1. No scientific data supports the proposed policy changes. The SEIS assumes dogs cause negative impact on GGNRA parks but studies have revealed the opposite is true. In contrast, GGNRA Park Police reports are replete with accounts of humans littering and vandalizing GGNRA property.

2. Dog owners are responsible. The result of the dog-owning community to encourage responsible ownership and clean up after their dogs has been remarkable.

3. The GGNRA has no federally designated critical habitat. Therefore there is no reason to ban dogs citing harm to such habitat.

4. The GGNRA urban park was created under legislation to serve the entire community. Off-leash dog walkers are specifically allowed to use the park in the enabling legislation. The radical changes and limitations proposed violate the intent of the initial legislation.

5. Studies show there are more dogs in San Francisco than children. So why would the GGNRA reduce the existing allowed dog recreation areas in favor of human-only access?

6. The severe reduction (up to 90%) of off-leash dog access plus reducing the numbers of trails in 21 existing sites where leashed dogs are currently allowed smells like rules from a person or committee who is irrationally afraid of or hates dogs. We would hope our public lands do not befall the fears of the few. For all these reasons and more, I urge the GGNRA to adopt the NO ACTION plan with regard to dogs access to our urban parklands.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Nebenzahl

Hoa Tran

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1187	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,06,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter
-----------------------------	--------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	December 28, 2013
------------------------	-------------------

Dr. Christian Paech

55 Yacht Lane

Daly City, CA 94014

Tel. 650.756.2354

e-mail: scpaech@comcast.net

Superintendent

GGNRA

Fort Mason, Bldg. 201

---

San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Madam or Sir:

For the past 35 years my wife and I have been regular visitors to Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. Recurring problems we are facing in these recreational areas are not properly controlled dogs (mostly of the recently sky-rocketing number of "dog-herders").

I am a disabled person suffering from limited peripheral vision and balance problems. Fast running (large) dogs ' in their excitement of being "let go" - often brush me from their rear and even try to weasel through my legs causing me to lose balance. Through my limited vision I cannot detect them quickly enough to guard myself against unexpected collisions. At a height of 6'3" (and an age of 71) a loss of balance is a painful experience!

When pointing out my dilemma to the dog owner (herder) more than once the response was "it's a dog park". While lack of civility (the use of a public park requires recognition ' and respect ' for the sharing of a facility) cannot be indoctrinated by policies (and neither would GGRNA be the platform for enforcing them) we suggest:

â€ Place a sign (yet another one, like the "You have to know the rules") reminding people the only way everyone (not just dog owners) will enjoy the use of GGRNA requires mutual respect for all by all (specifically that dogs must be under proper control).

Another concern with free running dogs is (1) enthusiastic slobbering on the clothes of unsuspecting hikers (sure, we have a washer at home; but who wants to walk around with dog paws and slobber on pants and shirts?); (2) lack of control over defecating dogs. The latter point presents health risks for small children and infants playing at Ocean Beach (and other beaches) not to speak of the intimidating effect of a huge dog on an infant sitting in the sand (we have been victimized in this manner many years ago earning the only but very common response by the owner "he/she (it??) is a friendly dog" (which is only for us but not for the dog owner to decide!). We offer the following solution:

â€ Divide Ocean Beach into two segments: stair well 1 to 11 no dogs; stair well 12-22 dogs permitted (or vice versa).

â€ Throughout the GONRA dogs must be properly controlled to ensure a pleasant coexistence of all participants, particularly on narrow trails (the "friendly dog"-label is absolutely inadequate!).

Sincerely,

Christian Paech

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1188	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109
	United States of America

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Dec,30,2013 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter
-----------------------------	--------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent
------------------------	----------------

GGRNA

Fort Mason/Bldg 201

SFCA 94123

Attn: Dog Management

I would like to submit a new comment:

The Mayor of San Francisco has been pressured by dog owners to advocate for dog owners and to prevent any limitation of dogs in parks and public areas.



The GGNRA has worked hard on their plans which I totally support.  
An effort now to sabotage those plans will be made by the Mayor I hope the GGNRA will continue to support more freedom from dogs in our parks and recreation areas.  
There is something unhealthy about a city that has more dogs than children  
Berenice Palmer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1189    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102-4689  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** San Francisco Board of Supervisors Town or City Government  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** December 19, 2013  
Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94 123-0022  
RE: Comments regarding the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas Draft Dog Management Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Ocean Beach

Dear Mr. Dean,

As strong supporters of our national parks, we wish to commend your efforts to preserve the resources and values in our parks for the use of future generations and to align your dog management policy with NPS regulations. However, our offices, jointly representing the constituency living near or using Ocean Beach for public recreation, have heard from our communities their serious concerns regarding the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). We are primarily concerned with the loss of dog walking opportunities as presented by the Preferred Alternative as well as the impact this will have on our City parks.

Under the Preferred Alternative in the 2013 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, 80% of Ocean Beach would be closed to dogs, where currently 100% of Ocean Beach is open to some form of dog walking. The Preferred Alternative would leave only the portion North of Stairwell 21 would be open to dogs. Furthermore:

- In the Ocean Beach Snowy Plover Protection Area, dogs would no longer be allowed on or off leash. Currently, dogs are allowed on leash year-round and off leash with voice control for 47 days.
- In the area North of Stairwell 21, there would be a regulated off-leash area (ROLA) with dogs under voice and sight control where currently, dogs are allowed off leash under voice control.
- South of Sloat Boulevard, no dogs would be allowed where currently dogs are allowed off leash under voice control.

Reducing available open space for dog walking on or off leash will strain our City's Parks and open spaces. The Ocean Beach Trail along Great Highway, which is cited multiple times throughout the SEIS as an available on leash dog walking area within the Ocean Beach Snowy Plover Protection Area, is actually under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. This trail also is already constrained by its multiple uses, including pedestrians, bicyclists, joggers, and dog walkers. It is further constrained due to its width of approximately ten feet. Removing dog walking from this portion of Ocean Beach would put further pressure on this already heavily used pathway.

Furthermore, District 4 contains only two off-leash dog play areas managed by the Recreation and Park Department in its boundaries, both of which are located in Stern Grove, over one mile away from Ocean Beach. Without an adequate analysis of how closing 80% of Ocean Beach to dogs would impact our City dog play areas and the maintenance load of our City departments, we cannot support the Preferred Alternative.

Similarly, District 1 contains three off-leash dog play areas that are managed by the Recreation and Park Department and would also, potentially, suffer negative impacts should the Preferred Alternative be implemented.

With over 120,000 dogs in San Francisco, balancing recreational opportunities for our communities is paramount. We are supportive of a more balanced approach for Ocean Beach. In the SEIS, Alternative E is the most balanced option for Ocean Beach. Alternative E would allow dogs off leash under voice and sight control North of Stairwell 21 and on leash in the Snowy Plover Protection Area and South of Sloat Boulevard. This would keep 100% of Ocean Beach open to some form of dog walking but would additionally eliminate visitor confusion about the seasonal leash restriction in the Snowy Plover Protection Area. We believe that this alternative could, with adequate enforcement of leash restrictions, make Ocean Beach a place where people, dogs, and wildlife can coexist.

We remain committed to working with you and your team toward a dog management policy that represents the values of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) and also best serves our community. Should you have any questions regarding our comments on the SEIS, please do not hesitate to contact our offices.

Sincerely,  
Eric Mar  
District 1  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Katy Tang  
District 4  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

cc: Nancy Pelosi, Congresswoman 12th District  
Dianne Feinstein, United States Senator  
Jackie Speier, Congresswoman District  
Leland Yee, California State Senator District 8  
Mark Leno, California State Senator District 11  
Phil Ting, California State Assemblymember District 19  
Edwin Lee, San Francisco Mayor  
David Chiu, President, Board of Supervisors  
Mark Farrell, Supervisor District 2  
London Breed, Supervisor District 5  
Jane Kim, Supervisor District 6  
Scott Wiener, Supervisor District 8  
David Campos, Supervisor District 9  
Malia Cohen, Supervisor District 10  
John Avalos, Supervisor District 11  
Norman Yee, Supervisor District 7  
Phil Ginsburg, General Manager San Francisco Recreation and Park Department

Mohammed Nuru, Director San Francisco Department of Public Works  
Rebecca Katz, Director San Francisco Animal Care and Control

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1190    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 10:45:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very sad to hear you would like to take away yet another of our open spaces. I think the word OPEN is self defining. Open space is for public use by responsible citizens. One of the joys of living here is being able to walk out of my house and in 5 minutes be in quiet wooded areas where my dog and I can enjoy a fine hike and exercise. I see no justification for your taking away this small pleasure. I sometimes get the feeling that everyone at GGNRA would like to see all our pets in a crate from birth to death. Please prove me wrong.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1191    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir beach and Mt. tam areas, Tennessee Valley, Rodeo Beach. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Dogs need off-leash exercise. All dog experts speak of this as necessary for a healthy dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1192    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Member Recreational Groups  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Dec,27,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** December 27, 2013

Dear Superintendent,  
Thank you for accepting my comments on the National Park Service's proposed dog management

---

policies.

The GGNRA is the only U.S. park allowing unleashed dogs, so Snowy Plovers at Ocean Beach Crissy Field are threatened.

Needed are enough dog-free trails so wildlife is allowed to live and flourish without predator, i.e., dog worries. Off-leash areas need fencing.

New rules should allow the elderly to walk, families to picnic people to hike, jog watch birds.

I'm not advocating a ban on dogs, but instead, want to see a balance so both dogs and birds can be protected, as well as people who enjoy these spectacular areas of nature.

Joyce Stanek

Golden Gate Audubon Member

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1193    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94945  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Dec,12,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,  
I would like the present rule of dogs on the south side of Stinson Beach O.K.  
I really enjoy playing and hanging out with my dog at Stinson Beach. Please keep dogs allowed on the Beach.  
Sincerely, Kathi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1194    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-1407  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Nov,28,2013 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident & Dog owner in San Francisco and I strongly encourage you to reconsider your adjustments to off leash dog walking areas.  
I have worked in the presidio for 5 years, two of those years I brought my dog to work & walked him daily on Chrissy Field. I am so sad that you would limit the area dogs can be off leash. I disagree that dogs are doing any damage to the area, infact I would argue that dog walkers are your BEST advocate for keeping the parks clean and a nice place to congregate. I have seen first hand that dog walkers pick up after themselves, and each other, because they consider this area their backyard and want to keep it nice. I urge you to use that group to your advantage - they want to keep the area just as pristine as you do - they have to come back everyday & walk again. Please let our dogs play!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1195    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and frequent user of the trails that may be affected I have vested interest in this. Please reconsider.

---

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1196	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Unknown, CA Unknown United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern				

I am a senior citizen (81) I have walked my dog at F.F. almost daily since 1980. We as dog owners love F.F. do what we can to keep it safe. I feel if I did not have this place to walk exercise my dog, I would not have reached this age.

I have a large dog that need to run fetch balls, at my age there is no way I could exercise him on a leash. Fort Funston has a large community of Senior Citizens who need to be able to walk their dogs off leash. There is also a large community of people who have walked there for years. We pick up trash, try to educate new dog owners do a monthly clean up.

It would be a mistake to limit areas at F.F. You will have more problems from non dog people who will destroy what ever they can.

Theresa Walker

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1197	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The state park and recreation areas are the only true place I can let my dogs off leash and allow them to return to their natural instincts to run & explore under my guidance. PLEASE do not roll this out as I feel it would affect the income and support of California State parks & recreation.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1198	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Tiburon , CA 94920 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	none Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				

---

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 11:13:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is ridiculous! There are more places in SF city to have your dog off leash than in Marin county- how can that be?

Dogs are members of peoples families and enjoy being outdoors and running around. It is crucial for their health and well being. Everyone knows that you can not effectively achieve the same level of exercise for the animal with it on the leash- especially true for older folks with dogs. Would you also say that children can only go to parks if they are contained in a stroller?

I am a tax payer who pays to use and maintain these areas- not having the use of this OUTDOOR space to take my dog and enjoy it at our leisure is absurd an unacceptable. My dog is happiest when running outdoors, playing with other dogs, and rolling in the grass or just observing nature. He deserves this right, as do all dogs.

These rules are cruel and annoying. STOP IT!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1199 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 11:52:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please allow dog walking to continue throughout the entire Rancho Corral del Tierra property. There is a long history of sustainable and responsible dog walking in the area. Please do not ban dogs from most of the property when there has been no environmental damage requiring restrictive provisions on dog walking. This is a recreational area and dog walking is a recreational activity and should therefore be allowed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1200 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 12:50:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am absolutely IRATE that yet another government entity is trying to SCREW UP MY PERSONAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS!

I pay a fortune in taxes to live in a place with open space...because I USE IT! Animals are FAMILY - and as such are a daily part of our lives. How dare you try to shut down even MORE dog friendly open space! It's already absolutely so difficult to take a hike around here with my dog! I have to basically never do a nice loop in Tennessee Valley because of the restrictions and you need to be a freaking map specialist to figure out where else they are allowed and not allowed.

My favorite trails have become pet unfriendly over the past few years, and I'M FRIGGING SICK OF IT!!!

Are you hearing me???

MY taxes pay YOUR salaries!! Stop screwing us over!

I am fine with certain breeds being leash only - I don't really want my kids to run into a off leash pit bulls, but even as much as I hate that particular breed, we are Americans, and we have RIGHTS, to life, liberty and the pursuit of FREEDOM. That means we get to HIKE with our entire family, not just the human ones.

**Correspondence ID:** 1201    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94063  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** San Mateo County Supervisor District 5 Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 13:17:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** January 14, 2014

Mr. Frank Dean, Superintendent  
National Park Service - Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Mr. Dean,

I am writing to offer my reaction to the GGNRA Dog Management/Environmental Impact Statement Plan. As I review the Preferred Alternatives, I am concerned over the effect the implementation of the Alternatives may have on the San Mateo County residents and visitors. As the San Mateo County Supervisor representing the Supervisorial District adjacent to Fort Funston, I respectfully ask that GGNRA considers continuing to allow off-leash play areas. Citizens in my District have used Fort Funston to recreate their dogs responsibly for years.

Throughout the process conducted to produce the Plan, I heard residents of San Mateo County ask not to have trail access and off-leash play areas for dog walkers reduced. As I reviewed the Alternatives, I am concerned by how many of these areas are being prohibited or restricted for dog walkers. In addition, I have concerns over the potential impact this can have on San Mateo County's coastal communities. By reducing the amount of trails people can access with their dogs and citing people for violations, GGNRA will be discouraging people from engaging in outdoor activities and enjoying their national park lands.

GGNRA states that they have selected the Alternatives because it grants multiple user groups the opportunity to enjoy the property, allow for habitat restoration, and is justifiable and enforceable by NPS Rangers. I am sympathetic to the need to reduce conflict between dog owners and those who may be afraid of dogs, the preservation of habitat, and reducing potential liability of the GGNRA. For decades, dog walkers, non-dog walkers, mountain bikers and horseback riders have all enjoyed the trails and park areas that are now managed by GGNRA. Multiple user groups have been enjoying these areas together in the past and should be able to continue to do so. I believe the strong desire by dog walkers and the community to continue the traditional use of these areas for recreation of their pets will make it difficult for GGNRA and the NPS Rangers to effectively enforce the Alternatives.

I ask that you reconsider your Alternatives and not place such heavy restrictions on trails, and especially the Fort Funston area currently used by dog walkers.

Sincerely,

Supervisor Adrienne J. Tissier  
District 5  
County of San Mateo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1202    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 13:36:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am very glad that dogs will now be leashed on most GGNRA public beaches. It is disturbing to have dogs running and fighting and peeing while families are trying to picnic and relax. But good luck enforcing the rule!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1203    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 14:28:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our family cares deeply about the environment and we care deeply about animals. It is one of the reasons we live in Marin County. We feel so grateful that so much land is protected and a wonderful home for many species of birds and other wildlife. We believe that the wildlife of Marin County has enough protected land to exist without taking more away from dog owners. If this is not the case we would like to see scientific evidence of this. We adopted a dog that needed a home and we enjoy the trails in and around Marin with her and our family. Without this option we may not have rescued her and if we did and we didn't have outdoor space to enjoy we would be in our cars driving to a locations where she could run freely. This would surely cause more environmental damage than dogs being allowed on trails. Please do not close the many beautiful trails to dog owners that are likely the same people that are conscious of the environment and do their best to cause no harm!

Thank you,  
JP H Salz  
Mill Valley, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1204    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 14:30:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Most of the dog walkers I know and others that I meet on the trails of Southern Marin are considerate and obey the rules of the GGNRA. To take away the use of some of these trails and roads is not what the GGNRA stood to represent. The use of most of the GGNRA was supposed to be open to everyone....bike riders, runners, hikers, and dog walkers.

To exclude the dog walkers from the Southern Marin Trails would be a example of Government using poor judgement.  
Please pay attention to the overall needs of those who use the GGNRA and not just a few users.

Keep the trails and roads open for everyone.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 1205    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 14:41:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed solution of the dog management plan, alternative F of the SEIS Report, penalizes dog walkers as whole, and does so to a significant degree. Although the solution would address environmental impact and user safety, it is far too constrictive to the population of park users, where many are dog walkers. If environmental impact and user safety are of concern, I urge you to design a more artful solution than excluding park users. This may be a historically popular solution, but that does not make it the right answer, especially to the severity that the dog management plan provides.

Instead design a management plan that meets the current requirements: the needs of the dog walker, safety needs, and environmental needs. Take your solution to a more granular level than leashing, banning, or not banning dogs. Devise a more creative plan that meets your requirements.

I do not support the implementation of the dog management plan due to its severe exclusion of dog walkers and therefore lack of ability to meet the needs of GGNRA users.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1206    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 15:54:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Changes to GGNRA Dog Access.

I'm a frequent, almost daily, user of Fort Funston and weekly user of Chrisy Field.

We will be DEVASTATED if we lose "off leash" access to these areas!

Our little dog is going to go bonkers.

We visit other parks in SF but nothing compares to these two areas. Plus all the other parks can't / won't be able to handle the increase in usage if these areas are closed! Most Dog parks in SF are already getting overwhelmed, and this is only going to exacerbate this issue.

I believe that these areas should remain as "off leash" dog areas. I do understand the need to some "education" for all visitors (dog and no dog people). I'd recommend some more basic signage ie) restricted access areas, stay on trail, etc.... Plus more garbage cans, not only for doggy poop but human litter, also; start fine/ticketing people who don't pick up dog waste and who litter. Have some rangers present in and around the areas of concern. I can't even recall the last time I saw a Park Ranger!!!

It would be nice to see some Volunteer efforts, sponsored by the GGNRA, to help in the maintenance these areas, help educate and maybe even sponsor a monthly/quarterly "work parties."

The Draft guidance is a little more then overwhelming for the general Joe/Johanna to understand or even want to understand (its over 1500 pages, w/ exec summary at ~20 pages). Lets see some reasonable enforcement and education in order to avoid this massive bureaucratic nightmare.

Regards

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1207    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Greenbrae, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 16:44:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Dog Management Plan.

There are adequate facilities in dog runs and other parks where dogs can run off leash. Dogs off-leash should be very limited if not entirely prohibited in the GGNRA.

Dogs and their owners can enjoy the parts of the area where they are allowed on leash. This will limit the significant negative impact on sensitive habitat, wild animals and birds as well as other visitors of all ages.

"Voice control" rarely seems to work for dogs and should not be considered an acceptable alternative to having proper control over a dog on a leash.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

David Riedel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1208    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Citizens for Progress and Sanity Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 17:38:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Committee Members,  
Thank you for taking the time to solicit input from the citizens of our potentially impacted communities. It is a testament to the thoroughness of the committee and its recognition of the gravity of this debate.

I would like to start by requesting the committees acknowledgement that our dog owner community is currently already drastically discriminated against in its access to our Bay Area parks. In Marin County, families with dogs are permitted access to merely 1% o our parks land! This alongside the fact the recent surveys show nearly 40% o all Californians are dog owners.

As frequent users of parks, dog owners are often the most committed volunteers to park maintenance and fund raising. In addition, our parks are funded equally by all tax payers, dog owner or not. This discrimination alone should give any fair analysis pause before considering further reduction of dog friendly public space.

Lastly, I would like to address the economic sense of further restricting parks from dog friendly space. Any tightening of dog restrictions would naturally require additional resources for policing and enforcing said policies. With our park systems already under intense financial pressures (park closers, etc), could our park dollars not be better spent reopening and maintaining our parks system instead of degrading the experience of some the parks systems biggest advocates and supporters?

In closing, I ask you to please reconsider any changes to our current dog friendly park space. It is unfairly over-limited as it is and to add to this discrimination makes little sense in regards to economic factors nor general equality.

Sincerely yours,  
Charles Gulick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1209    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 17:49:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and along the Sleepy Hollow divide trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1210    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 18:15:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate all you're doing to try to protect our environment. I feel dogs should not be off-leash anywhere in the GGNRA. Voice command doesn't always stop a dog. I have been sprayed by wet dogs/ food on my blanket sniffed - not appreciated. Birds are chased by dogs and vegetation trampled. I don't want to go into GGNRA areas and have to worry about where/when dogs have defecated/urinated. I appreciate dogs being banned wherever possible from the GGNRA. So many people walk with their dogs off-leash when they are supposed to be on-leash- much less all the dogwalkers with multiple pets!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1211    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 18:46:23

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose Alternative F for the following reasons:

Most of the people who take their dogs to the GGNRA are responsible and care greatly about the environment. One of the wonderful things about living here is that residents can take their dogs on trails. Many dogs are ill-suited to dog parks, and their owners don't want to stand around in the same place all the time. Most GGNRA visitors with dogs want to do everything possible to preserve this special privilege. It makes no sense to exclude responsible dog owners and their well behaved pets under the circumstances.

I agree with comment 29688: Issue more citations and fines. Fines should increase every time a person receives one, and it should be possible to ban people and their dogs who consistently flout the rules. Trained volunteers should be allowed to give citations. There should be a special phone app where people on walks can report violators.

Perhaps people who want to take their dogs to the GGNRA off-leash could take a class for a fee, the class covering where dogs mustn't go, proper etiquette, and so forth. The fee can go to paying for stricter enforcement, building simple barriers to keep dogs out of areas that are being revegetated.

Having people pay a fee for the privilege of walking their dog off-leash makes sense to me. They need to have this document available to show at all times, and dogs can wear a noticeable tag on their collars. Professional dog walkers need to take a class and need to be limited in the number of dogs they bring.

Dogs that are aggressive to other dogs or who chase joggers or otherwise annoy other visitors should not be allowed in the GGNRA.

I think the GGNRA should harness the passion and enthusiasm of the dog owners around here to make sure all rules are followed! That might be the most effective means yet of ensuring that the GGNRA lands and the wildlife they support can thrive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1212    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 19:02:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose Alternative F and strongly support Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1213    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 19:06:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To. Frank Dean,GGNRA

I am writing to let you know that I strongly oppose the dog management plan.

Over the last 13 years I have been a daily park user at Fort Funston and I have enjoyed this beautiful space to recreate with my dogs OFF LEASH. During this time I have formed bonds with several people

who also share in the enjoyment of walking with their pets off leash. There are several seniors who use this park daily that at one time had their own dog but with age and failing health can no longer care for a dog. However they still show up, walk and enjoy the company of other people dogs.

I'm not sure why you feel the need to fix something that isn't broken. This has been a much loved off leash area since the 70's. From reading the DEIS I do not see any solid proof of the claims against dogs destroying the land and killing birds.

The GGNRA has over 80,000 acres. Off leash dogs use less than 1%. Dog owners are tax payers too. I don't think asking for use of 1% of your land to play with my dogs off leash is asking a lot.

In addition to Fort Funston. I also use Sweeney Ridge as well as several trails in Pacifica. When I use these trails I don't even bring my dogs. I run them at the Fort then meet up with friends and hike your other land. So it's not that us "dog people" are asking to run free all over your land. We just want to keep what we have for our dogs.

Please leave us dog lovers a place to run with our pet "kids."

Thank you,  
Shannon Carlin

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1214	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,15,2014 19:40:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As a resident of San Francisco I urge you not to implement any restrictions on non-professional dog walking in the GGNRA. Since the City of San Francisco has given up all its ocean side land to the GGNRA it is vital that the GGNRA take into consideration the needs of San Francisco in managing GGNRA land in San Francisco. The Mayor of San Francisco, several of its board of supervisors and thousands of its residents support allowing off leash dog walking in San Francisco. I urge you to take this into consideration in the new dog management plan. There are over 100,000 dogs in San Francisco and if the current dog rules are changed to be more restrictive to non-professional dog walkers it will force many people that currently walk their dogs in the GGNRA to turn to city parks. The city parks do not have the capacity for the increased dog walking usage. If you feel the need to restrict dog walking please do not place restrictions on non-professional dog walking. Any restrictions to dog walking should be to dog walking professionals. Something along the lines of what the city of San Francisco is doing in their recent requirements that professional dog walkers need to be licensed and cannot walk more than 6 dogs at a time.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1215	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fairfax, CA 94930 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,15,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to many of the GGNRA trails and beaches. My dog is very well behaved and my whole family including the dog really enjoy these activities.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. Please don't take more recreational areas away from us.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Please don't take away our enjoyment. Please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1216 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 20:04:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the Park Service's efforts to manage the impact of dogs on our natural resources so that their negative impact on birds and wildlife are minimized. There are significantly more dogs and people than there were in 1979, and therefore more pressure on the environment and more negative impact. The impact to the beaches and their degradation from overuse is not something one can ignore just because it's not politically correct to do so.

In addition to people and dogs, the beaches are a resource for birds too, who get their food from the shoreline. I see them having to fly away from dogs, using their precious energy that they could be using to find something to eat. While I love dogs, it would be great to have an area where the birds can be undisturbed, and where people like me who do prefer to enjoy the beach without a bunch of dogs running around, their excrement everywhere, and I don't have to worry about the dogs who don't pay attention to 'voice control' - of which there are many. People and dogs, when there are many of them as there are in SF, degrade our natural resources like our beaches. More restricted areas would mean fewer dogs and people in those areas, which would help preserve the natural beauty of our beaches and help protect wildlife. It requires a sacrifice and crowding of other areas, yes, but sometimes that is what it takes to preserve our environment. We have a responsibility for the health of our pets, but we also have a responsibility for our natural resources too. We also have a population like me that would like at least some beach areas to enjoy that are dog free. Thank you!

Desi Perim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1217 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** san francisco, CA 92417  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 20:14:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a dog walker in San Francisco. I currently walk my dog in a handful of different places within the city a few of which happen to be within the GGNRA park area both on-leash and off-leash sections. I urge you to reconsider this off-leash issue and do not ban it outright and if anything just restrict the current areas to smaller ones. If you completely eradicate all of these off-leash areas such as Chrissy Field and Fort Funston then all these dogs and owners will have no where left to take them to play. The smaller off leash places like Stern Grove and Corona Heights will start to get flooded with people and get very overcrowded so that these too will have problems with erosion from people and their dogs whether they are on or off the leash. I feel that when dogs are on the leash they are in fact more territorial, aggressive, and do not demonstrate their instinctive playful and curious attitude toward life. Please do not put this into effect without considering that dog owners are citizens to of this county and deserve to retain their rights to recreational activities within the GGNRA system along with everyone else that utilizes the area. Do not discriminate against one group of people and ban them from exercising, playing, and socializing their dogs with others.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1218 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mil Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 20:21:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1219 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 20:23:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I am concerned about the message that is being relayed by the proposed impact statement. It implies that dog owners are not able to respond to environmental concerns without being told how to handle being a dog owner.

I have had a dog for one year and live in Tam Valley. Juno is s medium sized dog who is good natured and easy going. Because I have become a dog owner, I am getting to know humans and dogs in my community. I speak to people on a daily basis. I am out enjoying all the beauty offered by living in Mill Valley.

I happen to be someone who enjoys letting my dog have her freedom when we are out walking. It also afford me more freedom. We regularly go to Muir Beach, and use the Oakwood Valley trail in addition to small parks in the county.

I would welcome being educated about what I need to do to be a more responsible dog owner and would be very willing to volunteer my own time to educate others. I am willing to be part of a local clean up committee in the Tam Valley area.

I would be greatly disappointed if I had to constantly have my dog on leash in order to comply with the law. I feel this is similar to agreeing that my child must be restrained while we are using the National Park. She is just as likely to do something that would be a problem. She is under voice control most of the time but perhaps a little less than the dog.

Thank you for your consideration of these statements. I believe we are all keenly aware of how privileged we are to enjoy the GGNRA. I for one consider it a primary reason that I choose to live in Mill Valley.

Laurie Sterling

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1220	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,15,2014 20:24:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach as well as Miwak and Coastal Trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area! This is an overkill already. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1221	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---



**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 20:27:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a retired dog (2) owner who relies on the dog trails for my quality of life and that of my dogs. Please don't take this away from me/us! Dogs need to be free to roam and smell - and be dogs. The places I go in Marin are filled with other dog owners with off-leash dogs, runners, hikers and bikers. We get along fantastically almost all of the time; and everyone is happy! Why mess with this? Please don't!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1222    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 21:02:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Please help us having our family pets enjoy life too.

Thank you,

Michelle Aubin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1222    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,15,2014 21:29:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Once again, a small minority of people, in this case dog owners, want to impose their will upon the remainder of us who would like to use our trails and beaches without the constant disturbance of dogs running wild and uncontrolled.

---

At a minimum, please require dogs on-lease at environmentally sensitive sites such as Muir Beach. Unleashed dogs disturb birds, fish and other wildlife. The problem is not the dogs, it is with owners who refuse to exert any control over their pets....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1224    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 21:29:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve and protect the tiny 1% o GGNRA trails and beaches currently available to dogs and the owners. Our quality of life will be greatly diminished if you elect to eliminate this small, but essential privilege.

Many fond thanks!

Barbara Harris and family including our retriever, Bobby

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1225    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** greenbrae, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 22:02:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please make sure that dogs are permitted in very limited areas, and that dogs must always be required to be on leashes. Dogs present significant dangers to the wellbeing of the general public; dogs can and do attack and bite humans, espkecially children, women, and the elderly. Dog waste (feces) is dangerous to the health of humans, not to mention the damage to the environment.

Please limit the access of dogs to the GGNRA, and please require them to always have a leash.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1226    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** sf Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 22:52:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the no action alternative in the SEIS for Muir Beach, and the marin headlands. Please keep the pet policy. There are hardly any places a dog owner can walk their dog in the open anymore. I've been going for years and all dogs and owners are respectful.

The Golden Gate national recreation area was established to give recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. Please keep them open.

Thanks for your consideration.  
Susan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1227    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,15,2014 22:54:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't take away our right to take our dogs off leash on our public lands! Our right to hike and walk with our dogs is already severely restricted, please do not add further restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1228    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 08:14:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our family believes licensed, voice controlled dogs should be allowed off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1229    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 09:36:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs are an important part of many peoples lives and deserve to have open places to be outside. The beach and trails are these places.

I oppose any changes to the current regulations and actually would like more trails open and accessible to dogs.

The GGNRA is a RECREATION AREA. It is NOT a designated wilderness area !

An integral part of recreation is to allow humans to enjoy the outside world with their dog.

The current limited open areas are at the bare minimal and I oppose any further restrictions or regulations ... enough is enough.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1230    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 10:24:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the GGNRA plan to ban the various popular areas for dogs off leash. This seems cruel to dogs and their owners. Dogs are meant to run. Already there are very few free areas for our dogs. In general, most folks are very respectful of clean-up and doggie social behavior practices. What is the purpose of this over zealous limitation?

---

The idea of such restrictions serves only to remind us that our county is over-crowded with people coming from everywhere else and that we must feel the consequences in our daily living.

Please take this plan off the table!!

Furious,

Julie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1231	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 10:36:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The GGNRA, by its own rules, must conduct site-specific, peer-reviewed studies as the foundation for any policy changes intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The GGNRA acknowledges the required studies do not exist. This renders the proposed policy changes arbitrary and capricious, and as such they are unlawful and cannot be implemented. The ORIGINAL 1979 Pet Policy should be reinstated per the 2005 Federal Court decision because all closures since then have not been based upon site specific, peer-reviewed studies as the law requires. For lands added after the drafting of the original 1979 Pet Policy, DOI policy requires historical usage be maintained. Any changes would have to be justified by the requisite site-specific, peer-reviewed studies followed by a formal rulemaking process.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1232	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The GGNRA, by its own rules, must conduct site-specific, peer-reviewed studies as the foundation for any policy changes intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The GGNRA acknowledges the required studies do not exist. This renders the proposed policy changes arbitrary and capricious, and as such they are unlawful and cannot be implemented. The ORIGINAL 1979 Pet Policy should be reinstated per the 2005 Federal Court decision because all closures since then have not been based upon site specific, peer-reviewed studies as the law requires. For lands added after the drafting of the original 1979 Pet Policy, DOI policy requires historical usage be maintained. Any changes would have to be justified by the requisite site-specific, peer-reviewed studies followed by a formal rulemaking process.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1233	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94707 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 10:46:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Though I can't figure out from the documents if Stinson Beach is included in "adjustments to dog walking access for five sites in the preferred alternative", I would like to say that walking my dog on the allowed part of Stinson Beach is one of the most wonderful things left in a world of diminishing tolerance for dogs and children, and I hope the right will be maintained.

Thank you very much.

Jean Box

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1234	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 11:02:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As with the previous proposals, the NPS fails to take into account the large number of park users who bring along canine friends. Many dogs can't get a proper amount of exercise while tied to a leash, just as many humans wouldn't consider slowly walking to be adequate exercise. The GGNRA is a gigantic area and way too much of it is already off limits for dogs and their owners. Combined with the large number of beaches the State has declared off limits, it's increasingly hard for us taxpayers to enjoy the very parks we're paying for.

The current rules should be viewed as the minimum amount of flexibility and you should be focused on technologies and arrangements that open up more areas to voice control dog walking, not the other way around.

California has long been known as a burdensome administrative state, and it's a shame that it continues to happen via the NPS as well. We have more than enough wilderness already roped off. Please roll back your proposed regulations to a better balance between users.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1235	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 12:20:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider severely limiting off-leash areas in the GGNRecreationArea. Emphasis on recreation. I use Ft. Funston, Crissy Field and Ocean Beach often for recreation, and responsibly. These are great venues for people and their animals, funded by my/our tax dollars. Off-leash is wonderful exercise for dogs; something they cannot get on leash. I always pick up after my dog, and have taught him good doggy manners. There are plenty of leash-restricted areas already; we do not need more. What's going to be the unintended consequence here; where are these dogs going to go?

If this is about professional dog walkers, put in place measures that restrict/control large groups; do not penalize individuals.

Thank you for giving this issue more consideration.

**Correspondence ID:** 1236    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you in advance for taking the time to read my letter and to consider my comments. I find the present GGNRA Dog Management Proposal to be severe and extremely restrictive, exclusionary and selective, unjust and unjustified. I am writing in support of the NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVES.

I moved to San Francisco a year and a half ago, amazed to discover an extraordinary city and its magnificent surroundings as well as a city that welcomes and celebrates dogs. A city that understands if it treats its dog owning residents with respect that they in turn would behave in no less a manner.

My daily off-leash walks with my dog, alternating between Lands End, Fort Funston and the Marin Headland Trails surrounding Rodeo Beach are my exercise, my therapy, my church, my meditation, my vitamins. These easily accessed walks, keep me healthy, energized, and inspired.

I am enthralled by the beautiful nature I have the opportunity to immerse myself in. I am honored to share these mountains, forests, cliffs and beaches with hawks and pelicans, dolphins and sea lions, coyotes and deer. I am here, exploring, exercising and appreciating because of my dog. And not a day goes by that I do not give thanks for this immeasurable privilege.

~~~

The following paraphrases, reiterates and expands upon some of the comments and information that I have read and profoundly agree with regarding opposition to the proposed Plan:

\* The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan. The SEIS appears to have dismissed nearly all the previous comments from dog walkers.

\* SEIS still lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soil. (p. 373.) Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them. (e.g., p.97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

\* SEIS says that during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In the same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not to do them.

\* SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), (which are required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a longstanding, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

\* SEIS says there has to be a no-dog area at all sites where off-leash dog walking is allowed. For example, the SEIS says Muir Beach is too small to have both an off-leash and a no-dog area, so therefore there cannot be an off-leash area at Muir Beach (p. 113). There's no similar idea that sites that are no-dog also have to include off-leash areas. This shows the inherent unfairness of the SEIS.(

\* SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA document on the GGNRA website). They say they received over 4,700 comments, but never say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS says: NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas. (p. 100). But there's no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.(

\* SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The SF Supervisors and dog walkers asked for a thorough analysis. What we got was cursory at best.(

\* SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) in the GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.(

\* SEIS still does not consider management tools that could mitigate alleged impacts from dogs in the No-Action Alternative. For example, dog training classes, dog-horse workshops, and poop cleanup days could all mitigate concerns about dog safety and pathogens in feces that are used to argue that the No-Action Alternative will not work and therefore the GGNRA must restrict off-leash access.( In fact, I often carry out an extra poop bag (or two or more) from someone else to the nearest garbage disposal. Inexpensive provisions of bio-degradable bags and bins and anti-bacterial dispensers at parks could encourage people to do the same, i.e. An addition of playful signage could encourage everyone to share the responsibility.

\* SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that in many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities. (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to & expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972).(

\* SEIS will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. The only site-specific consensus agreement to come out of Negotiated Rulemaking was to allow off-leash dog walking on a trail in Oakwood Valley in Marin. This was included in the DEIS. However, it was removed from the SEIS (Oakwood Valley is now proposed to be on-leash only) because the GGNRA decided that there would be no off-leash dog walking on any trail. All the money and work that went into Negotiated Rulemaking was wasted.(

\* SEIS still will not allow any off-leash dog walking on New Lands acquired by the GGNRA in the future, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there.(

\* SEIS cites several surveys of visitor use and visitor satisfaction, including two done in 2011 in response to DEIS comments, that were so poorly done that their results are essentially meaningless. A 2008 visitor use survey at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field used people who intercepted people at these sites and asked about their park usage. However, the interceptors were observed by several people to actively avoid

talking to people walking with dogs, hopelessly skewing their results. A 2011 visitor use survey at Fort Funston and Muir Beach, done specifically in response to DEIS comments, only counted people as walking dogs if they had a leash in their hand. People walking with a friend and the friend's dog were not counted as a dog walker (because they did not have a dog of their own with them), even though they were only there to walk with the friend's dog. A 2011 Visitor Satisfaction Survey was so confusing respondents didn't know if they were being asked about their satisfaction with current conditions at GGNRA sites or with the severe restrictions proposed in the DEIS. (

\* SEIS still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who don't want to be around dogs. This criticism was made of the DEIS too and apparently ignored. (

\* The GGNRA park lands in Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo counties are part of local communities where millions of people should be inclusively and actively encouraged to continue enjoying regular relaxation, exercise, and inspiration that make it one of the most valued and visited lands in America. (

\* The new plan is not only a significant change from both the legislative mandate but also from the existing 1980 general management plan, which was highly supported by the public. (Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

\* The plans proposed fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder the movement of wildlife. And frankly, it seems like a contradictory intention, when there is nothing uglier than fences to scar the magnificent landscape and vistas of the GGNRA.

(\* The GGNRA is not the equivalent of the vast Yosemite wilderness and should not be misrepresented as an idealized 'backcountry. Neighborhood trails and beaches should not be managed to artificially exclude people so that a select few have 'solitary and narrowly defined recreational experiences and expect others to have to drive farther away, (bad for the environment) and increase crowding in a few small 'diverse opportunity areas.

\* The GGNRA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone and Yosemite.

~~~~

I have not, nor can I explore the State and National Parks because they are already completely closed to dogs. The Coastal Trail, one of the very few GGNRA Marin Headland trails open for dog walking is proposed to now be off limits too. If I can't go with my dog, I won't go without my dog. The whole point of being out walking in nature is so we both benefit. Why would I leave him at home and go walk myself? An example of a negative effect from closing off urban nature trails to people walking their dogs, is a gradual arrival and settling in of Squatters, contributing litter, human waste and a diminished sense of safety.

Another is that with less foot traffic of walkers with their dogs, wildlife (coyotes for instance), normally kept at bay, misguidedly expand their territory. This increases the risk of contact, confrontation and injury with the fewer people using the trails.

City parks with fenced in dog runs are not an alternative. They are limited, restrictive and already crowded. I experience no gain from standing around a dog park. My dog is not a 'fetcher' therefore he nor I get any exercise, stimulation, nor benefits.

A tired dog is a good dog.

A dog on leash never gets anywhere close to the amount of exercise that he does off-leash. On leash, dogs are restricted, less stimulated, they grow frustrated and angry, energy builds up and has nowhere to be released. Their behavior, in turn, can become reactive, impulsive, destructive and unpredictable.

I am a responsible dog owner with an extremely well behaved and VOICE CONTROLLED dog. In areas where there are plenty of people and picnics and kids, I choose to put my dog on leash. And in areas that are open and sparse, he walks freely, people who call to him are greeted happily and he in turn welcomes a friendly pat. Nine out of ten people I meet ANYWHERE react with delight and receptiveness upon seeing my dog. And it gives me great joy to see strangers smile and laugh, knowing that my dog contributed to that.



Instead of going backwards to match other cities in their restrictions and limited thinking, I wish that the GGNRA would continue to be the inclusive, trailblazer that San Francisco has always been. To do things better. To do things that have for years, clearly proven that they work and to build upon that.

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

To witness the exuberance of dogs running, bounding, playing and swimming with their owners, with other dogs and with other people and kids is incredible to behold.

We are astoundingly lucky to live in magnificent Northern California. In all the places and cities I've lived, I have never met so many conscious, responsible, respectful and aware people who greatly appreciate how blessed we are to be here. Please enable us to continue to celebrate that, in our freedoms, in our healthy choices, in our cherishing and sharing of our beloved natural wonders, where we are all welcome with our very best canine friends by our sides.

Thank you.

Kindly,

Jennifer Saxon

SAN FRANCISCO

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1237 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 13:41:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been taking my two dogs, Golden Retriever and Australian Shepherd, to Funston Beach for more than two years. This great natural resource is the perfect place for dogs and owners to go out, be in nature and get some exercise. Dogs need to run off-leash. Most weekends we get in a 3-4 mile run at Funston. This exercise is essential to the health and well being of my dogs as well as my health and well being. Walking calmly, on either end of a leash, down the street or through the park is not sufficient as a main source of exercise. We live in a city and we are very lucky to have the great resources of the GGNRA lands available to us. I'd hate to see these lands become overly regulated. Any weekend at Funston beach will show you how many dog owners love to use this space. Let's not shut out the very people that most appreciate these lands. I'm impressed with San Francisco and its openness to dogs in a variety of locations. In my 2 years in the city I have not see a single problem with this policy. Let's not make regulations where none are needed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1238 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** pacifica, CA 94044

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 15:06:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am a dog owner and have lived in Pacifica for 25 years. I have loved walking kids and my dogs over the

---

years down the Beach Blvd. promenade, out to the open space of Mori Point which is GGNRA land. We have seen the landscape change a bit over time but all in all it still remains a great resource in our backyard of breathtaking beauty and easy accessibility. I also am the parent of an autistic child, so having this opportunity to take my pack out into this national treasure is as much a blessing as it is a necessity for my sanity and well-being. I would hate for it to be completely off limits to my dogs as it has been our escape for decades. We are responsible dog people and sometimes pick up other dog owners droppings just because we respect the landscape and want it to be preserved and yet always available for our use.

I saw the documentary "Rebels with a Cause" which was about how the GGNRA, Pt. Reyes and other various open-space preservation agencies got their start. The founding fathers and mothers who worked relentlessly and tirelessly to shape the future of these lands for public use made it very clear that these areas were for the residing citizens, visitors, and future generations alike. So many of us are responsible dog owners and count on these open spaces to enjoy and recreate (it is a recreational area as the "R" in GGNRA denotes). This is the original intention of GGNRA and we as citizens, taxpayers, voters and dog-lovers want to continue to bring our four-legged, furry friends along with us when we enjoy this national treasure that is our backyard.

Please consider allowing leashed-dogs to be permitted in San Mateo County and vote yes to make that part of our legacy!

thank you,  
Pam Raymond

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1239	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Dogs against Bureaucracy Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 15:40:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	the GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.				

I OPPOSE ANY RULES THAT RESTRICT DOGS.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1240	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 16:23:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The prospect of banning dogs in the GGNR is ridiculous, and unfair. It punishes those of us that keep our dogs on leash AND those of us (like myself) that have a physical condition where having a dog could be the difference between hazard & safety. I suffer from M.S. I hike using an ankle brace, two poles, and a knee brace. My dog is trained to pick up things I drop, help me regain my balance if I fall, and give me support when needed. To ban her from the trails is to ban me. Seems very biased against those with disabilities. Linda Mannella				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1241 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 16:23:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. I do support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog on the Miwok, Coastal and Wolf Ridge trails and will be disheartened to be banned from these beautiful trails. As a homeowner in Southern Marin since 1998, I have helped support the maintenance of these trails along with the school system. I have paid thousands of dollars to improve our schools and do not have children.

99% o GGRA is already banned to dogs. One of the reasons I moved to Marin County and subsequently got a dog is to enjoy the beautiful outdoors. I am one of the responsible dog owners, who carry bags and scoop my poop as well as others. You can not make policy based on a few bad eggs.

Dog owners in general tend to partake in outdoor activities that promote healthy lifestyles for themselves as well as their 4 legged family members. Suggesting one take their canine to a dog park is ridiculous. First, that is not real exercise for the owner and is limited for the dogs, second, there are an insufficient number of parks to accommodate the population and the overcrowding is not healthy and will be a breeding ground for trouble.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area. Marin residents rely upon this open space.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. that policy still works today and should be retained.

You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. Should this pass you will force people to get in their cars creating more traffic, pollution and create even more congestion than what is currently being experienced.

In 2011, the GGNRA tried to implement a similar plan. It was opposed in the public comments b a margin of 3:1. these are public lands and the GGNRA need to listen to the entire public. For those grievously opposed to having dogs enjoy the 1% o trails and beaches available, they can certainly use the remaining 99%.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1242 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 16:24:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe this plan is too restrictive in regards to the off leash areas for dogs. Nearly one-third of households in San Francisco include at least one dog. Like it or not, there are 120,00 dogs in

---

The City, and they all need to be walked daily. Limiting the areas that already allow dogs will have the unintended consequence of inundating our city parks with dogs (both on and off-leash).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1243    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 16:34:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I really oppose alternative F and strongly support alternative A. I am a 72 year old long time resident of Marin County. I walk my dog on many of the designated trails and have never seen any problem with my dog or any other dog. Both people and the environment are not injured by our dogs since all of the dog owners I know are responsible dog owners. WE value our natural resources in this county, do not want them harmed but we value our pets also and want them to be able to enjoy nature. I don't understand why you want to ban dogs from so many areas which are now open to them. Are there many instances of problems???? If so, why have we not heard of them??? Please reconsider regulations which, for no good reason, will only decrease the wonderful life we Marin residents now have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1244    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Miami, FL 33125  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 16:37:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

SEND YOUR COMMENTS TO THE BNP BEFORE FEBRUARY 20th 2013:

<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/commentForm.cfm?documentID=56275>

Comment on the Biscayne National Park Supplemental Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement - November 2013

Alternative 1: No Action is my preferred alternative until the Biscayne National Parks Fishery Management Plan (updated November 2013) has been given enough time, over the next five to ten years, to take effect on the long term sustainability of the Parks fish.

However, if the GMP takes effect than I urge you to include the following modifications to the GMP.

1. Allow spearfishing. It is only fair that the GMP not discriminate against spearfishing. Also, spearfishing is helping to control the damage by Lionfish in the Park. Spearfisherman also helps to clean the Park of debris on the reefs. Besides, spearfishing is a selective sport that harvests fewer species, smaller numbers and size than other recreational sport as recorded by the IUSA and the IGFA.
2. Specify the science that will be used to adjust the number of harvesting permits, take species, and limits in the GMP (Adaptive Management Section). For example; if the GMP has a better than expected result as evidenced by a 10% f count boost to a target species than 10% m permits will be issued.
3. Allow anchorage. Buoy only options will present safety problems between boaters and divers. Instead, I encourage you to increase your budget allocation to enforce current park regulations including no anchorage on coral reef. Just a few well-placed fines will drive behavior and budget for continued enforcement.

Also, please let me know how I can be of assistance to the Park. How can I help to get Park personnel into our schools to educate our children of the importance of the Park and its marine environment? How can I help the Park at our marinas, docks and launch ramps to educate boaters about the park and best boating practices to protect its sensitive environment? And how can I help get Park personnel on and in the water first hand?

Otherwise I select Alternative 1: No Action. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Manuel Diaz

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1245	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 17:03:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** My personal opinion is that I love this plan the way it stands. There are just too many people who are not in control of their dogs. The amount of dog poop on trails is so disturbing and people (even if they think their dog is an angel) are just oblivious to their pets behavior. I worry about the environmental impact of poop on the trails and how those dogs affect other wildlife and plants in the area. There are also many people who want to hike peacefully without fears of an aggressive dog off leash and unattended coming up to them. I know it happens even if it never gets reported.

I am pro dogs on leash as much as possible and no dogs in areas that need rehabilitation and have a large or sensitive wildlife populations.

An example of a trail in Marin that allows dogs off leash is Baltimore canyon near Kentfield...The whole trail smells like dog poop. People leave their little plastic bags of poop on the side of the fire road (if they bother to even bag it) then never retrieve it on their way out. I'm not sure who is responsible for cleaning it up, though I know at times it looks like someone has. Every time I am there, there are people yelling and trying to break up dogs that are not playing nicely.

I know there are good people and that many of them are outstanding pet owners, but there are just as many oblivious ones. Even with rules people will bring their dogs off leash and do what they want, but at least these rules will control things a bit.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1246	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94708 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. You should maintain the long-standing 1979 pet policy.

I have been taking my dogs to Muir Beach since 1971 off-leash and never had or seen an unpleasant

incident. I went to Muir Beach for my 50th and 60th birthdays - - it is critical to me and my dog (she is the third dog I have had who is a MUir Beach Fan) to have Muir Beach for recreation.

I also go to other GGNRA off-leash sites. These areas are meant for recreation by urban people and their dogs. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Bay Area residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Please do not ban off-leash dogs at Muir Beach!!!!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1247	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 17:45:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not choose Alternative F of the dog trail plan. Please keep the "no action" alternative and leave things, limited as they are, as they are.				

Walking with our dogs is a fundamental pleasure in Marin County. It is already very restricted. I take my dogs to Muir Beach and enjoy watching them enjoy their freedom to run and sniff while I enjoy mine. I keep the dogs under strict voice command and never let them bother other beach goers. Many non-dog owners seem to enjoy meeting the dogs and having a chat. I have never had a complaint on the beach. I always take any litter off the beach. I also walk along the quiet Oak Valley Trail and enjoy meeting my fellow dog owners. Very, very rarely do I meet someone on that trail who does not have a dog. And the Miwok Trail is home to us. I can't believe that it would be closed to dogs and their humans.

Having Rodeo Beach as the only off-leash area in Marin is untenable. For one thing, it is very difficult to reach. It is completely against any ecological idea of reducing driving because it is impossible to get there without a major drive either through the headlands or through the tunnel- -both already crowded on nice weekends and always a long drive in the best of circumstances. I live in southern Marin and still find it too far to go on any regular basis. What about people living farther north? Also, if all Marin dogs are there, it will make it more crowded and less enjoyable for both people and dogs.

One of the best things about having a dog is the health-promoting aspect of a daily dog walk. To allow citizens to enjoy our beautiful nature, keep our dogs exercised with a walk, and keep ourselves healthy with outdoor recreation is good policy. There are many, many places a non-dog person can walk in Marin. There are fewer and fewer where a family can go with the family dog.

Please consider these issues when making a decision on dog policy.

---

Thank you,

Juliana Jensen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1248    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I regularly take my dog to the Oakwood and Alta trails, they are practically on my doorstep. Please, don't take that away from so many dogs and dog-owners

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Yours sincerely

Katherine Parkin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1249    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 18:31:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello, I am writing to request you to ban off-leash dogs on GGNRA trails.  
Off-leash dogs are a threat to:  
1) Other pets  
2) Hikers  
3) the natural habitat  
4) Wildlife

Dog owners often will claim that their dogs are under "voice control", which may be true until the dog

---

becomes excited, at which point it is out of control.

As well, many dog owners claim they need to have their dogs off-leash in order to exercise them. This is not true, as dogs can be exercised just fine on leash.

For the safety of everyone, and in order to help prevent dog attacks and accidents, please require dogs to be on-leash on GGNRA trails.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1250	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 944941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 20:51:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I have lived in San Francisco and Marin counties since 1999, and feel strongly there needs to remain a recreation area that families can enjoy with their dogs. The GGNRA is sufficiently restricted, please do not impose any additional restrictions on this public land.

Have you done an impact analysis on where all the dogs will go if your proposed plan is in place? This could cause over concentration of dog use in dog parks and neighborhood/city parks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1251	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I am not currently a dog owner. I hike these trails every week and have never experienced or observed an issue with people's dogs. I enjoy watching the dogs in the ocean and think owners should be allowed to bring dogs on trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Thank you,  
Kerry



---

**Correspondence ID:** 1252    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Davis, CA 95616  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 23:56:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the entire Baker Beach area off leash. I feel that the company of dogs greatly enhances my visit to the GGNRA, and I do not have a dog of my own..

Respectively  
Robi Pochapin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1253    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94605  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 01:51:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose this plan due to the lack of off leash dog areas and the ban on dogs from many trails. As single women it is a safety issue to have my dog and there are other ways to discourage irresponsible dog owners than a ban.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1254    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** MILL VALLEY, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 09:55:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA gate on Lattie is over run by professional dog walkers who park illegally and leave a mess behind.  
Yesterday as one with 6 unleashed dogs was leaving another with 5 was coming.  
Do the Rangers ever patrol here?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1255    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Belvedere, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 10:47:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I find it unacceptable that our dogs are going to lose off leash access to Muir Beach, Alta and other trails and that there is a proposal that my friendly labs will be completely banned from Coastal trails, Miwok, Wolf and Rhubarb. My family has lived in Marin for 25 years. My husband and I are lawyers and we have three children. Our family takes Sunday hikes with our dogs and have been doing so for 25 years. We run the Dipsea Race. We are very involved community members. We pick up after our dogs and they look forward as do we to our Sunday hikes. To only allow off-leash access at Rodeo will create dog chaos with too many in one space, traffic jams and lots of complaints and outrage

---

from local neighbors. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in 2011 comments; we support NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE, the SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of public land. We want the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy to be retained. The proposal is taking away rights to a RECREATIONAL AREA that was meant to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities including walking dogs to people who live in densely populated areas. We are not Yosemite or Yellowstone and different concerns and rights need to be balanced in our community. If we have to drive further from Belvedere to the only approved area, we will be harming the environment and it will defeat the entire purpose of this exercise, won't it? Diane Rice, Hosie Rice LLP

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1256    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fremont, CA 94539  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 11:27:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I truly enjoy the off leash parks in the bay area. That's the only reason I go to the parks. Please don't change the rules on off leash areas. I'd love to continue taking my dog to the off leash parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1257    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in the Outer Richmond and visit Ocean Beach and Fort Funston almost daily. My dog and I thoroughly enjoy visiting with neighbors and being outside- where dogs and people can be happy. We have this incredible resource, that should remain a public use space, not be conditional usage for only a select few. My dog is a part of my life, and like any family member, we want to enjoy downtime with him. Now, we are not allowed to bring dogs many places, but the beach should be one of those areas. Dogs need to exercise, run and chase balls, frisbees, each other. You wouldn't shut down playgrounds because they are loud, then why take away what effectively is a play area for dogs AND their humans? It doesn't make sense. I feel that there is a way to provide adequate space for this as well as space for Nature. Dogs are part of Nature- aren't they?

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Thank you,  
Natasha

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1258    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:10:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1259    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 12:26:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Please do not go forward with these restrictions regarding Dogs not being allowed off leash or as a prohibition against dogs. I regularly use trails (2-5 times a week), and I am not a dog owner. As such, I am highly sympathetic to dog owners being able to use the GGNRA for their recreation and the exercise of their dogs. I would urge you not to take any action against dog owners, or prohibiting the presence of dogs in the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1260    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 15:02:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the "No Action Alternative"

---

in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

Dogs are only allowed on 1% of the GGRA, and with more restrictions on dog friendly trails dog owners would be forced to take dogs to very densely dog populated parks. Dog owners need to spend much more time walking their dogs to get their dogs the exercise they need when on leash.

The name says it all: GOLDEN GATE NATN'L RECREATION AREA, it was designed for local residents to recreate and enjoy, you should not take that little percentage of space away from us.

Instead, we strongly suggest you reinforce laws for dog owners to clean after their animals and keep the trails and open spaces clean and healthy for everyone to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1261    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 15:37:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I 100% oppose the GGNRA's proposed Dog Management Plan. The 1979 Pet Policy has been since challenged and upheld as recently as 2005. No evidence has been shown that changes are needed. And certainly insufficient study has been done to show the impact to lands from the displacement. These lands could include GGNRA lands where dogs are not being taken (legally or not), other state parks in the area, and of course city parks, which will then be the only remaining legal dog areas that will not be able to cope with increased load.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1262    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941184250  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 16:29:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello. My name is Nick Jeffrey and I am the owner of one incredible dog. We frequent GGP, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, and Muir Beach mostly. My favorite part of living in the Bay Area are these parks where I can take my dog, off leash, and exercise. We are very grateful for these extraordinary areas, so please help keep them far away from ordinary. We don't like that word in these parts.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1263    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 17:05:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Our family does not support this plan. We do not take a dog to the parks but cannot understand why there would be so much limitation.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1264    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 20:29:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't have a dog, but I just have to say, for the most part, most dog owners are responsible and watch their dogs. I don't think they should be punished for enjoying nature with their pet and not causing damage to the ecosystem. Horses are 1000lb creatures that stamp on the trail and leave massive piles of feces. I don't see any raids against horse riding any time soon.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1265    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Menlo Park, CA 94025  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 22:05:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Fort Funston is our dog's favorite place. We so enjoy taking him there. Please keep this as an off leash park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1266    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Miwok trail, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach and many other great places in the city. I am a respectful dog owner and pick up after her. Part of why I live in this great place is to enjoy all the nature with my dog.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed

---

in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Please don't do this, you will be taking so much joy away.

Thank you for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1267    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan, 17, 2014 23:24:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Six months ago I walked into my heart doctors office for an annual check-up and I had the best blood work numbers of my life. My doctor asked me what had changed and I told him that I had a new young energetic dog and that my dog and I had walked over 900 miles together over the previous year on different trails in Marin County. He congratulated me and told me that I could probably thank my dog for my better health since that was the reason I was getting out everyday. We usually do two to three miles a day.

Please keep as many of your areas as possible available for us to walk with our dogs off leash. Dogs in general tend to be much less aggressive with each other when they are not constrained by a leash. When dogs are leashed they are much more leery since they know they don't have the freedom to move away from a problem or something they do not like.

I meet so many other people enjoying the trails and sharing the experience with their dogs and friends. There is a reason dogs are people's best friends, they help us to get out and enjoy the outdoors plus they give us unconditional friendship.

I sincerely hope you will not further restrict the places available to share the outdoors with our dogs.

I do not normally write letters to public officials, but this is one topic I feel strongly about.

Thanks you for your consideration in this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1268    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan, 18, 2014 00:59:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We live along the great highway where we can enjoy watching dogs at the beach from our home. Although we don't have a dog we find extreme relaxation and enjoyment from watching other people's dogs happily prancing along the beach. When we are stressed and see the dogs it helps lower our blood pressure and provides a medical benefit both physically and mentally for us. One solution would be to designate one half the beach for people only and the other half for people with dogs.

---

It would be best to make the dog section that part of the ocean beach that runs between the zoo and Judah Avenue.

Since people need to walk their dogs they should not mind having to park and walk quite a distance to get to the beach therefore allowing the people that need to park right near the beach to be able to have dog free Areas.

Also there should be more doggy bag stations at all the stairway entrances to the  
And fines can be issued to pet owners who do not pick up their doggie waste.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1269    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,18,2014 08:19:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I strongly oppose Alternative F.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1270    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the GGNRA. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The GGNRA was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. San Francisco Bay area residents rely upon this open space, which requires a different management strategy than a National Park. We live in an urban

area and lots of people have dogs and need to get their dogs out for exercise - this is their recreation.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs, was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,  
Lonna Richmond

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1271	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,18,2014 11:41:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The whole plan is a giant middle finger to the citizens of San Francisco. Unwarranted, unnecessary and completely ill founded. Based on no science, only misguided policy.				

It will turn law abiding citizens into criminals and overrun the city's existing parks.

Expect civil disobedience and total non compliance with any new regulations and any laws you fools impose on our beach access.

Stop wasting our time, money and access. You work for us, not the other way around. Leave the dog access as it is now and leave us alone!!!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1272	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,18,2014 18:24:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I live right next to a trailhead, and I enjoy seeing people walk their dogs. I feel that we need more trails open for people to walk their dogs.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1273	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,18,2014 20:06:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Designated areas for dog walking on leash, and other designated areas for off leash. I walk two small dogs on leash several times a week on Milagra Ridge. Usually other dogs are on leash, but owners with large dogs tend to let them off leash and take them on the narrow trails. I stay on the main paved road as I am never sure which large dogs would attack or cause harm to me or my small dogs. Signs are posted that all dogs must be on leash.				

If there were some designated areas for off leash and on leash it would be less likely that negative



incidents would happen. Also I do not feel the need to pick up after one's dog as long as the feces are off the main path or trails. Owners that leave feces on the walkway are inconsiderate of people with or without dogs. I do not have any ideas how to enforce this, but perhaps periodical ticketing and fines would help. Certain park areas in the Golden Gate Park area should be, I feel, off limits to all dogs so that those without dogs don't have to be subjected to the above.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1274    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,18,2014 22:39:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I beg you not to further restrict off-lead dog walking for dog owners. I have had nothing but positive experiences on Crissy field beach and dogs are already forbidden or forced on lead almost everywhere else I want to go.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1275    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 04:30:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To: GGNRA Superintendent Frank Dean

From: Thomas Roop, Member of Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston

Subject: 2013 SEIS Dog Management Plan

The GGNRA is an absentee custodian of the GGNRA parks in San Francisco. There are insufficient restrooms, garbage cans and the roads and paths are poorly maintained. While it was two members of Ocean Beach Dog Walkers just the other day witnessed a man defecating on the Stairs of Ocean Beach just south of the Cliff House. There are no Public Restrooms in the area and refuse cans are in short supply. Is this the type of Experience you want visitors to have in the GGNRA?

I go to Fort Funston every day of the week with our Family dog Goldie, she is always under voice control when she is off leash and we always carry a leash for her and use it as needed.

I find the Dog Management Plan SEIS 2013 an intrusive idea that will impede our freedom to recreate with our family dog Goldie at Fort Funston and other GGNRA parks in this urban setting.

I also find at Fort Funston the idea to let no dogs on or off leash on the Horse Trail, parts of the Sunset Trail and land in between the two trails along with the area west of Battery Davis, South and East of the Parking Lot and the outer rim trails which run along Skyline Blvd and. These trails and open spaces are primarily where Goldie and I walk for both our exercise and health and recreation one to two hours each visit

My doctor has advised me that this type of steady pace walking is good exercise for my heart condition. Goldie's veterinarian also believes that daily walks in a place where she can socialize off leash with other dogs is also very good for her health. The Key Here is Recreation and they way you want to close off Fort Funston is not right and will ruin the quality of our Experience at Fort Funston

I move that you throw away plans A through F and make the Original 1979 Pet Policy the law of the land in all three counties where the GGNRA operates..

The following paragraphs contain reasons I believe that the GGNRA is wrong and is participating in an unlawful change in policy/rules with regards to the historic recreation of dogs off leash at Fort Funston and the GGNRA as a whole. I demand answers to all questions posed in these pages well before any rule making is to be considered.

Yes for the Original 1979 Pet Policy to be made the law of the land!!!

No to the SEIS 2013 Dog Management Plan

Thomas Roop

Daly City, CA

Member of Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston

\*\*\*\*\*

The GGNRA's Dog Management Plan/DEIS/SEIS asserts that the change in Dog Management Policy is essential to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The DMP/DEIS/SEIS is unlawful and must be set aside (thrown out) because:

Â” The enabling legislation and Memorandum of Understanding with SF require the GGNRA to exercise "sound principles of land use, planning and management."

Â” Your GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation, the Memorandum of Understanding with SF for this park property, and NPS Rules, Regulations and Policy because they have failed to perform "vital monitoring" which NPS considers an essential element of sound principles of land use, planning and management.

Â” GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources due to the presence of dogs nor their guardians, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes.

Â” Federal law requires site-specific, peer reviewed studies to justify and guide changes in management of National Park System resources.

Â” The SEIS acknowledges the GGNRA has no such site-specific, peer reviewed studies for the impact of dogs and their guardians on water quality, vegetation, soils and wildlife in the GGNRA.

Â” There are no plant species which are endangered or threatened on Federal or State registers that have designated "critical habitat" in the GGNRA. Displacing recreation to enhance the growth of any of these listed plants is not required by the ESA and violates the enabling legislation for the GGNRA. However, we see that GGNRA management has displaced recreational access to plant these plants with regularity, the most egregious location being Fort Funston.

Â” The Monitoring Based Management Strategy is again a poison pill. This proposed compliance strategy has a measure of compliance that is totally subjective, with the GGNRA making all the decisions. Further, short or long term (permanent) closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA. It appears the language is designed to allow the GGNRA to make most or all of Fort Funston a native plant restoration/habitat, despite the fact that this is inconsistent with the enabling

legislation and MOU with SF.

“ Federal Law prohibits agency actions which are arbitrary, capricious and an abuse of discretion. Accordingly, this agency action, findings and conclusions should be set aside as prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 706 (2)A.

A brief post WWII history of Fort Funston (aka Doggie Disneyland)

Post WWII, Fort Funston (FF) was pretty much abandoned. In the 50's and early 60's, FF was a fabulous habitat - but not for wildlife. Rather, FF became a favorite hangout for seedy S.F. and Daly City gangs, drug dealers and users, sexual predators, off road recreation vehicle enthusiasts and a few off-leash dog walkers. Parents in nearby neighborhoods forbade their children from playing at FF due to its reputation for being unsafe. Tired of being harassed/harangued at other city parks, the dog community soon recognized the value in FF. It was clear that FF provided them an opportunity to recreate with their dogs off-leash in a beautiful seascape without any of the hassles presented at the other parks. No longer would they have to be inundated by the claims that they were infringing on the enjoyment of the city parks by adults and children who were afraid of dogs and complaints about dog waste.

Soon the word got out in the dog community and in the mid-late 60's FF realized a huge spike in the number of dogs and their human companions. It was these people who became the true custodians of FF. They were the ones who turned it into a real park. They took pride in their park. They kept it clean and safe. In fact, because of the significant presence of dogs and their humans, the criminal element soon left FF in search of a new refuge where they had control and would remain unchallenged. Many went to Golden Gate Park. Truth be told, the criminals were afraid of the dogs. And the dogs, being the good judge of people that they are, didn't like the criminals. Yes, it was because of the dogs, and only because of the dogs, that FF was now a VERY desirable park. This did not go unnoticed by the National Park Service.

When SF deeded FF in 1972 to the NPS/GGNRA, they inherited a spectacular park that was safe and well taken care of by its true custodians - the dog community. In return, the GGNRA promised via its enabling legislation to respect the historical usage of FF which included off-leash dog walking. This promise was codified in the GGNRA 1979 Pet Policy which officially designated FF as an off-leash dog park. In the early 1990's a new management philosophy permeated the GGNRA where conservation would now trump everything else in this national recreation area. Most notably, it would trump recreation. In 2000, after several illegal closures at FF, Fort Funston Dog Walkers sued the GGNRA and won. In 2001 the GGNRA arbitrarily and capriciously wiped out 30 years of promises and promulgations and voided the

1979 Pet Policy. This action was reversed in 2004 in Federal Court and then again in 2005 in Federal Appellate Court. The 1979 Pet Policy was reinstated as the law of the land and remains that way today. Presently, we are embroiled in a process, i.e., the 2013 GGNRA Pet Management Policy SEIS, which assures us that the GGNRA will once again remove off-leash dog walking from all of its recreation/park spaces for no good reason that I can see.

Yes on the Original 1979 Pet Policy

No to the 2013 SEIS Dog Management Plan

Thomas Roop

Daly City CA

Member of Ocean Beach Dog Walkers at Fort Funston

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1276	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,19,2014 05:23:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Look, I have read the report. It was so unprofessional I can't believe that I t was even accepted let alone used,.It's very clear there is an agenda on the part of the preparing parties. It's hard to believe that this farce continuing after all these years. I'm an outsider in this arena, just a citizen who has dogs. It's a fact there are more dogs than children in the county...yet the pet owners have to fight to use their own taxed services! Argh I'm so disgusted that I even have to do this.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

HAVE YOU ACTUALLY READ THE REPORT? It doesn't take a college education to see that it's poorly done and there is zero empirical data. The report used to justify that Dog's disturb plovers was done on one afternoon, and was merely one guy observing. There was no "study" done. That's just one example of the many falsities perpetuated in this whole situation. Even I an outsider to politics on either side of the issue can see that this is clearly some agenda by some parties who have motives that are unknown, either way they are not as altruistic as their supporters believe or they would not have had to lie in the EiR nor had to twist the truth to get the supposed environmentalists to support the cause. Argh.

It's such a waste because Fort Funston could be an incredible example to the nation, an amazing tourist attraction and if were fully utilized could be a destination to host huge income producing national events

for dog owners and lovers. National dog surfing events, earth dog events, festivals...the list could go for days.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1277    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Petaluma, CA 94975  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,19,2014 08:50:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It's been my understanding that for many years certain areas of the GGNRA (Golden Gate National Recreational Area) have allowed people to walk their dogs and let their dogs play "off-leash" in many of the areas of the GGNRA . Now that much of the land seems to be under the control of the NPS (National Parks Service)it appears the rules allowing dogs to be "off leash" on these public lands is about to come to a halt. I personally think we need to have some designated areas for our dogs to play and walk "Off leash" while under the visual and verbal control of their owners. I would like to ask that those involved in the decision to change the rules and not allow dogs "Off leash" in these areas please consider not changing the rules and keeping these areas accessible for us to allow our dogs to be "off leash" while under our control. It's been this way for many years and apparently worked OK so why change this, please keep the rules such that do allow our dogs to be "off leash" and some freedom in these public/designated public areas!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1278    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,19,2014 09:40:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose these extensive restrictions on citizens whose contact with nature and whose healthy exercise if from frequent hikes with their canine family members. Walking on leash is OK as required by safety and common sense. but being free in the outdoors is the essence of contact with the natural creatures of our planet.

A very large % o the SF Bay Area urban population live with canines. The benefits of doing so to their human families is well established. Few of these people would be out enjoying the trail if their canine family members didn't regularly walk them.

Dog owners are overwhelmingly people who care about their canine friends and the natural world. Their presence and enjoyment of the trails supports the parks and adds a usually responsible presence.

For those making the decision who don't know, taking a recreational walk in nature with a canine on leash is like walking with a human toddler. Their pace and interests differ from ours even as we go happily together down the trails.

Finally, while most of us have a deep respect for wild life, it is important to honor the presence of their domesticated presence, the dog, by allowing these loving creatures contact with outdoors which benefits their health and temperament as it does our own.

Please make your rules so they encourage use of the beautiful national park areas and enforce only against actual abuse. Our urban society will benefit from happy healthy dogs living among us.

Written by a widow, 75 years old, who hikes daily with her special friend and companion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1279    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Marin County Dog Owners Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 10:18:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Miwok Trail, Coastal Trail, Wolf Ridge Loop, and other areas that would be affected.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1280    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 10:20:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a home owner in San Francisco's Mission Terrace neighborhood and have 2 terriers that need space to run to stay healthy. There's no comparison between walking a dog on a leash and letting them run and stretch their legs. I love and respect Fort Funston as well as other parts of the GGNRA and I find it despicable that a city where I pay high taxes wants to take away some of my rights. The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1281    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 10:45:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Hi I've Benn live by ocean beach at 47th/Irving for 5 years. I live in a rental and am a free lance technician.

I frequent the beach and see people doing more harm to the area than dogs. We should be dealing with litter from people and harassment from the homeless first. I've never had an issue with a dog in all my years of visiting the beach and parks.

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1282    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94945  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 11:49:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are very upset with the plan to eliminate dog friendly parks!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1283    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 13:48:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog, Owen, to the coastal trails and Rodeo Beach loop.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

THIS is the situation in which the 1% MST be the group that matters.

Thanks you-

J O'Malley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1284    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 14:22:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not further restrict and limit dogs on GGNRA! They are restricted enough. Far more than other parts of the country. Time with our dog off leash at Muir and other places is a joy for everyone and isn't that the purpose of a public park area for all to enjoy?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1285    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 14:41:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My name is James Raymond and I am a 22 year resident of San Francisco. I use the off-leash areas of the GGNRA with my dog at least 3 times per week. The off-leash areas provide a uniquely safe, enjoyable area to get exercise and recreation with my dog.

I oppose what the GGNRA calls the "Preferred Alternative" and instead I urge formalization of the 1979 pet policy.

I oppose the "Preferred Alternative" for many reasons: it's too restrictive for both current and future GGNRA lands, the Monitoring-Based Management strategy is too easy to misuse, and a number of other reasons.

However, the primary reason I oppose the "Preferred Alternative" is that the plan that justifies the changes, the Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, is biased, unscientific, and seems to have been crafted to justify the personal preferences and biases of whoever wrote the plan, and not on any scientific reasons or even mass public sentiment. The many problems that the plan says "could" or "might" arise from off-leash dogs are simply conjecture; trumped up fearmongering invented to support the personal preferences of the writers of the plan. As a basis for a change in policy, the Plan is flimsy and unacceptable.

If decision makers at the GGNRA change policy based on this poorly written, poorly revised, biased and unscientific Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, THE NEXT STEP SHOULD BE TO MAKE SURE THAT THE DECISION MAKERS AT THE GGNRA GET FIRED. Anyone who bases decisions on such a biased, flimsy document does not have the intelligence or skills to run a national recreation area.

Thank you.

James Raymond  
Resident of San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1286    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I question that you truly "welcome" comments about the off leash dog issue. So far you have totally ignored the extensive comments.

I am a senior citizen who has lived here in San Francisco since 1973. I have, over time had four dogs and still have one. I get my exercise and enjoyment by walking my dog at Fort Funston and particularly on the beach from Sloat Boulevard to Cliff House. My dog also gets much needed exercise by running into the surf and along the sand. It is a joy for me to watch this. It is a joy you will be taking from ME if off leash use is restricted. There are few areas that compare to the beauty and have the fresh air as the ocean areas. I am baffled by the concerns being voiced about some environmental degradation being used as a reason for this limitation. It hasn't happened in all the time I've lived here and there is no reason to believe otherwise now.

To the contrary, confining people with dogs to small areas is going to cause degradation and health problems as well both for the dogs and their owners. Psychologically such confinement smacks of a depressing setting more akin to dog and dog owner concentration camps. Already the few off leash City owned parks are overcrowded, showing wear and resulting in people not being willing to go to them where they are packed in. I can point to Corona Heights and Upper Douglass Dog Park as prime examples.

When it was originally proposed that San Francisco turn over the lands to the National Park Service it was with the understanding, voiced at that time by both local leaders and our Congressional delegation that the uses would remain as they were and as well that these areas would not simply be lumped into the standard National Park Service regulations.

This new action is a betrayal of these understandings. The areas have not been wild in well over one hundred years. They are part of the City not some area with true wilderness areas. People here do not expect or want some wild area when there is a population topping a quarter million just within city limits including many people whose only transport is the public MUNI. They count too. If you were to go out to the beach you would see a very ethnically mixed group - together. You will disrupt this.

Thus:

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo. There are numerous beaches in San Mateo County that have been off leash forever and there is no showing that taking them away will be of any benefit. It will simply diminish any use by the public of public lands. â€

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. People not complying can be cited. People not picking up feces can be ticketed. A stiff fine is better than these restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral de Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1287	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,19,2014 15:13:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€				

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of

needed recreational open space.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1288    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** \* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1289    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1290    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Lafayette, CA 94549  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,19,2014 19:16:04

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of keeping Fort Funston an "off leash" area for dogs. We make the trip regularly to both get some great exercise with our pet, but to also help "socialize" her with other dogs. We have found people to be extremely respectful of the environment and of other people and their animals. Obviously there can be bad apples out there - but please don't let them ruin things for the overwhelming majority of responsible dog owners.

It's good for dogs, it's good for people.

Thank you for your consideration

The Christensen Family

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1291 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,19,2014 20:45:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner who frequents several of the ggnra areas. I am opposed to such severe limits of the off leash areas. Please do not take away one of the few places leafy where our dogs can run and play and socialize. It seems the endangered areas are already off limits and harsh restrictions will do nothing to promote further habitat sensitivity. Thank you and keep our areas leash free. Paul Robertson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1292 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

My name is Erin Hyden and I am opposed to outlined changes to the GGNRA as it applies to dramatically slashing off leash access for recreational dog walking. I live in Alameda but often visit Fort Funston with dogs off leash as well as other affected areas in San Mateo and Marin counties. My dogs are well-behaved, productive animals as are any friends' dogs that accompany me. I oppose the "preferred alternative plan for a multitude of reasons and have specific grievances with many of the plan details:

1) It is too restrictive because there is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I do not understand why the current plan is not being upheld since no good reasons have been given.

2) I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

3) Restricting animals to a small space can create crowding and dogs simply behave best when they are allowed wide open spaces to walk with their two and four-legged counterparts. Fencing in small areas just is not a smart thing to do.

4) I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Instead tickets should be issued to those who do not comply and all others should be left in peace.

5) The new dog management plan does not represent the people that it is supposed to serve. It does not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

6) The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

7) The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

8) The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

9) The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

10) The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

11) The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Please listen to the people who pay taxes for these recreational areas...most of them want to use these spaces with their dogs.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Erin Hyden

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1293    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,19,2014 21:06:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I absolutely oppose the closure of Fort Funston to dogs.

I am taking my dog and child to Fort Funston every weekend, it is part of our regular routine and exercise and we can not imagine our weekend without that adventure.

I have been a responsible dog owner for 20 years, and Fort Funston provides us with an opportunity that is very special living in a big city.

The weekend trip improves our quality of life, gets us out into nature and my son has great fun running and playing with our dog on the beach.

Do not close Fort Funston to dogs!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1294    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Fairfield, CA 94534  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1295    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 01:18:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** - don't ruin something that's working well

- park is very low maintenance the way it is
- park is enjoyed by so many people the way it is
- where would we go????
- the propose plan will not work, and very unfair
- more people will get hurt by the proposed changes
- people will not take good care of the park out of frustration
- will have more dog fight
- to much government
- other parks will be over crowded
- base on my experience using the park like fort funston for the last 11 years. taking this away and limiting access simply make no sense and will not make the park better, it will just upset people, creating more problems for everyone.
- please use your common sense not politics
- keep the uniqueness of this dog park (fort funston) it is enjoyed by so many people and animals for very little cost the the government
- changing the system that people have created at fort funston may cause an environmental hazard to the beaches and park itself
- old people and young children wont have a good and safe place to go to????
- animal shelters will experience less adoption
- dog walkers will be force to walk where they are not welcome.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1296    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN BRUNO, CA 94066  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 03:00:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Since this has been going on nothing has been done to repair walking trails or to remove sand from the trails. Is that because GGNRA wants NO ONE on the land? If dogs are not allowed off leash, the parking lot would be empty. Why can't you leave it the way it is and perhaps charge a small fee for upkeep? Who do you think you are? San Francisco should take back this land. You do not deserve to run it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1297    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 08:41:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

---



**Correspondence ID:** 1298    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Sfdog Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in San Francisco. And I walk at fort funston daily with my dogs! It is the best part of our day!!

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1299    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, the Miwok trail and many other outdoor locations. I live 50 yards from the trail that connects Waterview Drive to Panoramic Hwy. A primary reason I live here is to walk my dog off leash in nature. Please don't take that away from me and my neighbors.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1300    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I am a long time San Francisco Resident and dog owner.

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Optional Points to Make (choose as many or as few as you want):

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1301    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 91441  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 09:52:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a long time San Francisco resident and dog owner and GGNRA user.

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Optional Points to Make (choose as many or as few as you want):

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1302    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 10:21:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please do not ban dog walking on the proposed trails. dogs are low impact to the environment. They are not bothering the wildlife, fauna and other trail users. We have 2 miniature dachunds that we like to walk on the various trails. thank you for your consideration

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1303    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in San Francisco and generally use Crissy Field, Fort Funston, and Ocean Beach. I am an active dog owner and enthusiast. I walk every single day on GGNRA land with my dogs. I am also a dog trainer, so my dogs are under excellent voice control, have great manners, and love people and other dogs. Taking my dogs to the beach is my biggest passion. It is my hobby as well as my main means of exercise. I'm 47 and my doctor says that my dogs are keeping me in excellent health. My dogs are also emotionally and physically healthy from running off leash and socializing with other dogs. Here are a few points I'd like to make concerning the proposed changes:  
\* I feel totally betrayed by the GGNRA's complete dismissal of the 70% o comments supporting keeping ALL of the current off leash areas open to dogs. You asked for feedback, we gave it to you, and you IGNORED US! Are you going to do that again this time?  
\*We have such a small percentage of GGNRA land as it is. It is less than 1%! It is outrageous that you want to take this from us. Other groups or individuals who don't like dogs have 99% i GGNRA land to use!  
\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. (  
\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. We don't punish an entire group of people for the actions of a few. If you have money to monitor, you have money to ticket individual law breakers.  
\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.  
\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new

---

plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. This is ridiculous! Your proposal is so limiting that dogs will be forced into surrounding parks that are already crowded. It is irresponsible to ignore this concern.

\* The plan lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space.

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral de Tierra. Dog owners pay taxes and have the right to be heard. We have as much right to use the land as anyone else.

Sincerely, Marya Taylor

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1304	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

My partner, James Dewald of the same address, and I recently found out about the proposed changes severely limiting off-leash dog access in all of the areas we currently take our dog. This has shocked and deeply saddened us. We, and all of the people we know, strongly oppose these changes.

I can honestly say that having access to open nature to enjoy with our dog is the primary reason we bought our home in the city and continue to stay here despite the cost of living. Walking at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean beach and then all of the parks across the bridge is our daily pastime and immensely increases the wellbeing of our own lives as well as that of our dog.

We rescued a senior dog 2 years ago, and the first time we saw his depression lift was when we discovered how much he loved the waves at Crissy Field. Walking there and in the hills at Funston have without a doubt been the primary source of his healing and continues to be his main joy in life. Walking around the neighborhood doesn't bring the same gleam to his eye, nor to ours.

People and animals strongly need a sense of freedom and open space, especially in an urban environment. Please do not take that away from our community.

We oppose the following changes:

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Tiffany Wade

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1305	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

I am a San Francisco resident and dog owner. I am strongly opposed to GGNRA's Preferred Alternative because of its overly restrictive dog management plan. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
â€

I will be forwarding my position to my representatives at all levels (city, State and Congress) so that they understand how strongly their constituents are opposed to this plan.

Furthermore, I urge you to consider the following points:

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims

that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Melissa Montgomery

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1306	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

My partner, Tiffany Wade of the same address, and I recently found out about the proposed changes severely limiting off leash dog access in all of the areas we currently take our dog. This has shocked and deeply saddened us. We, and all of the people we know, strongly oppose these changes.

I can honestly say that having access to open nature to enjoy with our dog is the primary reason we bought our home in the city and continue to stay here despite the cost of living. Walking at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean beach and then all of the parks across the bridge is our daily past time and immensely increases the wellbeing of our own lives as well as that of our dog.

We rescued a senior dog 2 years ago, and the first time we saw his depression lift was when we discovered how much he loved the waves at Chrissy field. Walking there and in the hills at Funston have without a doubt been the primary source of his healing and continues to be his main joy in life. Walking around the neighborhood doesn't bring the same gleam to his eye, nor to ours.

People and animals strongly need a sense of freedom and open space, especially in an urban environment. Please do not take that away from our community.

We oppose the following changes:

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

James Dewald

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1307	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Redwood City, CA 94062 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 10:46:24
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am very concerned about the new dog management plan. This plan will cut where people can walk off- and on-leash by 90% cmpared with where people can walk with dogs now. It is going to create a huge impact on the Bay Area, which we simply cant afford.
------------------------	--

I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say.

The GGNRA was created in 1972 for the maintenance of needed recreational open space, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. Thats why its designated as a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. With the new dog management plan, the GGNRA is reneging on its promises to preserve and protect recreational access to the GGNRA.

There is no credible reason why people with dogs are not allowed to have adequate and reasonable space to walk their dogs in the vast 80,000 acres that comprise the GGNRA. Please take action to stop the GGNRA from imposing this radical plan on the San Francisco Bay Area.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1308	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. Its already restrictive enough in Southern Marin.

((I live in Tam Valley and regularly take my dog to Homestead Valley, the Oakwood Valley Fire Trail, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach and the headlands. Our dog is very friendly and well-behaved. Dont punish all dog owners for the misbehaving few.((

Over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Areas off-limits for dogs, which already seems completely unnecessary. We already feel limited in our options. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands. Its just not right. ((

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.((Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011. Comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan. Furthermore alternative A will force people into to their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1309 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 10:51:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog-owning resident of San Francisco, I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1310 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 10:59:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Hello,

I have been walking my dog in the GGNRA for over 8 years and taking away space to walk dogs will have a negative impact on one of the biggest reasons for moving to Marin. As a dog guardian and citizen it would place me in a limited position in relation my enjoyment of the space and constrain my ability to properly care for my pet. It seems to me that there is already a limited space to walk dogs off leash and taking more away will only further crowd and burden the few areas left. I would argue that we need more off leash space as opposed to less. I can tell you from experience that a dog that gets a lot of exercise is a well behaved dog -> and that has a direct impact on the community and environment as a whole.

I also have some concerns about the decision making process:

It seems that the decisions are not based on any scientific data and lean heavily on assumptions and assertions that provide little firm evidence that support them. It also appears to lack any peer reviewed site specific studies that I would think would be required before taking such action. Without studies and more formal review process, there do not seem to be any legitimate or legal foundations for these policy changes. Also, the plan does not differentiate between the impact caused by human beings or other animals and assumes that all negative impact is caused by dogs.

I oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative and support the NO ACTION alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1311 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1312 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** cep Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** \* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1313 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 11:07:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been walking the trails of the GGNRA for over 25 years. I am very familiar with the Coastal Fire Road and the Coyote Ridge Trail. Over these last few years, I have noticed a significant increase in dogs off leash on these trails. There are no dogs allowed on these trails and signs are posted. Most of the owners are fully aware of the restrictions as many of them live in the surrounding neighborhoods that are adjacent to the GGNRA. The rules are completely ignored. Many dog owners view the GGNRA as an extension of their backyard and do as they please. Park service employees are nowhere to be found to enforce the rules. When the cat is away....

Yes, dogs need designated areas where they can run off leash. But OWNERS need to be responsible and follow the rules. If they cannot follow this basic principle, then the privilege of walking dogs in a designated park area should be removed and/or restricted even further.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1314 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident and voter living in San Francisco. I am a dog owner and we use GGNRA off-leash areas frequently both for recreation and for health and well-being reasons. We use these areas responsibly and over the many years we have not noticed any abuse caused by other dogs and dog owners that justify the changes now proposed.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1315	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	elmhurst, IL 60126				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 12:09:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** \* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1316    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am Jean Templin and frequent multiple times per week with my dogs the following parks, Fort Funston, Rodeo Beach, Muir Beach. Here is what I think about your proposed changes!

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. I

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1317    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 13:25:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am at a loss to understand why you would change something that works! Dogs are restricted to a relatively small part of available trails and space. Why change it?

Marin County is not a wilderness area and people do not come here for a backcountry experience; the open space GGNRA is for RECREATION - which includes open space for dogs and their owners. Non-dog owners smile when they see dogs prancing along trails -

There is no compelling reason to further restrict dog access from places they have had access to since 1979 - with no problems.. Retain the "no action alternative" in the areas so beloved for dog access: Muir Beach, Oakwood Valley, Marin Headlands... Marin County is not Yosemite...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1318    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94608  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 13:34:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I walk our dog approximately twice a week at Fort Funston. I wouldn't change anything about it. I really love and appreciate having the freedom to walk the dog off lease in such a wonderful place.

I understand that the GGNRA feels the need to restrict and regulate the use of Fort Funston as an off lease dog walking area. That is what government bureaucracies do. It however does not make it a good idea to change things. The idea that we must protect the wildlife from dogs may be well intentioned but is ridiculous in the big scope of things. This is a small small sliver of a huge coastline. Think of it as a unique Eco-system the dogs coexisting with shorebirds, hawks and ground squirrels. This park is well loved and gets lots of use. I suggest that if it is too much trouble for the Park Service to run that they give the land to San Francisco.

There are plenty of beautiful protected areas but few where dogs can go of leash. If you restrict the area with fences you will ruin a great place. Don't be mindless government stooges. Leave well enough alone. We know you are better than that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1319    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 13:38:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello - 2 years ago I was a resident of California. I loved my time in San Francisco but certainly not as much as my dog Mali. A chow mix that loved running and swimming in Crissy Field and playing ball at many of the beautiful parks in the city. I currently reside in NYC and luckily live across from Central Park where my dog can still enjoy a little bit of nature but unlike SF dogs have to be on-leash all the time with the exception of morning and late evening. I have witness a clear difference in dog behavior between leash and off leash times. Dogs are more protective when they are on-leash. I always have to be alert because if my dog wants to do the "meet and sniff" while the dog is on-leash, the dog can become aggressive...and strike, a very difference experience when off-leash. Everyone is happy, dogs are friendly. I've been wanting to move back to San Francisco and once I heard parks were evaluating their off-leash regulations I am hesitant to return. I find these new limitations unfair to our animals, I hope you are able to find a more agreeable compromise.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Dogs should be able to walk freely on trails and make sure owners are ensuring dogs can remain on the trails.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative

Please consider what an impact the drastic change will have on San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1320    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 13:43:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Muir Beach is a spectacular spot and our dog Fallon loves to run and catch balls in the waves there. We always have bags on hand to pick up her poop and can understand the concern about that. But tightening the leash laws in my opinion will not help but in the end make for unhappier dogs with limited places to run with freedom. It is a dog owner's responsibility to understand their dog's behavior (good or bad) and make appropriate decisions. Dog classes are readily available for those with behavioral and social issues and dog poop bags are easy to find as well. I think part of the solution is stressing high dog-ownership standards instead of limiting places for them to be free. Please consider

---

keeping Muir Beach a leash-free zone.  
Thanks for your time and consideration!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1321    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My name is Christine Stuart. I live in Mill Valley and hike on the Miwok and Oakwood Valley trails with my golden retriever Sadie every day. The following are my comments on the proposed alternative.

i,§ I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. At in-person meetings when all of this movement began, I was told the sole reason for these changes was to ease the rangers' ability to enforce regulations; I was also told that no one had reported serious issues with the current status of trail usage. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

i,§ I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA; this will change the entire experience of hiking these trails. In addition, in my 16 years of hiking these and other trails, I almost never see dogs more than 1-2 yards off the main trails. Installing fences will ruin the serenity of walking these trails.

i,§ I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

i,§ The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. As stated earlier, there are no compelling reasons or justification for these changes aside from "ease of enforcement," thereby depriving the most frequent users of these trails of our daily benefit from using these outdoor places which were originally intended for our benefit.

i,§ The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. Without question more serious degradation is imposed on trails throughout the Bay Area by bikers every day, not to mention the egregious lack of courtesy for other users of trails and outdoor space. Could we consider putting them on leashes??

Finally, again at the in-person meetings in Mill Valley some years ago, I proposed that you take advantage of the insights of people using these trails every day, most of whom are accompanied by dogs. We see the uses and abuses humans impose on our trails and parks. I've personally cleaned up after humans almost daily including those camping illegally in these places.

Consider making us "trail guardians" who can give you more useful information about what's going on in Bay Area parks; you could establish a site wherein we could register any useful observations. We love and treasure our daily hikes with our dogs. Oh, and by the way, we all know it's completely unlikely that you have the money and manpower to enforce whatever you decide to impose on us; you are simply



losing our respect through this continued effort to threaten us with deprivation of reasonable rights to use these incredible outdoor places.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1322    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 14:26:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Susan Garbuio, and I live in San Francisco. My husband, William B. Nern, and I walk our dog, Jasmine, at least weekly at Fort Funston. We enjoy this experience very much, and appreciate how lucky we are to have such a beautiful location to walk our dog. Our dog enjoys being off leash and having an opportunity to play with other dogs. We also on a less regular schedule walk our dog off leash at Crissy Field. I am registering my opposition to the proposed changes to the GGNRA dog walking policy.

I am opposed to the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. I support the formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy and would like to see included off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands the GGNRA acquires in the future. Since my tax dollar will be used to purchase and maintain both existing and new GGNRA lands I want to be sure that I have the right to access these lands in an appropriate manner with my dog such as off-leash under voice control.

It is my understanding that the GGNRA was established to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space." To date I believe the GGNRA has done a good job of meeting this goal; however by restricting off-leash dog walking you would be restricting access to recreational space for a segment of the local population. This does not seem to be in keeping with the reason GGNRA was established. I supported the establishment of the GGRNA. At that time I never would have thought that at some point my access with my dog would become restricted by the same organization I saw as protecting this beautiful land and my guaranteeing my access.

As a San Francisco resident I am also concerned about the impact the Preferred Alternative, if implemented, will have on City's dog parks. Given San Francisco's size there are a limited number of off-leash dog parks in San Francisco, and in my opinion none as beautiful or as enjoyable as Fort Funston.

Much of the Preferred Alternative sounds arbitrary such as not allowing off-leash dog walking on any trail, or on any newly acquired land, especially since there appear to be few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Lastly I am also opposed to the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version. Allowing GGNRA to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions appears to be very arbitrary and contrary to the democratic process .

Thank you very much for accepting my public comment opposing the dog management plan. I sincerely hope you will not implement the Preferred Alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1323    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 14:28:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1324 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 16:20:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1325 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 16:58:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I hope we will be able to let our dog off leash on Stinson Beach (north half) as is currently allowed.

It would be great to be able to let her off leash on Muir beach as well.

We are happy to keep her away from sensitive dune and wetland areas at both beaches.

We saw the sign with web address for comments at Stinson yesterday.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1326 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702

United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 18:06:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Save off leash!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1327    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Belmont, CA 94002  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Service dog tutor Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 18:17:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I use GGNRA parks for hiking and exercising my dogs and encourage clients to do the same. I use the properties 2-3 times a month and have never had a bad experience with other dogs, dog owners or non-dogowners. Please keep dog access, so people will exercise their pooches and themselves, lowering costs for medications for diabetes, hypertension, and depression.

Jean Cary  
service Dog tutor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1328    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Montara Dog Group Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 18:30:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern,

Because local communities use Rancho and we have a history of walking our dogs off leash responsibly, I am writing to urge the GGNRA to continue off-leash walking of dogs in areas that are already established off-leash dog walking locations such as the lower portions of Rancho Corral de Tierra in Montara and El Granada, and allow on-leash dog walking in Moss Beach. San Mateo County is the only county where GGNRA is proposing to ban off-leash dog walking despite the history of walking dogs off leash responsibly.

Like so many other people in the area, I moved to Montara only a year ago specifically because I knew that there were places where I could walk my dog both on and off leash here.

Most of the walkers at Rancho Corral are local and are dog walkers, according to the SEIS, so I am puzzled why the GGNRA is proposing to limit the use so much for dog walkers given the recreational needs of the residents.

Furthermore, the SEIS fails to link dog walking with document resource impacts. Rancho continues to provide valuable habitat for many endangered species. GGNRA fails to provide any scientific data about the impact dog walking has on the natural resources.

Thank you for your consideration and I do hope you revise the plan for on and off leash dog walking in Montara and the coastside in general.

Sincerely,  
Emily Benson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1329    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 18:37:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Your proposal is not based on scientific evidence and speaks again to government bowing to special interests. This area has more dogs than children and it should be expected that this will impact future voting and funding support if the change is enacted as so proposed.  
As a resident of San Francisco,I will ensure that any change will not go unnoticed especially when NPS is not supporting its charter.

Christine Templin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1330    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 18:46:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My dog and I think you should leave the off-leash areas of the GGNRA as they are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1331    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We live close to the Presidio and often walk our dog on its many wonderful trails. Our family likes to take our dog to Crissy Field and we estimate that we walk on GGNRA property at least five times a week.

We oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. Our family supports formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

We also oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

We oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

Importantly, we feel the new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier

version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1332    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 18:55:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow dogs in the National Parks. They are destructive to the environment and wildlife. They create an unwelcome and hostile atmosphere for human beings. On leash, off-leash it's all the same. I have not enjoyed any park experience in recent years due to the ever increasing dog population. There is little if any enforcement of the leash law, dog walkers violate rules far more consistently than they follow them. The sense of entitlement among dog owners is truly stunning. I do not feel safe, nor do any of my friends with children.

In addition, there is rampant abuse of the "service" dog license/medallion. I see it over and over again - people claim their pet is a "service" dog, but then do not follow any of the service dog requirements/rules.

Please, no more dogs - the owners abuse the freedoms they've been given thus far and violate the laws.

Parks for the people.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1333    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 19:16:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose limiting the area for off-leash dogs. Keep Fort Funston open for off-leash dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1334    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 19:25:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been enjoying Crissy Field, the Bay front and GGNRA for many years. When I want to enjoy the beautiful view of the Golden Gate Bridge, have a long walk with my dogs I head to this special location. Please do not take this privilege away from me and all people who use it to exercise themselves and their dogs. Please consider some way of setting a reasonable boundary so that we can be a model city for others. Thank you very much.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1335    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This would be tragic. There are so few off leash dog areas left in an area FULL of dogs! Dogs extend and enhance the lives of humans. They make us happier and healthier. But they can only do this if they are happy and healthy themselves. Requiring dogs to be on leash at Fort Funston and erecting penned in off-leash areas is too restrictive and will look ugly.

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no

evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1336	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 20:42:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** \* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Optional Points to Make (choose as many or as few as you want):

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1337    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 21:20:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Each segment of society should have adequate, accessible appropriate space for recreation, and not be funneled to remote, small lots, and concentrated into high densities. I do not believe that the NPS is serving the general public well, by isolating and concentrating large segments of the population. The rules that were laid out in 1979 defined areas that were adjacent to the populations, and were well distributed amongst all the NPS lands, thus reducing the amount of driving needed. That is the sane way to deal with this issue.

Rodeo beach is distant and isolated from the population in Marin. It seems a very poor choice of locations, and people generally do not drive that far to walk the dog. They will continue to use the areas adjacent to where the live. The best rules are the ones designed to work well, with the target population.

I do go to Rodeo beach several times a year. However, i regularly go to Muir Beach, Oakwood trail, and Homestead Hill, as they are adjacent to my neighborhood, within walking distance, and the only adequate areas to run the dog.

Once there are NO legal, accessible trails (except areas to far away to access), when it is time to walk the dog, people will be walking the dog illegally on any trail they walk on. There is then no incentive at all for the public to remain only on the specific dog-trails. I fear that some of the NPS proposals will result in problems, and the local public will be ill-served.

Thanks for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1338    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,20,2014 21:27:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** Hello,

My name is Julia and I am a responsible dog owner living in San Francisco. My two well trained dogs and I frequent different parts of GGNRA, mostly Fort Funston, five to seven times a week. During these visits I make sure to clean up after my dogs, I keep them out of protected areas and they are under voice control at all times. I also join clean-up sessions or sometimes just bring a bag and clean up trash.

We need this area to remain off-leash area because of the positive and balancing effects that visiting the GGNRA has on us. Living in a city, this space is needed to relax the body and the soul and the dogs need the opportunity to run off leash. Most city dogs, like my dogs, spend most time leashed, and they are of great service to their owners and the community.

!!Without the option to let them run off leash on a hour-long walk, working dogs like mine will have to live in non-appropriate living conditions as running off leash on a regular basis is needed to keep them physically and mentally healthy!!

A lot of hikes and areas are already not dog friendly and we live in a county with a very high amount of dogs This should be considered when the rules and regulations are made and the needs of the citizens of this county need to be catered to and protected, which means in this case that room to let dogs run needs to be provided and protected from lawmaking that will limit it.

I strongly oppose cutting back the opportunity to let dogs run off-leash at Fort Funston and any other GGNRA.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1339	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,20,2014 22:21:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	RE: Fort Funston, San Francisco, CA				

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1340	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 01:02:15				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a senior citizen with a well behaved beagle. Having an off leash area to walk my dog in Golden Gate Park helps me have someplace to walk each day and helps maintain my health. I hope that you will consider off leash areas for walking my dog for my sake.

Thank you,  
Claudia Zeiler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1341 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to many beaches and trails. I actually take my dogs wherever I go. They are my best friends and they love going with me everywhere. I am responsible and keep them on voice command and pick up after them. I always carry leashes as well. My dogs are friendly and others respond favorably to them, especially families.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1342 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** oak brook, IL 60523  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** wells fargo advisors Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 09:07:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to convey my support of OFF LEASH lands for recreational dog walking in the Golden Gate National Recreational area of San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1343 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-2617  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:**

Hi I'm justin velo

I live in the Potrero district of san francisco and usually visit Fort Funston with my family and dog about twice a week. Our dog walker takes our dog & others to Fort Funston an additional 2 times a week ( at least- mid week )

We usually go on the weekends and meet up with other couples with their dogs and take a wonderful leash free 2 mile walk around and down to the beach .

To summarize, Fort Funston is THE ONLY place where we feel comfortable taking our dogs off leash. It's the only place where a dog can really run and be off leash without us being worried about car traffic and pedestrians. Because of this we make the 7 mile drive every weekend. Its just a very special place where dogs can socialize wit other dogs and get the real exercise they deserve as pets. I

below are some points :

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says

the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1344	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA:				

I am a 4th grade teacher in Marin, and I live in San Francisco. Part of my work with my students is teaching them the importance of biodiversity and balanced ecosystems. We conduct an intensive unit on native, non-native and invasive plants of the Bay Area, and we conduct student-designed service learning projects in the interest of habitat restoration and community education on important principles of caring for open spaces over time. We work with local park rangers and plant experts from the community, and we take class trips to Muir Beach to support the habitat restoration efforts there.

In addition to being a schoolteacher, I am also a dog owner. While my partner and I work full work weeks, our dog walker picks up our 10 month-old large-breed puppy every day and takes him to Fort Funston for the critical exercise he needs to maintain a happy, healthy lifestyle. There, he is able to run, play and splash around off-leash. Similarly, my partner and I take Truman to East Beach at Crissy Field every weekend so he can run and play off leash. He absolutely loves it there- -as one student in my class described it, "It's a doggy wonderland,"- -and he is a safe and friendly addition to the milieu on East Beach.

As you probably realize, in our urban district it can be a challenge to provide a large dog with the exercise he needs. GGNRA has been a welcome, necessary component of the workability of our happy family.

With the proposed GGNRA Dog Management Plan, that would change. I am writing to express my strong opposition to that plan. Below are the points our walker helped outline about the plan, all of which I have carefully reviewed and heartily agree with based on my research of the matter.

I implore you not to restrict off-leash dog access that is so vital to our family, and many others.

Thank you,  
Christopher Warner  
cwarner@mcads.org

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1345	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent/GGNRA staff:

I am a dog owner that has lived in San Francisco for 17 years. I walk/run my dog off leash daily under voice control on GGNRA land, especially Fort Funston and Baker Beach. Over 40% of our population are dog owners. This is a huge portion of our population that deserves to have access for recreation and to enjoy this public land.

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. (

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space.

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1346    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 12:08:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

Please do not strip my privileges of off-leash recreation for me and my dog. I pay my taxes and love the ability to use our National, State, and local parks for recreational purposes with my well trained, respectful canine companion. I am not alone in this. I do believe these are privileges and I treat our public lands as I do my own, they are sacred.

I explore you to keep the off-leash areas of all parks open for use. Furthermore, I ask you to expand these areas to every park possible.

Sincerely,  
Jai Carrell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1347    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello I am a responsible dog owner who frequents Fort Funston and it's beach with my dog. It is one of the only remaining spaces available for my dog to be with me off leash. Please stop inching out SF home owners who own dogs. You're giving us NO space to be outside with our well behaved dogs off leash.

I am writing to oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

Additionally, I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most

people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1348	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Bisbee, AZ 85603 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 12:43:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My comment and the initial reason I signed a petition protesting your policies began with an park employee tasing a citizen who did not instantly obey her command. You should not employ idiots who cannot handle having some small measure of authority and who go crazy when their meager authority is challenged by TASERING someone. Please do not employ fools. Please do not give these idiotic fools tasers. These ignorant, untrained jerks will eventually kill or terribly injure someone. IS THIS WHAT YOU WANT???				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1349	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 12:48:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for trying to make the parks and trails more enjoyable for everyone. Many park users do not wish to be forced to interact with others' dogs at all times. Your plans seem to be very reasonable.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1350	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 12:52:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** I have been a resident of San Francisco for over 20 years. During that time I have frequently visited the areas under consideration in the documents. Twenty years ago I was single and would walk through many of the off-leash dog areas in hopes of being able to pet the dogs that I was unable to have because I lived in an apartment. What I found was a community of dog-walking people happily socializing, while the dogs happily socialized too. To get my dog petting in I had to approach the dogs because they were not interested in people who walked by them. The dogs were friendly and happy to be petted because they were well-socialized.

When we able to have dogs in our home I was excited to take the dogs to the many beautiful areas in San Francisco. This was a great social activity for myself and my dogs. My dogs are over 14 years old now. I have been taking my dogs off-leash several times a week, specifically to the beach and Fort Funston. What I have discovered is that my dogs NEED to be off leash. I can walk them on leash day, after day, but when their paws hit the sand and they can run, they are happy dogs. I am a happy person.

This is a city where people tend to accept people's differences, as long as the differences are the same as their own. I believe people should be respectfull of others. I don't expect everyone to love dogs, but I also don't expect to be yelled at when I am out walking my dogs. Dog walking is a great exercise and community builder. To limit dog walking, restict dog walking, is to limit the community from building. Being part of a community in a city is a special thing. I know many neighbors because we are out walking our dogs. I also have many encounters with other dog owners because we are out walking our dogs at the same time at the same place, no matter what the weather may be. Dog owners are not fair weather friends. We are out there through thick and thin fog, light and hard rain, sunshine and wind. So if a trail is worn, it is worn from use. It is hard to find a group of people dedicated to getting out and going for a walk than a dog owner.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1351	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 12:53:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a dog owner and I fully support the no dogs rule at all of the proposed park areas and the dogs on leash only rule at all of the proposed park areas, especially at Corral de Tierra in Montara.				

I feel that the public is fortunate to have so much open space and park land in the City and elsewhere in the GGNRA, and dog owners like myself are obligated to respect the rights of those who prefer to not interact with dogs- on or off leash- at parks that have been identified as suitable for such restrictions.

As a lifetime resident of San Mateo County, including 20 years on the coast in Montara and Pacifica, I was actively involved in local efforts to acquire and protect what today is the park at Corral de Tierra. While I realize there are residents in Montara who view their "backyard park" as theirs to enjoy as they see fit, i.e. dogs off leash anywhere in the park, such a position/attitude ignores the fact that the park was created with state and federal funding and as such is a resource of not only local significance but of state, national and world-wide significance.

As with anyone who lives in a place as special as the Bay Area, and especially within proximity to SF Bay or the California coast, we should all be willing to abide by park rules that serve to protect natural resources and provide a safe and enjoyable experience for all park users, including those without dogs.

Thank you.

Timothy Duff

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1352    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 12:54:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is truly astonishing after all of this time developing the DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN that GGNRA has made the decision to hold an informational meeting about the Plan in San Francisco during working hours! Not on the coast during the evening when the people who are affected by the Plan can actually attend and have input.

It wasn't enough for a GGNRA ranger to shoot one of our coastside neighbors with a taser gun, it wasn't enough to impose your DOG PLAN on the coastside community who has no need for your plans. We've been doing just fine without a DOG PLAN for decades. Thanks anyway.

Why don't you do yourselves a BIG favor and actually TRY to reach out to our coastside community in a positive way. Maybe YOU should come to US and present your PLAN.

Have you considered that it may behoove GGNRA to do a little community building, since the first action taken by GGNRA after securing ownership of Rancho Corral de Tierra created extremely negative PR for the agency (wouldn't want to be THAT PR Director)?

Maybe you should think about that. Particularly if you expect any cooperation by the coastside community and their dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1353    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 13:03:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in the Outer Sunset of San Francisco, four blocks from Ocean Beach, an area which is very impacted by your dog policy. I have reviewed your draft proposal for a "Dog Management Plan". It seems like a policy designed to cover up your own mismanagement. That's because you already don't enforce the CURRENT plan that you have. At Ocean Beach, where I live, huge numbers of dogs run off leash in the on leash areas on a daily basis. The last two weeks has been sunny and warm at the beach, and on any day there were DOZENS of dogs down there - - and their owners - - who were violating the CURRENT regulations on on-leash. Yet I have not seen a single GGNRA office writing citations to violators.

In addition, the dogs crap all over the beach (and many owners don't scoop), they chase birds (including threatened species), jump up on people that want nothing to do with them (and have destroyed my headset for my iphone on one occasion when a dog jumped up and clawed my chest), and generally create havoc. Many dog owners are responsible with their pets, but many are not. When I have(courteously) informed

---

some dog owners that their dog was off leash in an on leash area, I have been physically threatened, verbally abused and harassed.

All of this is going on RIGHT NOW, with rules being violated according to the CURRENT PLAN. When I have told your officers as well as supervisors about these violations, they have been ignored. On one recent occasion, two of your officers were sitting in their vehicle in the parking lot of Ocean Beach, and I informed them that there were five dogs just over the sand dunes that were off leash in an on leash area. They basically ignored me, and when I asked them if they were going to do their job, one of your officers threatened me with being cited for some bogus violation.

In a conversation I had with one of your supervisors, I was told that "It's a resource problem, we don't have the officers to patrol the beach for dog violations." Yet you have tons of officers to harass local people who are having fires at night, enjoying the beach and minding their own business. Just the other night, I saw THREE of your cruisers sitting in the parking lot, waiting for the 10 pm parking lot curfew so you could start harassing those on the beach. Where is that zeal and number of officers when it comes to enforcing your current dog policy during the day?

It's clear to me that your priorities are off, and it's just "a resource problem." You are putting the wrong amount of resources to the wrong things.

Moreover, in this draft proposal for a new "dog management plan", I don't see any provision for adding "more resources" i.e. more officers to enforce your regulations. Did I miss it somewhere? Without that, how will you be able to enforce a new plan any better than you been able to enforce the current plan?

Frankly, at this point you guys at the GGNRA have very little credibility. It looks to me like you are "shifting the deck chairs," nothing more. You are creating the perception of "action" to mask your current inaction. There is nothing about the CURRENT plan that couldn't be made to work if you guys were to actually prioritize your resources in a better way, and have some officers down there to enforce your current regulations.

Sincerely,  
Steven Hill  
Outer Sunset, San Francisco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1354	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115
-----------------	-------------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Charlotte. I live in Pacific Heights with my husband and our miniature labradoodle, Lola. Lola and I love the great outdoors and run, hike and play together as much as possible. Our favorite places are Crissy Field and Oakwood Valley. It's a great way for Lola to get her energy out and we both benefit from the fresh air and exercise.
------------------------	--

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Optional Points to Make (choose as many or as few as you want):

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1355	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mountain View, CA 94043				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Hi,

I am an owner of two rescue dogs and i LOVE going to the dog parks in the SF area. It's frequently the highlight of my weeks/months. It's also the best place to socialize my dog and enjoy the outdoors with other happy faces!

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Thank you,  
Lisa-Anne

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1356	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:**

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 13:52:24
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** \* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

Optional Points to Make (choose as many or as few as you want):

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1357	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 13:59:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern,				

Please save our off leash area as it provides a necessary recreation for both humans and dogs! If we did not have a place to take our dogs off leash we would not get out as well.

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1358	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whome it may concern				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-

friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Oakwood Valley trail, the off-leash section of Stinson Beach, and various other trails and beached in the area that allow off leash access.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained, especially considering the great number of families in this area who have dogs as pets, and need space to get their dogs exercise. Further, many people employ dog walking services - - banning dogs off-leash would destroy jobs.

Allowing dogs only on Rodeo Beach would also have the unwanted effect of making that beach very, very densely used by dog owners, and would create a \*dangerous\* environment there for both people and dogs due to the extra chaos created by an overblown density of people and dogs. This plan is RIDICULOUS and written by people with no understanding of our area and how our citizens use it.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1359	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 14:26:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Baker Beach and Crissy Field

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1360	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,21,2014 14:36:50**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir and Rodeo Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1361	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Gina Ematt and I live in San Francisco. I visit Chrissy Field and Fort Funston every single weekend with my Vizsla. I also visit other GGNRA parks and trails in the Bay Area.				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please do not deprive us of this valuable space.

Thank you  
Gina Ematt

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1362	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hayfork, CA 96041 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---



**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,21,2014 14:52:12**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** It seems, every few years we have to address this question....

The simple fact remains that Fort Funston is essential to the live and routines of many people, I'm sure you have the numbers...

Dog behaviorists will inform you that off leash exercise is essential to the physical and behavioral health of all larger canines. Frankly, I was a bit surprised at the sheer number of dogs over 50# that daily attended Fort Funston. One might expect a few less, in an area so deficient in open space.

It is well known that dogs greet each other best when left to their own devices, the act of restraining a dog, in the presence of another, can instigate violent behavior. The disparity in the numbers of bad incidents at Fort Funston, as opposed to those of Crissy Field seem to bear that out.

We all know the damage to life and property that an out of control 75# dog can do...

In the interest of public safety, the only logical course of action would be to leave a good thing alone.

This has always seemed like a handy, but very short sighted, show of a solution in search of a real problem.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1363	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 14:56:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi-				

I am a homeowner in Potrero Hill and the owner of 2 dogs that were rescued from a shelter. I am also the CEO of Nixle, which employs 30 people and is based in San Francisco. I am also a life-long resident and a contributor to environmental funds, including the GGNRA.

I STRONGLY oppose the "Preferred Alternative", and I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy plus off-leash access in all GGNRA-managed areas.

I STRONGLY oppose fences for off-leash areas.

I STRONGLY oppose the monitoring-based management strategy. The GGNRA has no right to change leash statuses.

The GGNRA is overstepping its domain. These parks are for the people of San Francisco, and enjoyment with dogs has always been an integral part of that enjoyment. San Francisco is a dense urban area. San Franciscans love pets. San Francisco parks are a huge part of bringing those things together. Changing these laws will kill a critical dynamic in our city.

Please reconsider and stop the above mentioned items.

Eric

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1364	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Susan D'Amours and I live in the Hayes Valley neighborhood. I often take my dog to the off leash areas at Alamo Square Park, Bernal Heights and Fort Funston.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan does not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan also does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space." The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Thank you,  
Susan D'Amours

**Correspondence ID:** 1365 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 15:12:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This dog management plan appears to take the recreation out of the GGNRA.

There are many respectful dog owners that want to take their dogs with them while they exercise in Marin and SF

We live here so we can enjoy the outdoors. Taking this land away makes no sense. There is only 1% tat is designated use for dogs anyway. I urge you to leave the policy written in 1979 in place.

If there are issues with individual dog owners that are Not responsible then that should be addressed.

Taking the use of the out doors away from all the citizens of marin county is not the answer.

I personally walk Muir beach, Crissy fields with my dog. I am a responsible Guardian and my dog is well behaved and i pick up after him.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1366 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Novato, CA 94947  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Canine Behavior Associates Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog and client dogs to a variety of GGNRA trails where they are allowed.

As you know, dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. We have seen no compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ndeed, to my knowledge, you havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space, which is unlike any other.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Please do not take this from us.

Sincerely,

Trish King  
CPDT-KA, CDBC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1367 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 15:50:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Good Morning,

Can we just leave "Fort Funstone" open for dog walking as it is and stop throwing away taxpayer money for useless proposal? It is working for many years just fine.  
Did management at GGNRA just lost any common sense and try to follow a few people who just hate animals? It is a sad time for our country, when the elected official or government employees start to listen to a few lawyers who just want to suck out money from the government funds.  
The only suggestion for any kind of change, would be limiting a number of dogs under escort of the professional "Dog Walker". Sometimes when is more that 5 dogs per person the control can be lost.  
Please let dog owners enjoy their animals. There should be no more time or government money spent for this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1368    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 15:54:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am deeply disappointed by the many fundamental changes that are proposed. I frequently walk my dog in San Francisco at various sites affected by the proposed changes as well as in Marin at various of the affected sites.  
I have seen humans on bicycles, horses and children causing far more damage and interference to the natural habitat and general enjoyment of all than I have dogs. Will you next be banning people from the sites you currently plan to exclude or severely restrict the freedom of dogs?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1369    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Jennifer Carter and I'm a native San Franciscan who has grown up with dogs and now am the proud owner of a 2 year old French bulldog. I have fond childhood memories of taking our family dog to Fort Funston and watching the hanggliders while Charlie, then Max and now Ronin enjoyed the freedom of the outdoors. Never once did I witness an incident between either four legged or two legged creatures. But rather, a joyous and simbiotic coexistence that even the non-dog owners seemed to enjoy and actively seek out.

Over recent years, I've noticed a steadfast pursuit to destroy this experience. With new laws and changes to existing laws that seek to turn San Francisco into New York City where dogs are contained in shallow fenced in runs sprinkled around the city. Or worse, where dogs need to go to a "gym" just to get enough exercise.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Â· The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Â· The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Â· The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

Â· The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

Â· The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Â· The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1370	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94038 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 16:04:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I understand the concern for dog waste, but what about the huge amounts of horse or pack animal excrement that you are allowing to be left on trails? I hike and ride my bike through piles that for some reason never seem to be a concern of yours, yet dog waste is mentioned. Are we in 1860 and the horse and owner are not responsible for their own? Why should this issue be left cold. Seems everyone else that is visiting the park is held accountable for plenty of small time issues yet the largest piles just lay there for weeks on end.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1371	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 16:08:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I have been a member of the GGNRA for over 10 years. I joined before I even had a dog (and now I have two). I see no reason to change the dog management status quo in the GGNRA.

While any plan for public lands must incorporate the needs of all of its visitors, it seems absurd to put the needs of those who don't like dogs above the needs of those who have them, since the latter group is statistically more likely to use the park in the first place, and often during times when others do not. In addition, the areas that are currently designated as off leash are a minute portion of the overall land (less than 1%). My guess is that dog owners and dog walkers comprise a lot more than 1% o the park users. Don't be taken in by the very vocal minority of anti-dog people. Many people don't have dogs, and they still enjoy being around them. The number of dog-related complaints has increased purely because the population has increased - it's not because dogs have become more out of hand.

Reducing the areas where dogs are free to be dogs will make it difficult for dog-owners in the Bay Area to exercise their dogs (and themselves), and this will result in (a) overcrowding of existing dog runs in the City parks, and (b) increased dog aggression since they will not be as tired and happy as they currently are. My favorite places to go with our dogs are Crissy Field and the beaches (where they go almost every day to romp with their doggy buddies), Ocean Beach and Fort Funston (I call this place doggy heaven). On any given weekend, you will see hundreds of people, single people, couples, groups of friends, families with kids, elderly and handicapped people, walking with their dogs. Fort Funston and Crissy Field are especially precious since you can walk with your dogs and kids (not just throw the ball), see beautiful sights and the paths allow wheelchair access.

All that said, I would like to propose a couple of things that might improve the situation: off leash areas should have clear signposting so that those who are not comfortable around dogs, or who would just prefer not to be around dogs, can choose to go elsewhere (in the other 99% o the lands); in addition, we dog owners are willing to compromise seasonally when native species of bird or plants need some extra protection from the dogs, and if during those times, signs are posted, we would be willing to have our dogs on leash in those sensitive areas, or under voice command to keep out.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1372	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 16:13:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRA should be returned to SF,SAN MATEO COUNTIES.Frank Dean should be replaced immediately for his mismanagement and ignoring SF Supervisors.GGNRA insists on ignoring the recreational aspect.They want to run the area as a national park,not a recreational area. Fort Funston has a total of 2 benches and 1 table.This reflects the look don`t stay,keep your dog home. GGNRA for 3 years keep issuing documents that don`t change and ignore the wishes of SF Residents. A waste of public funds,just replace GGNRA with locals				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1373	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 16:18:16				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood, Miwak, Muir Beach. Coastal, Homestead, Alta and Rodeo Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1374	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent Golden Gate National Recreation Area Attn: SEIS Fort Mason, Bldg. 201 San Francisco, CA 94123				

Attn: Dog Management Plan

January 21, 2014

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: GGNRA Dog Management Plan

I lived in the Marina in San Francisco for nine years and I now live in Mill Valley in Marin County. I am the owner of two Vizslas. I walk my dogs three times a day and send them out with a dog walker twice a day while I am at work. Every day after work I take my dogs on a walk on GGNRA land for 30-45 minutes. On Saturday and Sunday I usually walk them at Chrissy Field in the morning and in the Presidio or Marin in the afternoon. In addition, my dog walker takes the dogs to GGNRA trails in Marin daily Monday through Friday.

I am from the East Coast and have lived in the Bay area for 15 years. I consider myself fortunate to live in such a beautiful and historical city. Some of the areas I treasure are Chrissy Field and the Presidio, and the GGNRA hiking trails in Marin. There are few cities anywhere in the world where one can walk with their dog in a National Park or along a beach. Chrissy Field and the Presidio are two special places in that they are bursting with natural beauty and yet are also grounded in rich history. The trails in Marin are gorgeous and allow one to get out into nature on multi-use trails with hikers and other dog owners.

Chrissy Field, the Presidio and Marin are perfect places to walk your dog off leash. At Chrissy Field the dogs can run on the beach and romp in the field. Few other places provide such diverse terrain and excellent play areas. The Presidio is also an excellent place for dogs to walk off-leash as there are few people, no cars and ample trails. Other excellent off-leash dog walking areas are the Marin Headlands, Fort Funston and Baker Beach. These are all ideal spots for us dog owners to walk and exercise our dogs safely away from traffic and other hazards.

As I am sure you are aware, it is very important for a dog's mental and physical health that they get plenty of exercise. Some dog breeds require more exercise than others and it would be difficult for those breeds, such as the Vizsla, to get the proper exercise they require if they cannot run and play off leash. My dogs are very high energy and need to exercise at least two hours a day. Exercise and socializing is critical to a dog's health and well-being. I make taking my dogs out for exercise my number one priority.

I am strongly in favor of allowing dogs off-leash in as many GGNRA areas as possible. The more places that one can walk their dog(s) off-leash, the better. I hope you will consider the impact on San Francisco and Marin if off leash dog walking is banned in the GGNRA. Banning or further limiting off leash dogs will have a significant negative impact on San Francisco and Marin parks. And recreation areas At least 10,000 dogs visit the GGNRA every day. San Francisco city parks are much, much smaller than the GGNRA and will be unable to absorb the impact of all those dogs if they are forced out of the GGNRA. The negative impact on parks and other recreation areas in San Francisco and Marin far outweighs any potential negative impacts in the GGNRA.

Given that I walk my dogs several times a day, I am able to get out and meet many locals in both San Francisco and Marin as well as tourists on my daily walks. Given my passion for the Bay area, one of the things I am able to do is share stories and history with people who are visiting from out of town. One of the things that makes it easy for them to approach me is my dogs as they form a common bond between people. Every day I am out with my dogs I meet and socialize with people young and old; people gay and straight, people from the city or Marin or out of town folks who are just visiting.

One of the nice things about Chrissy Field, the Presidio and GGNRA trails in Marin is that they are multi-use areas. So on any given day one is apt to encounter joggers, walkers, hikers, school children, botanists, photographers, people picnicking, etc. One of the charms of the area is that it attracts and supports such a diverse group of people and wide range of activities. The community of people recreating with off leash dogs represents a tremendous cultural resource in San Francisco, Marin and the GGNRA. Where else can you see people from nearly every ethnic background and race, all socio-economic levels, seniors, families with kids, etc. all getting together every day and every week to socialize together while their dogs play off leash. Walking and playing with off leash dogs brings together people who otherwise would rarely see or interact with one another.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative plan because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.



I am alarmed that the new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. I have written numerous letters over the years and feel my voice and comments, and those of others, have not been heard!!

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades. This will impact hundreds of dog owners such as myself! I am extremely alarmed about the possible restriction. It will be a nightmare for myself and all other dog owners!!

San Francisco and Marin residents have been walking dogs off leash in the GGNRA for decades and this is yet another valid consideration for maintaining off leash areas. Off leash dog walking is the status quo. Banning or further limiting where off leash dogs are allowed constitutes a change to the current and historical use of the park. Continuing to allow significant off leash recreation opportunities constitutes a "continuity of use" of park land. I implore you to maintain continuity of use. I am strongly in favor of allowing dogs off-leash in as many GGNRA areas as possible. The more places that one can walk their dog(s) off-leash, the better.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Emily Church

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1375	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Sir Walks-ALot Dog Training Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 16:29:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, General Superintendent Golden Gate National Recreation Area,				

I strongly favor keeping the GGNRA Alternative A Dog Plan or even opening up more places for people and their dogs to enjoy. Growing up at Ft Barry during the 1970's we enjoyed the natural beauty and marveled at the views, while maintaining a sense of community. It is my feeling that something I consider to be part of my heritage and my heart will be restricted even more then it is now and I will no longer be able to share that with my children, because we can't take our 4 legged family member Bella. If you can tell me what to tell a child when they ask, "Why can't Bella come on the trail anymore", I would appreciate it. It may sound funny, but it is a real issue for me and makes me balk at setting aside lands for "Open Space", because I may not be able to utilize them. So, it pushes me to think more favorably about development and less about Open Spaces or recreational concerns. As a member of the Sierra Club it

pains me to think Pro-Development, but if it creates recreation trails or large dog parks, then I'd be likely to vote for Development.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

We need more access, not less, to the places we hold dear in our hearts and minds.

Thanks again, Robert L. Jupe Jr. Owner- Sir Walks-A Lot Dog Training

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1376	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 16:37:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Crissy Field and Fort Funston.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. San Francisco residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1377	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 16:51:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	PROPOSAL				

DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN  
For GGNRA land

The current Preferred Proposal for ways to regulate dog activity on GGNRA land had created a contentious and adversarial relationship between the quite severe regulatory actions proposed in the GGNRA plan and the dog-owning users of the land. This Proposal suggests a way forward that would have these adversaries work together on an on-going basis to achieve the highest and best outcome for all.

## ESTABLISH CITIZENS' COMMITTEES

Each of the areas addressed in the GGNRA DMP will be invited to form a Citizens' Committee; dog owners and non-owners would be encouraged to participate.

Any area that doesn't have an established representative or doesn't come forward with a Committee would be regulated as stated in the final DMP.

A protocol is established defining the relationship and levels of authority between the GGNRA and the Citizens' Committees

In participating areas, a Citizens's Committee is formed and a Chairperson is elected by the Committee.

Each area that forms a Committee will be assigned a representative from GGNRA. It is the responsibility of that representative to present concerns specific to the area.

The responsibilities of each area's Committee would be:

- o Draw up a list of mitigations, if perceived, to the DMP, including specific oversight actions for which the Committee accepts responsibility (see sample examples below)
- o Address the concerns of the GGNRA rep, per above
- o Submit and discuss the list with its GGNRA rep; reach trial agreement
- o Establish a renewal agreement plan (follow-up to ensure the conditions of the mitigation are met and consequences if they are not)
- o Implement the agreed-upon mitigation

## EXAMPLE OF A MITIGATION PLAN

I live and walk my dogs in Southern Marin so am only familiar with the trails in this area and will use the Oakwood Valley trail as an example. Of course, each area has its own issues and each Plan would, therefore, have different components. NOTE that this is only an example, NOT a suggestion for a final plan.

GGNRA Plan - Alternative E, Map 4-E: dogs allowed off-leash, under voice control, only on the fire road section of the Oakwood Valley trail up to the bridge. Dogs allowed on leash on trail section.

Possible Citizens' Plan - Alternative B, Map 4-B: dogs allowed off-leash, under voice control on Fire Road, Oakwood Valley Trail, and Alta Trail. Dog owners required to carry leashes.

Mitigation Terms and Conditions for Oakwood Valley (NOTE THAT THIS IS JUST AN EXAMPLE, NOT AN OUTCOME):

Local Committee is formed, Chair is appointed by group.

Committee meets with the appointed GGNRA rep to hash out specific needs and concerns of the specific area.

Alternative E would be in force on weekends and holidays, Alternative B on weekdays.

Citizens will patrol the trails and roads covered in Alternative B a minimum of once every 2 weeks to pick up all dog droppings not collected in GGNRA-supplied trash bins.

Chairperson will be forwarded complaints, including those concerning out-of-control dogs and unpicked-up droppings, from citizens. A log will be kept of the complaints for review with GGNRA rep. Serious complaints (attacks by dogs, injury, etc.) will be submitted immediately to GGNRA.

Initial trial period will be 60 days.

## SUMMARY

This is a bare bones and sketchy Proposal, just to give you the idea of a new way of approaching this volatile issue. The Proposal is intended to find a way for reasonable citizens to cooperate with its reasonable governmental bodies to address the problem of dog management on public land; if it is decided that neither group can be reasonable and Intervention From On High is required, then this is a loss for all concerned and, unfortunately, for democracy. As your extended Comment Period

demonstrates, you believe that any plan works best when those affected by the plan help design its component parts. The assumption of this Proposal is that enough people are involved enough in the DMP issue that they would put their money where their mouth is - and their time and effort where their concerns are. The people I know who are concerned about the perceived draconian extent of the GGNRA Preferred Plan are reasonable people who understand the negatives of dogs on open space trails and areas, but they also know the positives of well-behaved dogs getting adequate off-leash exercise. GGNRA will need to monitor and police any regulations it puts in place; this Proposal has the advantage of sharing some of that responsibility with the citizens of each affected area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1378    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 16:52:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel strongly that it is important to distinguish the difference in geographical areas within the National Park Service. What may apply to an urban area is likely to be very different in a less populated rural area and regulations should be set appropriately. With respect to Montara Mountain CA, tolerance, acceptance and peaceful co-existence should continue as it has for as long as I can remember. This philosophy should apply to horseback riders, bike riders, hikers, dog walkers (both on and off leash). There have been so few "dog-related" incidences that it is such a shame to implement further restrictions for those of us are responsible and enjoy walking our dogs off-leash. Not only is it an important freedom for dogs, but also for ourselves. I'm hoping logic and reason will be taken seriously in this matter going forward. There are risks with everything we do and often there are appropriate laws set to manage those risks. This however, is clearly not a big enough risk to enforce such a frivolous law. There will always be the occasional, irresponsible person or dog owner who may or a may not have control over their dog(whether on or off leash), but from someone who has lived on the coast for 4 decades, dog owners with exceptionally aggressive dogs tend to tightly manage them or keep them out of public areas... especially on the coast of Half Moon Bay. It's certainly understandable to implement such a law in some areas(particularly urban settings), however, not within the hills of Montara. So far the result has made both dog owners and dogs more unfriendly and un-social causing even greater risks for dog-related incidences. For anyone who knows anything about animal behavior, dogs tend to be far more aggressive on-leash and just as difficult to control. Again, there are risks to be taken when venturing out in nature such as an encounter with a mountain lion or a situation with an un-skilled mountain biker. Have there been enough dog-related incidences to warrant this restrictive law? If statistics were examined, I'm confident the response would be "no". There are so few places to go anymore where we can enjoy such freedoms. For those that are fearful, they should consider the multitude of choices where the leash law makes sense and is strongly enforced. Please keep a piece of California wild...there is almost nothing left and this law just doesn't make sense. Not here and not at this time!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1379    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 16:58:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

I regularly walk on these beaches, do not own a dog but feel strongly that they should be allowed.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1380    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Answlmo, CA 94979  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 17:06:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

I love to hike and spend time in nature. I do so with a well trained, well behaved dog. She is an important part of my connection to nature. I would stop using the San Francisco Bay area parks if I couldn't bring her with me. Further more, I would probably move out of the area all together.

I, like many of my friends, am a responsible dog owner who cleans up after my animal and obeys the leash laws. I support responsible access with dogs in natural environments. Please keep natural areas open to me and my dog.

Sincerely,  
Ananya Hixon, MA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1381    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** 1971 Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

I have been taking my dogs to Muir Beach for 40 years. I can not imagine it not being a place they can run freely and play. It would be such an incredible shame. We have rented a house every year in Muir Beach in the summer and I would reconsider going there now if my 2 small dogs cannot run freely on the beaches.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

~Zoe Rolland  
San Rafael, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1382	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	MILL VALLEY, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 17:15:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Regarding Muir Beach, Alternative A is my most preferred plan. Muir Beach has been a wonderful place for families of all types to come and enjoy nature, and keeping dogs on leash while being tempted by the cool ocean can be a bit torturous. I have never seen or experienced any type of destruction or disturbance of the native wildlife by dogs. If this has proven to be an issue, I would suggest better signage at these areas. In my experience, having dogs under voice control has proven effective for this area.

Thank you for your consideration. I truly hope we can keep Muir Beach a wonderful place for all to visit and enjoy to its fullest.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1383	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 9123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	1550 Bay St Tenants Assn. Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 17:24:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

Thanks so much for all you do for us! I submitted my comments before the last deadline, which you can probably find thru my name or email address. I have additional comments, after Mayor Lee's, & regarding his concerns that dog restrictions in our National Park would overwhelm City parks. If that is actually true, then it just reinforces that we have too many dogs. I adored my 2 dogs: a poodle mix & a black cocker spaniel. And I've been a dog-sitter for 20 years. The people I dog sit for don't have this "divine right to dogs any & everywhere," as dog advocates espouse.

I know there are great dog owners, but too many are NOT. I live across the street from Moscone Park on 1 side & Ft. Mason Great Meadow on the other; senior home The Heritage is on the other corner. Dogs are left to run "wild" & owners ignore their pets sniffing & jumping on kids & adults. If dog owners were so good, why do I see so much poop; or if picked up, then toss it when they think no one is watching?

Besides dog feces, what about & why don't we hear anything about dog urine? Do people want to sit in it or have their kids play on urine-soaked grass?

Dog owners just don't have the right to foul our parks. An idea is enforcing pets to be licensed, more dog runs/separate areas in parks; a big fine for non-neutered/spayed pets; working w/SPCA & other agencies for better pet guardians. I'm not so sure that 350 pets adopted from Xmas Macy's is such a good thing- - how many have been returned; or worse, abandoned.

This is about Dog Policy, but you'll probably need to deal with feral cats, too.

My great thanks to whoever reads this email & totes or tallies my issues. My wish is for parks that everyone can enjoy. Very sincerely, Jan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1384	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 17:25:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I favor GGNRA going back to the plan adopted and agreed upon in 1979.				

Since the mid-sixties I have been a frequent visitor at Fort Funston and Crissy Field along with my dogs. I am a scientist, and as such make note of the environment to a fairly keen degree of detail. I agree with others who have observed that the 'findings' made by GGNRA are poorly researched and inaccurate.

The impact of humans and dogs at Fort Funston as I've observed appears to be less than that of the ravens and the wind.

Many of the people that I've met who are there without a dog tell me that they come there because they enjoy seeing the dogs playing. Often they want to interact with dogs on their walks as well. There are many people who come there with no dog, but carry a pocket full of dog treats.

There used to be several bird species there: sparrows, swallows, gulls, hawks, even a pair of great horned owls. It was the ravens that impacted those species, not dogs.

For an area visited by the large number of dogs that come to Fort Funston daily, it is quite clean and dog-litter free. At Point Isabel in Albany by comparison I encounter quite a bit of dog feces even though they have frequently placed bag dispensers and dustbins. At Fort Funston there's always been an unspoken ethic to pick up any litter seen regardless of 'ownership'. Yes, frequent emptying of the waste bins is a necessity, but the waste does get into the bins, not the ground so much. If not for the ravens pulling things out of the dustbins, there would be less paper and plastic on the ground as well. (How about some signage regarding cigarette litter?) My dogs understand that butts are litter and collect them even though I'd rather they not.

Personally, I've taken the extra step of teaching my dogs to pick up people-litter they see or that I send them to retrieve. Dogs like to play, socialize and run but they also really do enjoy having a job.

There's another special aspect to visiting Fort Funston . . . the people interactions. Dogs really are good conversation starters.

The thousands (millions) spent over this issue is truly sad. I wish San Francisco had never given the areas to GGNRA in the first place. In an urban area of this small size we need to have these spaces for the RECREATION that was promised.

Poe Asher

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1385    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** 1550 Bay St Tenants Assn. Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 17:26:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

Thanks so much for all you do for us! I submitted my comments before the last deadline, which you can probably find thru my name or email address. I have additional comments, after Mayor Lee's, & regarding his concerns that dog restrictions in our National Park would overwhelm City parks. If that is actually true, then it just reinforces that we have too many dogs. I adored my 2 dogs: a poodle mix & a black cocker spaniel. And I've been a dog-sitter for 20 years. The people I dog sit for don't have this "divine right to dogs any & everywhere," as dog advocates espouse.

I know there are great dog owners, but too many are NOT. I live across the street from Moscone Park on 1 side & Ft. Mason Great Meadow on the other; senior home The Heritage is on the other corner. Dogs are left to run "wild" & owners ignore their pets sniffing & jumping on kids & adults. If dog owners were so good, why do I see so much poop; or if picked up, then toss it when they think no one is watching?

Besides dog feces, what about & why don't we hear anything about dog urine? Do people want to sit in it or have their kids play on urine-soaked grass?

Dog owners just don't have the right to foul our parks. An idea is enforcing pets to be licensed, more dog runs/separate areas in parks; a big fine for non-neutered/spayed pets; working w/SPCA & other agencies for better pet guardians. I'm not so sure that 350 pets adopted from Xmas Macy's is such a good thing- - how many have been returned; or worse, abandoned.

This is about Dog Policy, but you'll probably need to deal with feral cats, too.

My great thanks to whoever reads this email & totes or tallies my issues. My wish is for parks that everyone can enjoy. Very sincerely, Jan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1386    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 17:29:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The concept for restricting dogs in fenced in areas where they cannot roam free is part of the enduring folly that just because an animal cannot speak for itself, that its consciousness is inferior. With all due respect to the environment and plant life -which we do love and cherish- Our lives are oppressive enough, we all need to feel free whenever we can. Dogs included.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1387    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 18:07:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** \* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1388    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 18:43:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The off-leash zones in SF are already minuscule, please don't take away what few zones we have. It's is proven imperative to dog health for them to be able to run free for a certain amount of time each day. If you under exercise dogs, they become anxious, and dog anxiety is what leads to aggression and has a direct correlation to aggressive attack behavior. I also strongly disagree with the environmental impact reports, I feel that they should be revisited. as a dog owner I respect the environment, keep my pet from altering it, pick up her feces, keep her from digging or chasing endangered birds, etc. I also feel that tourists cause more damage to the environment than dogs. They walk where they aren't supposed to, litter EVERYWHERE, and generally disrespect. So if you are going to make areas NO DOG ZONES for the sake of the environment, you have to restrict human access as well, to be fair.

San Francisco is praised for its forward and progressive thinking. We are a city for everyone, we respect nature and love being a smart city. Let's not take a step backwards, PLEASE.

As the city expands more and more due to the booming population, yards are becoming a thing of the past. Where are our dogs supposed to run?

This is WRONG and I'm SO upset about it. I love san francisco, please don't make me grow to hate this fair city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1389    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 19:23:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:**   Sirs,

I will be commenting only on Crissy Field and Beach as this is the area that I have visited 3 to 4 days a week over the last 10 years. I walk, with my dog, the whole beach area, Crissy Field and all the way to Golden Gate Bridge. As a senior, this is my main source of exercise for myself and my dog. I would not be able to give my dog the exercise he needs to be healthy and well adjusted unless I had access to the off leash beach area. Having reviewed the draft proposal for this part of the GGNRA, I would like to make the following comments :

I support the idea of making the beach adjacent to the parking lot off limits to off leash dogs. I agree that there are some people who are uncomfortable around dogs and this will allow them to enjoy the beach without interaction with dogs. However, I would encourage you to consider making this area on leash only on weekends and holidays as there are very few people who visit this area during weekdays other than dog owners and professional walkers and , since there are so many dogwalkers who utilize this area during weekdays, it may create overcrowding on Central Beach on an everyday basis.

I agree that dogs should be on-leash in parking lots and all paths used by walkers and bikers for the safety of all concerned. Dogs should be allowed off leash once they reach the beach entrances.

I am in favor of having Central Beach officially designated as off leash. I do not enjoy negative interactions with people who simply do not like dogs and express this to me even though dogs are well behaved and under voice control.

Keep Crissy Field primarily off leash. Once again, I have rarely seen anyone other than dog owners and walkers utilizing this area during weekdays, or frankly, at any other time except on major holidays.

I have no problem changing the snowy plover beach to no dogs allowed. I do want to note, however, that I frequently see small children racing through this area, disturbing nesting areas and frightening birds. I also see this behavior on a regular basis on all the beaches and closed off sensitive areas. Parents need to educate their children that it is not OK to harass wildlife. I see this behavior far more in children while it is extremely unusual to see dogs chasing wildlife.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1390	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:**   I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog(s) to Miwok, and other listed trails. I don't think that people should be "punished" for the lack of care on trails that very few display. Most dog people are respectful of the trails and hills they walk on and we take care of it like it should be..not letting our dog(s) run outside designated trails, picking up poop, cleaning up garbage found, etc. Dogs are a huge part of most people's lives and we need a place, other than dog parks where most bad occurrence's happen, to walk our dogs freely. Have us pay a usage fee...more ranger patrol...something other than just NO DOGS.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1391	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Vly, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 20:05:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern:				

Re Proposed GGNRA plan

I have grown up Mill Vly/Tenn Vly area riding my horses before it became GGNRA as well as when it transitioned. As a lifelong dog owner, this is an area I know like the back of my hand. I can remember the Marincello Rd and the little Spanish style fixtures at the entrance. We were all thrilled to see it grind to a halt. The area is being loved to death. it is understandable to control how it is used and managed. As a dog owner (and dog walker) I typically keep my dog on leash. I am also a multi-horse owner. It is impossible to regulate all users all the time. As a dog walker, I am very rarely, in the Headlands. I do however, occasionally walk my own dogs on the Miwok Trail that extends from the lower end of the parking area going N towards Mt Tam. It is over reactive, overly restrictive of the GGNRA management to clamp down in such a manner on this and other trails. It completely excludes a substantial group of users. I would hope you will reconsider this heavy handed approach.

Ellen Garvie.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1392	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,21,2014 20:11:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I suggest that dogs be allowed in public parkland only if they are leashed, muzzled and diapered. We diaper our children. We do not allow them to shit everywhere and then suggest that parents pick it up. We do not allow our children to bite and intimidate others.				

I am sympathetic to the need for some individuals who need dogs. But I fail to see why dogs deserve more consideration than human beings. Please do not let dogs roam without leashes, without muzzles, nor without diapers.

Thanks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1393	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Staunton , VA 24401  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 20:44:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Although I currently reside in Virginia, I was a resident of San Francisco and still have many contacts in the city. I am a responsible dog owner, as are my friends in the city, and already there are too few places we can take our dogs for off-leash running time. Dogs need to burn off their energy to remain balanced and well-behaved, and sometimes the only way their owners can help them do that is by letting them run off leash. I am not a marathon runner, but my dog is, and she needs more places - not fewer - where she can get proper space to run. If you cut back on off-leash areas in and around the city you will definitely start to see the results in the behavior of the under-exercised, unbalanced dogs who will begin to act out because they will no longer have proper outlets to expend their energy. I don't think that's a side effect the proponents of these cuts have thought through.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1394    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 20:56:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Fort Funston, Muir Beach, Crissy Field and other...

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1395    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,21,2014 20:57:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not limit dog access and privileges at Muir Beach, Crissy Field and Fort Funston...

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1396    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 21:44:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog on off-leash hikes in Marin. She is a German Shepherd and really needs that type of exercise.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1397    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94945  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,21,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I only take my dog to off-leash areas as she is friendly, year old Labrador retriever mix and desperately needs the exercise that only off-leash areas provide. As a California voter, and a fully employed citizen, I feel that it is ridiculous for dogs to be restricted as they are already AND to extend these restrictions. It feels like a criminalization of dogs and a loss of rights to dog owners.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1398    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:01:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Bruce Yandell, a San Carlos resident for the past 21 years. I walk my dog regularly on and off-leash for the past several years and I regularly enjoy the GGNRA.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for GGNRA because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA was designed to be a place to enjoy and appreciate the outdoors and nature. I can't think of a better way to enjoy our natural beauty than with another animal and animal loving residents (and voters) of the SF Bay Area. Our community should be looking for ways to increase access to all individuals rather than implementing regulations which will restrict and reduce appreciation of the resources that were set aside for the greater good of the community.

Please join us in an effort to preserve the rights of everyone for access to the GGNRA.

Sincerely,

Bruce Yandell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1399    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Joan 4 Pets Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 10:02:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As dogs outnumber children in this city, the rights of their guardians should be given equal if not more consideration.

As a dog trainer I know the importance of off leash recreation for dogs. Dogs are social animals and are part of our lives. It is important that people have ample areas for their dogs to run off leash and socialize

with other dogs.

If you restrict the access to off leash areas, this will push dog walkers to go to local parks which will be a burden for the city. It also might put many dog walkers out of business.

As a former SF SPCA employee who ran the mobile adoption department, I am concerned about the future of dog adoptions should there be restrictive off leash areas. People might think twice about adopting a dog if it means they can not have them properly exercised.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1400	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 10:26:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern:				

After reading the preferred dog management alternative for Mori Point, I am disappointed to see that the protection of the area's ecology and visitor safety takes a back seat to a vocal minority of dog-owners who fail to take responsibility for the impact their behaviors have on the area.

I used to walk and jog the Mori Point area almost daily with my toddler son, and since the first comment period , the amount of dog excrement has grown, as are the numbers of off-leash animals in already on-leash appointed areas.

It is rarely the case when I don't see off leash dogs running through the new plantings, damaging the work to preserve habitat for endangered species. I have been afraid several times for my safety and that of my son because of pitbull and similar breeds off-leash, as well as other large dogs chasing wildly through the area with their owners far from any ability to curb and control their dogs. I realize there are a number of respectful dog owners, but it only takes one neglectful owner to precipitate a tragedy.

And in my 13 years of frequenting Mori Point, I have yet to see one enforcement officer, hence the low number of reported incidents in the most recent report. If there are not enough resources to enforce on-leash and excrement pick-up policies, the proposed alternative of on-leash is useless. We are back to the status quo of lack of safety, damaged ecology for the animals that do belong in the area, as well as the unhygienic waste ubiquitous to Mori Point.

It is easy to see the stark comparison between San Pedro Valley Park which has a no-dog policy, and as a result I now prefer San Pedro Park and will leave Mori to the dogs.

Sincerely,  
Summer Lee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1401	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 10:52:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to most Marin trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1402    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Los Angeles, CA 90020  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 11:08:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My girlfriend and I have talked about getting a puppy for a very long time. It would be an absolute shame if we had no place in the city for him/her to roam free for a little while, because, like people, exercise is very important for a dog's health.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1403    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 11:23:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog on the Miwok and Coastal trail and strictly observe all regulations regarding dog control and waste management.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a

---



densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1404    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 12:20:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and on the Coastal Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1405    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a responsible dog owner and resident of Mill Valley, California, I am concerned about the new proposal to further limit dog access areas in Marin County. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 which ran 3:1 against the plan. I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. The SEIS contains no peer reviewed site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public land. I would request that you retain the 1979 pet policy and remember that it is a recreation area and not a national park.

Me, my wife and our 6 year old daughter have lived in Mill valley since 2004 and take our dog on daily walks throughout southern marin. The areas that allow dog walking are very limited. Restricting these areas further will require us to drive greater distances to find suitable dog walking areas. Thank you for allowing me to comment on this important topic. - J. Weis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1406    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

If you wish to regulate dog usage in those public areas you should target dog owner that do not clean up after their dogs or do not have recall control.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1407    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** half moon bay, CA 94019  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 13:19:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Tennessee Valley Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1408    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 13:23:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** You can write your own comments or customize the sample letter below.

#### Sample Letter

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dogs to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1409	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 14:02:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,  
Ashley Smith

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1410	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Menlo Park, CA 94025 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in the bay area for about a decade and have brought my family to the GGNRA almost weekly during that time.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1411	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a long time resident of San Francisco and have enjoyed walking my dogs off leash at Crissy Field and other Bay Area beaches and within the GGNRA.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Thank you

Tad Moore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1412    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Nicasio, CA 94946-9706  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 14:33:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am absolutely against any proposal that would not allow my dog to run free. Who are the people who would require all dogs to be on leashes at all times? They are the Utopians who believe they know better how others should live their lives and that all institutions that have existed with virtually little or no problem, should be eliminated or amended so that these Utopians can feel empowered. The people I know who have dogs and walk them in the parks which allow them to do so unleashed, do so responsibly and by that I mean that they pick up after their dogs and reel them in when conflicts occur. If they know their dog is territorial, they keep the dog on the leash. It's simple common sense. This common sense may be violated by an extremely small minority of dog owners. That these events, of which i have not seen one, are elevated to crisis status by again, a very small handful of idiots, is idiotic in and of itself and symptomatic of the pussification of America and especially the Bay Area (San Francisco).

I oppose any regulation that would prohibit my dog to run freely and responsibly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1413    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 14:44:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family has been taking our dogs to Fort Funston for more than 20 years. We live in San Mateo, but it has become increasingly difficult to find an open, legal, place for them to run, play, and exercise... so we make the 20-30 minute drive up to the Coast. This trek has become a favorite of ours, and is the most exciting thing in our dogs' lives. Every few weeks we load them into our Jeep and head up Hwy 280... it isn't long before they sense our destination and, boy, do those tails start wagging!

Now, we are hearing that the GGNRA, in it's infinite wisdom, plans to restrict the off-leash area at various locations, including Fort Funston... to some tiny little plot of enclosed land. We already have enclosed, postage stamp-sized lots in San Mateo for our dogs... they are a JOKE! Dogs need lots of open room to exercise & have some fun. Now, we can't even take them down to the beach & throw a ball or stick into the waves for them to retrieve ?!! Ridiculous and completely unfair. Who do you folks actually think you are, anyway? I thought we defeated the Nazis decades ago! Where is our "Government by the people, and FOR the people" ?!

How about you put this to a vote (this IS America, isn't it?) instead of imposing your authority on the public? Does ANYTHING that we (the dog-loving public) say even matter at this point? Surely does not feel like it.

There is NO reason we can't have parks/beaches that DO allow dogs off-leash, in addition to these restricted locations that you dog-haters are so passionate about. That way, you folks can go to your dog-free parks and talk about the "native plants" and the rest of us can enjoy the great outdoors with our best friends.

Are you still even reading this at this point? I probably lost you at "Nazis", huh? Well, just in case this IS being taken into any kind of consideration, please put my family down for a huge "Hell, NO" on the GGNRA's plan. It is just wrong.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1414	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Park Planning,				

My name is Maya De La Rosa-Cohen and I live with my family and two dogs in the Noe Valley neighborhood of San Francisco. I have been recently deeply disturbed by your proposed plans to cut 90% of the land where I normally walk with my dogs at least three times a week. Considering that there are very few alternatives left in the city where I can walk freely with my dogs who are under voice control off-leash, this proposed plan will greatly negatively affect our day to day lives. I strongly disagree with the positions of the executive boards of these groups, and would like to make it clear that these local boards do not speak for their members nor do they speak for me. My dogs and I spend at least three days a week walking at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Fort Mason- an activity that is good for our mutual health and happiness. The restriction of these and other areas that have long been established as off-leash pet areas would be an abominable change for many dog owners living in San Francisco. The Preferred Alternative is too restrictive and there is no justification in the SEIS for these major changes. Moreover I support the formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. Putting up fences in areas like Crissy Field, Fort Mason and Fort Funston would make the off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. But if fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them? One of the great advantages of SF living and SF beauty is the open and welcoming nature of our parks. The plan to restrict these areas with fences and other material boundaries would be a grievous mistake that would inevitably damage our city's beauty and welcoming energy- not to mention how it would negatively alter the lives of SF dogs and their beloved owners.

Lastly, I would like to formally oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported. The SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments

from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions. SEIS still lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

My dogs and the dogs of my friends are all under voice control. They present no evident threat to the indigenous wildlife of the areas we walk in. The off-leash areas at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Fort Mason provide an incredible community for dog lovers, owners and walkers to enjoy this city's natural beauty freely. The harsh restrictions outlined in your plan are unfair and unwarranted. Please reconsider as I know this issue is greatly important to me, my family, my dogs, and my friends who, although they may not own dogs, truly enjoy the freedom allowed them and their fellow citizens to walk with their dogs off-leash on park grounds.

Sincerely,

Maya De La Rosa-Cohen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1415	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Santa Barbara, CA 93109				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 16:05:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	In different plans I noticed that there are areas where it is suggested "no dogs are allowed". These areas then get a designation of no impact(by dogs) since no dogs are allowed. While logical, in fact, "no impact" is not an accurate designation because dog owners consciously decide not to obey the rules and will take dogs where there is no enforcement at the time.				

That some dog owners purposely do not obey the rules is also stated in a few places in the SEIS. It is not an opinion, it is a fact. Therefore to be more truthful, I suggest you take into consideration that even in areas where no dogs are allowed, there will be impacts from dog walking. Some dog walkers prefer to get away from other people and dogs and will seek out "no dogs allowed" areas to do so. I once had a friend tell me she purposely walked her dog on a "no dog" trail because her dog didn't get along with other dogs.

Assuming "no impacts" from dogs in areas where no dogs are allowed is dependent upon enforcement until such time as people decide they need to obey the rules.

Having lived next door to a 35 acre offleash dog park for nearly 20 years and following the progression of offleash dog recreation in CA, I suggest modifying any statement as to "no impacts" in areas where "no dogs" are allowed by adding it will take "consistent enforcement" for that to be a truer statement of fact.



**Correspondence ID:** 1416 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 16:08:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan / SEIS is an incredibly biased document that is focused on creating increased limits to dog owners/dogs without any consideration or sense of fairness regarding the reality of the current situation. If the GGNRA is approximately 117 square miles and 99% of it is currently off limits to dogs, then currently 115 square miles are unavailable to dogs, leaving only approximately 2 square miles for dog access. Shouldn't the conversation and the dog management plan be oriented to finding MORE opportunity for recreation for people with dogs? The bone-headed bias that resulted in this draft plan going public should be an embarrassment to the GGNRA. Where's the leadership? Next thing you know, you'll be suggesting paving over undeveloped ridge lines for parking lots above Muir Woods...wait, you already did that! It appears that there's a tremendous amount of confusion over the mission of the Golden Gate National RECREATION Area, an area that was rightfully protected from development so as to be enjoyed by all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1417 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to as many dog friendly places in the GGRA, like Muir Beach or the Miwok Trail, as possible and would like to continue to have the current access to them.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1418 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Novato, CA 94947  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 16:10:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** With the issue of dog management in the GGNRA under discussion, I would like to see stricter rules for dogs developed and enforced.

Reasoned, responsible dog owners would not expect to take their domestic pets to a natural open space and allow them to interfere with other park visitors and wild life as the dogs run off leash. The demonstrative dog owners who argue for their 'right' to run dogs off leash should not be allowed to dictate policy.

Please rule in favor of the park.

Thank you.

Bill Jones

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1419	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 16:18:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS,				

I'm writing to urge you to support and promote dog-friendly policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I live beside the GGNRA and am grateful to spend time hiking and cycling on the Miwok, Coastal, Green Gulch, Dias Ridge, and other trails almost daily. Often, I walk my dog along the Miwok trail, meeting up with friends and neighbors doing the same. Walking our dogs in the GGNRA has been the basis of many friendships and has fostered a true sense of community in our neighborhood, whose steep, windy, narrow roads and lack of sidewalks is not safe for dog walking.

My 12-year-old daughter and I constantly marvel at the good fortune we have to live near such a beautiful, hilly place, that allows us to get some real heart-pumping exercise and appreciate nature while we walk our dog. The GGNRA currently allows many kids and families a chance to get out in nature and exercise with their pets-an awesome way to ensure that children grow up with an appreciation for animals and nature and a healthy appetite for physical activity.

In the nearly 1,000 visits I've made to the GGNRA over the past three years, including frequent weekend visits to Muir Beach, I've never encountered any bad dog behavior. Instead, I see dog owners yielding to cyclists, other hikers, and beach goers; picking up after their pets; forbidding their dogs from going off trail; and generally acting responsibly. I've found the dog owners who frequent the GGNRA to demonstrate an amazing model of responsible citizenry and consideration for others.

So, I was surprised and disappointed to discover that you are considering further limiting the areas where dogs are allowed in the GGNRA.

The GGNRA was designated as a recreation area for exactly this kind of use-for the residents of the Bay Area to have the opportunity to get exercise in fresh air and nature. Please don't take this opportunity away from those of us who value it so deeply.

I understand that you have not undertaken the peer-reviewed, site-specific studies required by law before drastically altering public use laws. How, then, can you make a proper decision about trail usage in the GGNRA?

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

I urge you to maintain dog-friendly status throughout as much of the GGNRA as is possible, certainly including the Miwok Trail, the Coastal Trail, the Wolf Ridge Loop, the Rhubarb Trail, the Rodeo Beach Loop, Muir Beach, Homestead/Four Corners, and everywhere else dogs are currently allowed.

To honor the needs of local residents, I urge you to return to the 1979 Pet Policy, which allows for appropriate use by pet owners of OUR recreational land.

Thank you for listening. Please think carefully about the impact these decisions have on local communities, on the health of our families, and on the lifelong habits our children are forming. We treasure the opportunity to exercise in nature, with our whole families- -dogs included!

Sincerely,  
Kaitlin Quistgard

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1420	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 16:27:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	National Park Service,				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to many of the trails and beaches in Marin County, including Muir Beach and Oakwood Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1421	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 16:36:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The current off leash areas in the GGNRA are very important to the thousands of dog owners in the bay area. Please do not place any additional restrictions on both off leash and on leash dog walking. There are over 100,000 dogs in San Francisco and they need a place to exercise. San Francisco has given a significant amount of its beaches and natural lands to GGNRA jurisdiction and current San Francisco parks are not able to handle the influx of dogs that would happen if dog walking was limited in the GGNRA. On behalf of me and the thousands of other dog owners who walk their dogs in the GGNRA please do not restrict dog walking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1422    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:00:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing because I oppose Alternative F and because I support Alternative A.

I have lived on Spring Drive, just a few blocks from the Miwok Trailhead on Marin Drive, for almost three years, and my wife, my dog and I are in the GGNRA almost ever day, hiking, running or riding our bikes out to Muir Beach. In the hundreds of times we have done one of these activities, we have NEVER witnessed an unfavorable interaction between dogs or humans. On the contrary, dog walkers are routinely courteous and friendly. Nor have we observed any sanitation issues as a result of dogs.

My understanding is that the GGNRA is a recreation area that was established for this very set of activities. And as an avid user, I can attest that it is hugely successful today at fulfilling that mission: recreation. And dogs need recreation just as we do. There is already so little open space available to dog lovers; 3 trail corridors in the headlands and Muir Beach. What benefits can further restrictions possibly yield? Indeed, Alternative F will only limit the recreation possibilities for many people, as well as their dogs.

Choose Alternative A.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1423    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:20:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Marin county is an outstanding place to live, because of its open space, that is enjoyed not only by the residents but by untold numbers of visitors. The GGNRA represents much of this open space, such that the proposed ban on off leash dogs would have a profound effect on the happiness of not only the affected dog residents but thousands of their owner-families.

I support the No Action Alternative in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin headlands.

I use these areas almost every day and find the vast majority of dog owners I encounter are responsible stewards of these much appreciated areas.

Please keep the 1979 Pet Policy in place.

The GGNRA is a major reason that San Francisco is such a great place to live. I have financially supported the GGNRA and feel the provision of approved off leash areas for dog owners represents significant value in the community.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1424    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 17:26:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam:

My name is Wendy Umphrey and I live in Mill Valley. I have walked my dog on Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, and on approved Marin trails, for the past 5 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and Marin county trails like the Oakwood Valley trail because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science and not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, dogs are a part of our lives here in the Bay Area. Most pet owners want to be responsible pet owners. We want to exercise our dogs freely in the allowed open spaces, because tired dogs are good dogs. Having a yard or fenced dog park to exercise in is not sufficient for any but the smallest of breeds. Further curtailing the amount of open space available for dog exercise will affect the dogs and dog owners in a negative way, and whether it will improve the lives of non-dog people is questionable at best. Please keep the rules as they are. We already are seriously constrained as to where we can exercise our animals. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Wendy Umphrey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1425    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not change the current off leash policies. We take our dog out off leash whenever we can. She enjoys the freedom of running around meeting other dogs as do I. I love that she

---

can run around and explore. I know that it makes her so very happy.

We visit Pulgas Ridge in San Carlos very often and would actually prefer more off leash access on the hiking trails. About once a month, we will go to either Fort Funston or Baker Beach.

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1426	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 17:51:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The proposed changes to the dog walking areas are a total disaster. The idea that all the dogs that use Ocean Beach are to be restricted to an off leash area under the Cliff House that's approximately the size of a baseball diamond is so blatantly unworkable that it's simply ludicrous. The dogs and their owners would be packed like sardines in a ridiculously tiny space. It will absolutely ruin Ocean Beach as a destination for dog owners. Owners and their dogs should have access to - at bare minimum - the section of the beach from the Cliff house to Fulton Street, which is half a mile long, and will leave the remaining three miles of beach dog free. I hardly think that letting dogs have access to one-seventh of the total beach is asking too much. Dog owners are numerous in San Francisco. We have a right to enjoy the beach, with our dogs, without being cramped and corralled into a virtual shoebox.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1427	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,22,2014 17:57:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear National park service. I am a 12 year old boy that loves to walk at fort funston with my dog. I think it would really be an upset to me, my friends, and family, also dog, if you closed fort funston for dogs. so i hope that this e-mail inspires you not to leash and ban dogs at fort funston.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1428	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:29:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in Pacific Heights with my wife and our miniature labradoodle, Lola.

Lola and I love the great outdoors and run, hike and play together as much as possible.

Our favorite places are Crissy Field and Oakwood Valley. It's a great way for Lola to get her energy out and we both benefit from the fresh air and exercise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1429    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:38:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We chose to live here and pay property taxes in this very expensive county mainly due to access to open space. We have owned dogs all our lives. For 20 years we were in SF and for the last 8, here in Marin County. We are extremely distressed to see our rights to open space in the GGNRA being further limited. As it is, we cannot walk with our dog on Mt Tam. The GGNRA was historically set aside as a RECREATION AREA...it's even in your name. It is NOT a museum of flora and fauna. I feel the rights of dog owners to enjoy at least the minuscule 1% or so of designated trails is being further chipped away at by a vocal few.

As a woman who frequently hikes alone during the week, many times, the only other people I see on the trails are other folks walking their dogs. When you take that user group out of the mix, it feels LESS SAFE. This was the case when many former off leash sites in SF became leash only. Suddenly, no one was there. The regular folk disappeared who'd been daily walkers.

We live in a urban area and the GGNRA land was set aside expressly to SERVE THE PEOPLE and create a balance with nature. To discriminate against one user group flies in the face of everything the GGNRA was historically set up to do. Please do not erode our freedoms further. Let the SF Bay Area be an example of tolerance and freedom and respect for all life, man and dog alike.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1430    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:39:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a

---

densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1431    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 18:41:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Hello -

I support Alternative A and strongly oppose Alternative F.

I do not own a dog, but I live near Eastwood Park, off of Tennessee Valley Road.

I have always enjoyed seeing dogs on these trails and have never seen a dog or dog-owner misbehave. It's one of the reasons I enjoy walking this trail, because the dogs make me smile. And I see how families and elderly benefit from being able to take their dogs on a nearby trail to walk without having to get into a car and face tremendous traffic - which has gotten increasing worse with the increased visitation to Muir Woods.

I do think that professional dog walkers should have some limits on the number they can have off-leash at any time and should have responsibilities for helping keep our trails clean. I believe if they received GGNRA permits for a fee, that fee could help offset providing additional trash cans/garbage bags to make cleaning up poop easy.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Robin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1432    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 19:44:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would submit that dogs should be kept on leash in the GGNRA. At Crissy Field, the area where I spend the most time as a runner and bird-watcher, off-leash dogs are harassing and killing the endangered plovers. There are numerous other places where people can allow their dogs to run wild (Golden Gate Park? Dolores Park? Alta Vista Park? The Presidio?) without needing to jeopardize an endangered species. Aside from that, it is annoying and dangerous whenever an unleashed dog sprints on to the busy bike/walking path nearly causing collisions with cyclists, pedestrians, strollers, etc.

Dogs certainly need to be on leash in other National Parks. Why is GGNRA regarded differently just because it is located within city limits? Would dogs be able to run around terrorizing and maiming wildlife in Yosemite Valley? Of course not. So why are the standards set differently for San Francisco?

Sincerely:

---



A concerned San Franciscan and nature enthusiast

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1433    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 20:38:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail, Miwok Trail, Muir Beach and Homestead/Four Corners Area.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1434    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I visit Fort Funston with my dog Cora every day. She is a great dog and is really only happy and fully exercised when she gets to run around and explore nature and socialize with other dogs. I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1435    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it Concerns:

As a member of Marin County and long-time visitor (over 50yrs) to both State and National Parks, I have been both dismayed and disappointed by the "bulldozed" legislation and decisions without consideration of the public or local residents which utilize and financially support your services.

To this day, I greatly miss the Fallow and Axis deer which once resided in Pt. Reyes where I frequently ride my horse. Now I am hearing that you wish to eliminate my dog walking trails! I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Coastal trail, Miwok trail, Rhubarb and Wolf Ridge. We regularly enjoy Muir Beach and the Rodeo Beach loop.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed or site-specific studies which support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. Marin County is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. As residents we rely upon and frequent these open spaces. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. Please think outside of your envelope and include the locals in your consideration.

Legal access for ALL users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and must be retained!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1436    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 21:10:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having been a GGNRA user for decades, I believe it is critical to allow continued off leash access by dog users, unchanged from current conditions. Option A is the clear choice. The other proposed regulations are a response to vocal minorities that agitate for change due to personal bias or infrequent and uncommon incidents. In reality, given the enormous number of dog walkers that allow their dogs to exercise and play off leash, any such incidents are truly rare. Dogs and their people are overwhelming valuable, considerate, and responsible users of the GGNRA who should not be unnecessarily regulated. Enforcement should be reserved for the true bad apples who are unlikely to change their behavior regardless of regulations. The resources already expended for this process, and the resources that would potentially be required under the other options, can and should be allocated to more important issues. Allowing people to self regulate first, with enforcement a distant second, is always in society's best interests and is the higher calling of freedom. People who want to avoid dogs have ample alternative locations to visit within the GGNRA. Just like changing the station to avoid unwanted programming, people have a choice. Neither is censorship or the heavy hand of authority the best

---

solution. Educate, maintain, serve, improve, supply, and communicate with your users to engender the behaviors you desire and you can accomplish more than you can with the proposed options.

For the record, I own a home, a business, I vote, I pay taxes, and yes, I have a dog. I am a responsible, contributing member of society who understand the issues and the consequences of what I am asking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1437    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Woodacre , CA 9973  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 21:26:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I pay a lot of my income to live in marin , I have dogs and horses and I live in marin because I enjoy open space . I have lived hear my whole life , and have always had dogs as do all my friends , we all enjoy the parks and open spaces . I also work with dogs and all my clients , even the elderly enjoy the trails and open spaces with thier dogs . They spend a lot of money on thier pets as do most people in marin , we are not a county who dumps a dog in the back yard and forgets about them! They are part of the family , thankfully . You will lose a lot of support if you enact unfriendly dog policy in the park. The funny thing is most of the people I know that use the park have dogs ! We are the ones who use it every weekend or even more , we are not tourist or fare weather users . We are responsible , we pick up poop , and train our dogs . We have a lot invested in our pets health and well being . The park is part of our life . I think it sad a for the higher ups to treat us like insignigent users and to pit "kid people " against " dog people " , many have both . I can not tell you how many dirty diapers I have seen ( and picked up ) on the trails after a holiday weekend .... How many beer cans , how many cigarettes how much garbage .... So for the parks to act like thier biggest issue is dogs ! Please.

Sadly the park is not pristine and it never will be as long as people use it, so to act like dogs being removed will somehow return it to it's natural state is just ridiculas . Also to act like more people will use the parks if dogs are gone is also ridiculous . People will either use it or not , it's not about whether or not dogs are allowed. I know Sierra club people and Audubon peopel, I support both, I believe there are times when we need to post no off leash dogs during nesting of some birds .... But to make it permanent is a mistake .

Marin is about 90% oen space , thanks to real environmentalist , not burrecrats . It's not okay to act like dogs are that big of a problem , it is a waste of time . Do something better with your time and resources . I see dogs and family's every where , they are a huge part of our lives now . In fact the pet industry was one of the only industries to grow during the recession and continues to grow , you are missing an opportunity to be more progressive and inclusive of all park users .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1438    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 21:33:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I feel so frustrated at the very thought that I will not be permitted to walk my dogs in many places that I currently enjoy....THIS IS CRAZY.

We spend and outrageous amount of money to live here.

I request the FREEDOM to walk my canine companions.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1439    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94063  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** January 14, 2014

Mr. Frank Dean, Superintendent  
National Park Service ' Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Mr. Dean,

I am writing to offer my reaction to the GGNRA Dog Management/Environmental Impact Statement Plan. As I review the Preferred Alternatives, I am concerned over the effect the implementation of the Alternatives may have on the San Mateo County residents and visitors. As the San Mateo County Supervisor representing the Supervisorial District adjacent to Fort Funston, I respectfully ask that GGNRA considers continuing to allow off-leash play areas. Citizens in my District have used Fort Funston to recreate their dogs responsibly for years.

Throughout the process conducted to produce the Plan, I heard residents of San Mateo County ask not to have trail access and off-leash play areas for dog walkers reduced. As I reviewed the Alternatives, I am concerned by how many of these areas are being prohibited or restricted for dog walkers. In addition, I have concerns over the potential impact this can have on San Mateo County's coastal communities. By reducing the amount of trails people can access with their dogs and citing people for violations, GGNRA will be discouraging people from engaging in outdoor activities and enjoying their national park lands. GGNRA states that they have selected the Alternatives because it grants multiple user groups the opportunity to enjoy the property, allow for habitat restoration. and is justifiable and enforceable by NPS Rangers. I am sympathetic to the need to reduce conflict between dog owners and those who may be afraid of dogs, the preservation of habitat, and reducing potential liability of the GGNRA. For decades, dog walkers, non-dog walkers, mountain bikers and horseback riders have all enjoyed the trails and park areas that are now managed by GGNRA. Multiple user groups have been enjoying these areas together in the past and should be able to continue to do so. I believe the strong desire by dog walkers and the community to continue the traditional use of these areas for recreation of their pets will make it difficult for GGNRA and the NPS Rangers to effectively enforce the Alternatives.

I ask that you reconsider your Alternatives and not place such heavy restrictions on trails, and especially the Fort Funston area currently used by dog walkers.

Sincerely,

Supervisor Adrienne J. Tissier

District 5

County of San Mateo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1440    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-002  
Dog Management Plan  
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement  
Support: NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE  
January 13, 2014  
Dear Mr. Dean,

I walk my dog, off-leash, on the Oakwood Valley Trail in the GGNRA, several times a week. I was surprised and disappointed to learn that a discussion was underway to reduce the amount of free running area for dogs. I would have hoped to be writing in support of expanded access, but see that elements opposed to dog interests have already framed the conversation negatively.

The GGNRA is an astonishing resource for our community. When I lived in San Francisco, I was a runner, without a dog, who used many if not most of the Area's trails. It was always a pleasure to encounter the many other types of travelers, whether they were on horse, mountain bike, or foot. I also would come to ride the wonderfully beautiful and challenging single-track trails that beckoned from across the Bay. Now I take my dog for the only off-leash walking we can do to the Oakwood trail. Over the decades my opportunities to experience the GGNRA have been systematically reduced, undoubtedly as the result of initiatives like this one, by a vocal minority. As managers of the Area, I would encourage you to find ways to expand access for all, as opposed to reducing it.

At the very least I'm certain you recognize that as use groups are pushed from the Area, your fundraising is impacted. In my case, GGNRA was a favored charity. That is no longer the case as I cannot peruse my preferred activities as I could in the past. I expect that your mandate is not to maximize financial support, but I do think that lost revenue should be an indicator of whether or not you are meriting the needs of your audience.

Perhaps the issue is the result of a misunderstanding of the function and environmental quality of the Area. This is a large urban park close to a major city, and surrounded by suburbs. It provides local flora and fauna historic and protected borders. But, most importantly, it is a recreation area for humans wishing to engage nature. Not all people do that the same way, and helping us accommodate the needs of each other could be your highest priority. In this country we have a wide variety of outdoor areas, some that exclude humans to protect the natural order, such as the Farallon Islands. There are other areas like Golden Gate Park that are almost entirely devoted to human use, despite the large sample of flora and fauna that exist there.

While it is possible that free roaming dogs in the GGNRA may scare some wild life, I suspect there is plenty of remote area that can act as a refuge, should it actually be proved that the dogs are a problem. Mostly, however, this park's use is between the Farallons and Golden Gate Park. It is for all humans and is an essential resource for those of us who have dogs. Since a good dog is a happily exercised dog, please keep and expand the area we can use to experience nature with our pets, thereby providing a benefit, in well behaved canine companions even outside of the GGNRA.

Please give me a reason to support the Area again. Many thanks for your consideration.

Chip Smith  
167 Ethel Ave  
Mill Valley, CA 94941

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1442	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Larkspur, CA 94939 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:** Jan 2014

GGNRA Ft. Mason

Re Dogs @ Rodeo Beach Ft Kronkite

As a longtime user, perhaps twenty years, who walks my dog @ Kronkite beach I would hope that we are able to continue to do so. People are generally conscientious, but I for one clean up others poops when I find them. When I walk I pick up plastic, foam and mylar, oh and treated lumber scraps. mainly its bottle caps, straws and shotgun wads. In the past, a loop of the beach netted a shopping bag full, now 2, 3 times a week I'll fill a pocket. We are getting better. We really need places to let our dogs run. Most of the coast is reserved for shorebirds. I've lived on, in a salt march in Larkspur for 35 years.

Thank you

Herbert B. Launer

#9 Boardwalk One

Larkspur, CA 94939

415-924-6120

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1443 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Montara, CA 94037

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Montara Dog Group Recreational Groups**Affiliation:** OfficialRep**Received:** Jan,13,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:** January 10, 2014

Bill Bechtell

President, Montara Dog Group

P.O. Box 370493

Montara, CA 94037

Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Fort Mason, Bldg 201

San Francisco, CA 94 123-0022

Attn: SEIS

Dear Superintendent Dean,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important document, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft DMP/SEIS).

I apologize if you find some of my comments similar to comments on the previous Draft DMP/EIS. The web-based "Comment Response Report" was entirely too cumbersome to be practical. In any event, it appears that most comments were not taken seriously, because the GGNRA's preferred alternative for Rancho Corral de Tierra (Rancho) in the current Draft DMP/SEIS still does not allow sufficient opportunity for recreational dog walking.

My name is Bill Bechtell and I am president of the Montara Dog Group. The group consists of approximately 400 people, mostly residents of the San Mateo County midcoastside, who regularly walk their dogs in the open space known as Rancho. The midcoastside includes the small unincorporated communities of Montara, Moss Beach and El Granada. It is bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean, and on the east by Rancho. The area has long had the reputation of being a dog-friendly area, largely because of the numerous trails available in Rancho for dog walking. I, myself, have lived in Montara for 37 years, and regularly walk my dogs on the numerous Rancho trails. The midcoastside is also a tight-knit

---

community willing to fight hard to preserve the cultural and environmental values that attracted us to this area in the first place.

For many years the open space known as Rancho was privately held by various development corporations. They tried to build condos and golf courses, and to subdivide the property into "ranchettes." We fought back all of these attempts. Then Caltrans dusted off some 1960s-era freeway plans, and tried to put a freeway (the Devil's Slide Bypass) through the heart of Rancho. Again we mobilized to fight this freeway, and eventually convinced Caltrans that a tunnel behind Devil's Slide was a much better solution, again sparing Rancho.

Then in 2001, the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST) purchased Rancho to save it from development. We dog walkers have had a very good working relationship with POST over the years. They have no staff rangers, so we have been POST's eyes and ears on Rancho, reporting off-road vehicle activity and illegal dumping. We have also installed and maintained dog waste disposal cans throughout the dog walking area for the past 6 years at our own expense, and all done by volunteers from our group.

If the GGNRA's preferred alternative for Rancho (Alternative B, No dog walking allowed except on-leash on a few trails near Montara and El Granada) is put into effect, it will be very sad and ironic that those of us who have fought so hard to protect the land will now be forced off of the land. (See Attachment 1).

The GGNRA is referred to as a "park" throughout the SEIS. The GGNRA is not a National Park. It is a National Recreation Area. If Congress had wanted GGNRA to be a national park, that is what they would have authorized. Also on the first page of the Executive Summary, the SEIS states: "The purpose of the GGNRA is to offer national park experiences (emphasis mine) to a large and diverse urban population while preserving and interpreting natural, historic, scenic and recreational values." If I want "national park experiences" (whatever that is) I will go to a real national park, such as Yosemite, Yellowstone or the Grand Canyon. I understand that the GGNRA's mission requires balancing the various values, but this SEIS does not give nearly enough weight to recreational values (such as dog walking), the main reason for the GGNRA's existence.

The Montara Dog Group's "preferred alternative" for Rancho is Alternative A, the "No Action" alternative, with the addition of two off-leash dog walking areas, one near Montara and the other near El Granada (See Attachment 2). Dogs would be allowed on-leash throughout the remainder of Rancho as indicated in Alternative A in the SEIS (See Attachment 3).

There is a fundamental error in the status quo assumed for GGNRA's No Action alternative in the SEIS. As acknowledged on page 60 of the SEIS, there has been a long history of off-leash dog walking at Rancho, although not officially sanctioned. As such, off-leash dog walking should be the status quo or baseline for GGNRA's No Action alternative, not on-leash dog walking. As you know, Montara Dog Group and Crissy Field Dog Group have previously corresponded with you extensively on this issue, so instead of rehashing the contents of those letters, I have attached them to my SEIS comments, for the record. (Attachments 4 through 9)

The tone of the SEIS tends to pit dog walkers versus environmentalists, and that is not necessarily the case. Although a dog walker, I also consider myself an environmentalist. I have been a Sierra Club member for over 50 years (former trip leader), and a member of Sequoia Audubon Society (former board member) for about 30 years. With proper education, signage and enforcement, there is no reason for dog walking to cause environmental damage, either to wildlife or plants. Mr. Ken White, president of the Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA, considered the effect of off-leash dogs on Rancho near Montara, and came to these conclusions:

"Our professional wildlife rehabilitation staff completed a review/analysis of the site and the proposal, and we believe that there is no observable reason related to the protection of native wildlife which would justify denying access to off-leash dogs in the area."

Please reconsider your plan to ban dogs and off-leash dog play from the small areas of Rancho Corral de Tierra which informally allowed this use for years with no negative impact."

Ken White's full letter is attached at the end of my comments (Attachment 10). Mr. White's conclusions directly contradict the speculative wildlife impacts at Rancho suggested by GGNRA on page

697 of the SEIS. The fact is that the SEIS fails to identify any scientific studies, site specific to Rancho, that document adverse impacts from dog walking on wildlife or on flora at Rancho. Montara Dog Group certainly realizes and accepts the need to restrict dogs (and people) from certain sensitive habitat areas, and will cooperate fully to help protect those areas when they are identified by scientific studies. Another flaw in the SEIS and GGNRA's preferred alternative is the total lack of off-leash dog walking opportunities in San Mateo County. Page 43 of the SEIS refers to "Management objectives in the draft 2011 General Management Plan that are relevant to dog management include the following: The park has significantly expanded in size and includes many new lands in San Mateo County. This planning process takes a comprehensive parkwide approach that will help ensure that the management of the natural and cultural resources and visitor experiences are consistent throughout all park areas." (Emphasis mine.) Obviously the SEIS does not meet this objective because Mann County and San Francisco County both have off-leash dog walking areas, while GGNRA's preferred alternatives for San Mateo County have none. Off-leash dog walking areas should be provided by GGNRA in San Mateo County as well as the other two counties.

In conclusion, GGNRA's draft Dog Management Plan/SEIS is extremely biased against people who recreate with their dogs, with insufficient documentation to support that bias. It appears that the GGNRA's goal is to restrict people with dogs to the maximum extent possible, in spite of Congress' mandate in the enabling legislation to preserve and encourage recreation, including dog walking. I hope that the final plan will take our comments to heart, and provide more areas for dog walking, both on-leash and off-leash, within Rancho and the rest of the GGNRA.

Yours truly,

Bill Bechtell

President, Montara Dog Group

Member, Sierra Club

Member, Audubon Society

Attachments:

1. Alternative B
2. Rancho off-leash areas
3. Alternative A
4. Speier to Jewell letter, 6/19/13
5. Dean to Speier letter, 7/3/13
6. MDG/CFDG to Dean letter, 7/23/13
7. Dean to MDG/CFDG letter, 8/13/13
8. MDG/CFDG to Dean letter, 8/27/13
9. Dean to MDG/CFDG letter, 9/17/13
10. White to Dean letter, 2/8/11

Cc:

U.S. Senator Diane Feinstein

U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer

Congresswoman Jackie Speier

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

Congressman Jared Huffman

State Senator Leland Yee

State Assemblymember Jerry Hill

Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell

National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis

National Park Service, Pacific West Region

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX

San Mateo County Supervisor Don Horsley

Crissy Field Dog Group Chair, Martha Walters



**Correspondence ID:** 1444    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** NA, UN NA  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreational Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

RE: Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Dean;

I am writing to comment in response to the Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DMP/SEIS). This important document will affect the entire Bay Area for years to come and it is important that the GGNRA planners listen to those of us who have been using these lands, some of us for decades. First I would like to say that I find none of the alternatives acceptable, as none allow off leash dogs, but I prefer Alternative A. I am an equestrian who has been active with the local land managers to keep horses on area trails and in the future plans for land use. (Board Member, Bay Area Barns and Trails; President, Coastside Horse Council; Committee Member, SMC Confined Animal Technical Advisory Committee; Member, SMC Resource Conservation District Advisory Board; Past President, ETRAC) I am a member of several riding clubs and a member of the Montara Dog Group. I am a resident of Montara and have been riding with or walking with my dog in the area now known as Rancho Corral de Tierra (Rancho) for almost 20 years. I grew up in San Francisco and rode horses for years on the beach and in Golden Gate Park (with my dogs). I have been using the area now known as GGNRA since the early 1950's. I find your new plan restrictive and not supportive of an open space for urban recreation.

My first objection is your statement of the purpose of the GGNRA as "providing a national park experience to the public." GGNRA is a National Recreational Area not a National Park. As such its purpose is to provide open space for public recreation and enjoyment. The lands that comprise GGNRA have been used for farming and/or have been under some form of human management for centuries and are not the pristine areas that make up a National Park such as Yosemite or Bryce or Yellowstone. The GGNRA lands are perfect for urban recreation; they are easily accessed and are not part of a sensitive ecosystem, although there are some endangered species found in the areas. As an ecologist (PhD, UC Davis) I think of sensitive ecosystems as those that are threatened by human expansion into an area or areas that have not been subjected to human use. The lands under the purview of GGNRA are beautiful and wonderful but not threatened. The animals and plants that make up the ecosystem have had centuries to come to terms with the human users of the land. Even the endangered species have managed to find areas where they are surviving quite well by the numbers that are seen here. GGNRA is a unique urban recreation area and as such should be treated with special respect but please do not try to turn it into a National Park. Congress set up the National Recreational Areas to be something different from a National Park. A recreation area is a place to be outside and enjoy, it is not an area that needs protection or preservation.

As the newest area of GGNRA, Rancho is a perfect example of the type of land that makes up the whole of GGNRA; it was a ranch from the time of the Spanish colonies until it was bought by developers who tried to subdivide the land. The community was able to fight the attempts to develop the area and leave the land as open space. However, it seems we can't fight the

government; now that the land is owned by GGNRA the rules are changing without taking the community input into account. The results of many meetings and comments have apparently been ignored if the current document reflects the results. Before GGNRA acquired the land we locals used it with no restraints and were good to it. We cleaned up after our dogs, we left a small footprint on the land, used only a few trails and didn't disturb the creeks. When POST bought the land in 2001 the use as is continued and we continued our care of the area. In fact, during that time the Montara Dog Group went to the trouble to voluntarily put in dog waste disposal sites and to police the area.

As part of our care we respect the wildlife and do not disturb the native flora and fauna. As locals we live with the local wildlife, we keep the deer out of our gardens but let them into our pastures, we enjoy the native predators and hope they don't eat too many of our domestic animals. We (including our dogs) and the native animals find a way to live together. The dogs in Montara, Moss Beach and El Granada have been off leash in the area for decades and there is no evidence of a decline in the number of native animals that can be accredited to the dogs. Perhaps a decline due to the rapid growth of the area but that is human intervention not dogs. I have photos on a home trail cam of some of the local predators; fox, coyote, raccoon etc. I have not been lucky enough to get the mountain lion but know it has been close. The wood rats make nests in our backyard and there are birds of all kinds in the yard. Does leave their fawns at the edge of our property while they browse in our fields. Our loose farm dogs have not kept any away.

The DMP/SEIS states that off leash dogs are a threat to the native animals. From my observations of the native fauna I can find no evidence that supports the contention that they need protection from off leash dogs. This is supported by Mr. Ken White, President of the Peninsula Humane Society and his professional staff, who also find no reason to ban off leash dogs. As an ecologist I have been interested for years in the interactions of native fauna and the encroachment of humans. I find these rural interfaces most interesting by the adaptations of the native animals to the new environment. We have a large coyote population in Montara (much more of a threat to other species than the occasional off leash dog) but they are rarely seen and seldom heard. Most dogs are not inclined to hunt; domesticated dogs historically do not do well when left on their own in the wild. They rely on the food provided by their owners and are not apt to try to find another source. If the threat to wildlife is real, there is no scientific evidence in the DMP/SEIS that off leash dogs are a threat. Without scientific evidence there is no reason for the ban and it should be removed.

The DMP/SEIS states the locals are most likely to be the users of Rancho, which is the case in Marin where the majority of users of GGNRA are locals. With the long history of responsible use of the land it surprises me that GGNRA is asking for a total ban of off leash areas. Do you think that the locals are going to suddenly turn into hooligans? Dog owners have dogs to be friends and companions, the dogs are helpers in many ways; dogs give their owners a lot of satisfaction and are shown to lower blood pressure and help keep us healthy. Of course one of the ways they do that is providing a playmate and a reason to be outside walking. Watch any dog food commercial and see what we do with our dogs, we throw things for them to find and bring back, we give them obstacles to jump over, etc. These are all activities that are done off leash. It is a form of punishment to keep us from playing with our companions. We do not send them into the brush to chase rabbits, we play with them.

The impact of not having anywhere on the Coastside to walk dogs off leash is huge. It means to legally have a dog off leash we will have to go in our cars for miles to get to the few areas on the Peninsula that allow off leash dog walking or into San Francisco where off leash dogs will still be allowed. The environmental impact of that is far greater than the perceived impact of a few dogs on the Rancho land. Given that there is no scientific evidence that off leash dogs damage the land, I for one do not understand the tone of the DMP/SEIS. It is so anti-dog that I wonder if any of the people who drafted it have ever been on a walk with a dog.

I worry that as the Park Service becomes more restrictive that this will affect the equestrians in more ways than the case that we can no longer ride with our dogs. There is something special about being out in the open with your horse and dog that cannot be matched by other experiences. I miss my dog when out with my horse and the dog does not understand why she has to stay home. I also miss the security of having the dog with me. Over the years I have had a couple of encounters while riding my horse when having the dog with me was what saved me from a bad experience.

In conclusion I am asking you to stop calling GGNRA a National Park and to keep it an Urban Recreation Area. Along with this allow us to recreate with our dogs. The residents of Montara, Moss Beach and El Granada need a place to walk our dogs beyond our back yards. For this I ask that you do not finalize the plan with the preferred option but go back and re-examine the case for off leash areas in Rancho.

Sincerely,

Lyndall Erb, PhD

Cc:

Senator Dianne Feinstein

Senator Barbara Boxer

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

Congresswoman Jackie Speier

State Senator Jerry Hill

State Senator Leland Yee

State Assembly Member Mark Church

National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis

Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1445	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 10:32:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Carolyn Hendrickson and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dogs at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and Golden Gate Park, as well as the on leash trails in the Marin Headlands. I am a member of the Sierra Club.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston and Ocean Beach because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, I agree that in order to have shared community space for everyone to enjoy and to be environmentally responsible, dogs should be restricted from some sites and leash laws should be enforced in sensitive areas. However, there should be adequate space that is easily accessible to dog owners. My

family and I use the open space for off leash walks, runs and games that help us get exercise, stay healthy, and minimize our time on the road. As is, we can ride our bikes to many of these locations (with a dog carriage in tow behind my bike for our three-legged dog). We have two rescue dogs from San Francisco and Oakland Animal Care and Control. Vigorous exercise and off leash play has been an important part in their recovery from a traumatic start and some of the anxiety issues they developed while mistreated by previous owners and time living in city shelters. My family feels strongly that it is important to put our energy into helping local animals recover and integrate into our dense urban community. A big part of this is making sure they are good and tired and well-exercised.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Hendrickson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1446	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 11:30:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am writing to countest the recent restrictions proposed for dog walking in the GGNRA. I have walked my dogs regularly at Crissy Field, off-leash, for 30 years. It is one of the great pleasures of living in San Francisco and is a local treasure. Our community has used this space for decades to no harm. The restrictions posed by the National Park Service are detrimental to local residents and their pets.

My dog also goes regularly to Ft Funston Park for off-leash walks. That park is well known as a place for dogs. It is my understanding that this park will largely become off limits for off leash dogs. Where are these dogs going to go for exercise? I think the NPS is being short sighted in closing any of these spaces. It will result in over-crowding in other areas causing problems that never existed before. Please leave San Francisco parks the way they've been for residents. Your national organization needs to take into account the needs of local residents who have been using these spaces, without problems, for years.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1447	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 11:39:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	NPS,				

I am a resident and active supporter of the Golden Gates Parks Conservancy, Sierra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council, and other environmental groups. Protecting the environment is a priority for me.

At the same time, I recognize that I live in an urban area. I own 1 dog and visit Fort Funston every week day. My comments primarily concern Fort Funston.

The research done to prepare this plan was obviously extensive. I would like to submit the following

comments:

- The report includes a section about monitoring-based management strategy. That strategy includes monitoring the number of dogs and dog walkers, among other items. Has any monitoring of the number of dogs (in general, not only for commercial dog walkers) been done as part of the research for the plan? If only 25 dogs use Fort Funston on a day, it's not a problem to relocate those dogs to other city parks. But what happens when hundreds of dogs are relocated? Or thousands? The potential for aggressive incidents increases dramatically if a large number of dogs are relocated to a smaller area.

And I would bet that people are more likely to change the location where they take their dog (if the final plan requires it) than they are to change the time of day. Many of us work and have a set window for going to Fort Funston. So, if the plan restricts off-leash areas in the GGNRA, not only will a lot more dogs be transferred to city parks, but they likely won't be dispersed throughout the hours of the day in an even manner.

The two paragraphs above apply also if significant areas of Fort Funston are changed to be on-leash only. Those that remain off-leash will result in more dogs in a smaller space.

One of the advantages of having off-leash areas at Fort Funston is that the size of the park allows more space for these dogs to interact. Obviously, that doesn't mean there are no aggressive incidents at Fort Funston, but they're less likely to occur in a space that large than in a much smaller city park.

- Dogs have always been important to people. For city-dwellers, they are a link to nature that is invaluable. Proper care of dogs requires adequate exercise, which provides an outlet for energy that might otherwise be misdirected. On-leash areas do not provide the same outlet as off-leash areas. For some dogs, this is not as much of an issue. For others, it makes all the difference between a well-behaved dog and one that turns to mischief or worse. Because of the density of the human population, one might argue that it's even more important for dogs who live in an urban area to have the proper outlet for their energy.

As an example, my dog (26 lbs) was rescued from a shelter. He had previously been a stray and so is very fearful. We have taken several obedience classes and used private training, but his fear is deeply ingrained. He won't walk farther than 1/2 block in either direction from our house, which certainly doesn't give him the proper amount of exercise. However, he feels safe at Fort Funston and at beaches, so we take him off-leash there so he can get the proper exercise. If we don't take him, he is definitely more difficult to manage. These off-leash areas make a huge difference - - walking him on-leash at these places is not nearly as effective.

- I do support closing certain areas for protection of species or habitat with fencing or similar borders. However, that support does not negate the concerns expressed above.

I urge you to keep the maximum amount of space off-leash at Fort Funston.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gina Luzzi

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1448	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Marin County Dog Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				

---

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 11:39:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

Please, PLEASE do not further restrict the few areas we have to take our dogs off leash in areas where they can really stretch their legs and RUN. As an owner of a hound (and there are hundreds of thousands like me), my dog needs to really stretch her legs at a full run, or she would literally go crazy. Small dog parks in the city here and there are not a good fit for many, perhaps even most dogs.

The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area like mine. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yosemite or Yellowstone.

I support the GGNRA "No Action Alternative" in the the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

To force people into their cars in search of the scant places where dogs can run is hard on people, hard on the environment in terms of driving longer distances, and all-around bad for Marin County.

Thank you for considering this letter!

Rachel Paluska

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1449    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 11:46:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1450    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NONE of the alternatives for Ocean Beach allow dogs off leash west of Lincoln to Sloat.

Leashing dogs here is completely untenable. This is the most urban stretch of beach north of LA. Human concerns trump the birds on this one. The Snowy Plover can find another place to roost, it's really just that simple. We can't turn back the clock. It's too late. The humans have already arrived on this little stretch of beach.

These regulations will create countless negative interactions between dogs and their owners and the legal enforcement of it will be an unwarranted expenditure of time and effort that should be spent elsewhere where real safety concerns exist.

Nor will the birds really even be impacted. There are plenty of other secluded beaches on the pacific coast for these birds.

CEQA does provide for over-ruling environmental concerns if they are recognized. This is one of those cases. Enforcing this leash only rule will NOT result in any environmental improvement, but it will do a lot of damage to the many human beings who live here.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1451 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94158  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:39:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Anthony Fresina

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1452 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfield, CA 94533  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 12:40:19

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1453    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I have lived at Muir Beach for just under 35 years and have owned 2 dogs in that time. There are already so many beaches and trails where dogs are not allowed; I don't understand the necessity to limit dogs to off-leash at our little Muir Beach. To think that a local Muir Beacher cannot run their dog on the beach is punitive. Many others from Southern Marin and beyond bring their dogs here as it's the closest beach where dogs can exercise. It's part of the culture of the area. The NPS wants to make our parklands into some sort of museum; forgetting that the recreational areas of Marin are our backyards and why we chose to live here. Don't people and dogs count too?

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1454    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** b2emedia Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 13:22:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NONE of the alternatives for Ocean Beach allow dogs off leash west of Lincoln to Sloat.

Leashing dogs here is completely untenable. This is the most urban stretch of beach north of LA. Human concerns trump the birds on this one. The Snowy Plover can find another place to roost, it's really just that simple. We can't turn back the clock. It's too late. The humans have already arrived on this little stretch of beach.

These regulations will create countless negative interactions between dogs and their owners and the legal enforcement of it will be an unwarranted expenditure of time and effort that should be spent elsewhere where real safety concerns exist.

Nor will the birds really even be impacted. There are plenty of other secluded beaches on the pacific coast for these birds.

CEQA does provide for over-ruling environmental concerns if they are recognized. This is one of those cases. Enforcing this leash only rule will NOT result in any environmental improvement, but it will do a lot of damage to the many human beings who live here by creating arguments and resulting in negative citizen/law enforcement interactions and needless fines.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1455    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-002

Dog Management Plan  
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement  
Support: NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Dear Mr. Dean:

I walk my dog, off-leash, on the Oakwood Valley Trail in the GGNRA, three times a week on average. The Oakwood trail is about the only trail I ever have my dog off leash. I was so happy to find such a beautiful, safe, well-maintained and convenient trail. I am disappointed to learn that a discussion is underway to reduce the amount of free running area for dogs. I would have hoped to be writing in support of expanded access, but see that elements opposed to dog interests have already framed the conversation negatively.

The GGNRA is an astonishing resource for our community. Dog owners are a large part of this community and it is very frustrating to find that there are very few places in the GGNRA to go with a dog, even on a leash. I am a responsible dog owner and diligent about cleaning up and controlling my dog! I hope the bad behavior of others will not impact the people like me who feel that it is a great privilege to have this resource. Please don't change the accessibility for the Oakwood trail!

Over the decades my opportunities to experience the GGNRA have been systematically reduced, undoubtedly as the result of initiatives like this one, by a vocal minority. As managers of the Area, I would encourage you to find ways to expand access as opposed to reducing it for the sectors of the public who actively and regularly visit.

At the very least I'm certain you recognize that as use groups are pushed from the Area, your fundraising is impacted. In my case, GGNRA was a favored charity. That is no longer the case as I cannot peruse my preferred activities as I could in the past.

I also expect that your mandate is not to maximize financial support, but I do think that lost revenue should be an indicator of whether or not you are meriting the needs of your audience.

Perhaps the issue is the result of a misunderstanding of the function and environmental quality of the Area. This is a large urban park close to a major city, and surrounded by suburbs. It provides local flora and fauna historic and protected borders. But, most importantly, it is a recreation area for humans wishing to engage nature. Not all people do that the same way, and helping us accommodate the needs of each other might be your highest priority. In this country we have a wide variety of outdoor areas, some that exclude humans to protect the natural order as much as we can, such as the Farallon Islands. There are other areas like Golden Gate Park that are almost entirely devoted to human use, despite the large sample of flora and fauna that exist there as well. Thank you for your time, Lisa Terry

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1456	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 15:30:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am FOR banning dogs on the beach in San Francisco. I cannot tell you how many times I have seen dog owners just walk away from their dog's feces - - like they're too good to pick it up. I am also tired of being nipped at by aggressive dogs, "bumped" by dogs chasing balls and frisbees, growled at by dogs who are overly protective. I love dogs, but clearly it's the people who own them that need to be retrained. Banning dogs on the beach may be a great lesson for dog owners. It's not a right, but a privilege, to use National Park property. Sure would be nice to enjoy a leisurely stroll on the beach again.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1457	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet				

---

Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1458	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 15:41:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

(In fact I support INCREASING the number of dog-friend areas, but that doesn't seem to have been considered at all!)

I regularly take my dog to Mt Tam, Rodeo Beach, Muir Beach, Coastal Trail, Wolfback Ridge, and other trails in the GGNRA.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

But most important the GGNRA is NOT a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space, including biking, and hiking with children and dogs.

The vocal minority of dog haters should not be allowed to hurt the vast majority of dog owners who are considerate, friendly and loving.

Thanks in advance,

- - Frank Leahy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1459    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 15:54:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is just ridiculous... not only is what's being proposed wrong... it's also insanely damaging to the local community and businesses.

1) EVERYONE who has a dog and bought a house out there did so b/c it's one of the only places you can still walk your dog off lease. If this goes through it could have a damaging impact on our property values and resale potential.

2) This part of the beach has virtually ZERO wildlife that needs to be protected from dogs... saying that some bird "might" be scared by dogs is just a lie. The dogs have been there for 50 years... if they didn't hurt them before then it's not going to start now.

3) There are COUNTLESS small businesses that support dog owners... walkers... groomers... boarders... and they ALL will lose business if this gets passes

4) With the federal budget problems AND high unemployment, why why why WASTE money enforcing a outdated and USELESS law??? Are the park officials really that silly to think they can change 50 years of habits with blank threats? Just because you walk a dog off lease doesn't mean you're subject to stop & seizure... what that means is I HAVE EVERY RIGHT TO WITHHOLD NAME & ADDRESS if I get confronted by a ranger... so how do you plan to enforce it? It's silly and a great example of POLITICIANS WASTING AMERICA'S MONEY...

You DO realize that there are many better ways to help American OTHER THAN encroching on our rights? I for one am NEVER supporting a national parks service again and will never vote for funding or help for an organization that ignores logic so it can feel more powerful... do what you want, but everyone will remember how useless you are and everyone will remember how much time and \$\$\$ you wasted because you HATE dogs.

Good luck ever getting elected with this on your record... if dogs are a mans best friend... apparently the national park service is mans worst friend.

Haver fun being miserable and pointless in life... I'm getting back to WORK and will continue to walk my dog on that beach OFF leash whenever the hell I choose.

- From everyone in America other than the 4 people sitting in a room reading this

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1460    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 16:13:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live by Mori Point for almost 40 years. This area is the housing area that connected to the park. I always have dog and I love to walk my dog to Mori Point everytime I can together bringing my friends or relative to look at the ocean and climb the mountain when they came to visit. I love to let my dog go off leash because I know that my dog(s) is very friendly and does not bother anybody that ride bicycle or jogging. I have a chance to meet lots of friendly people that do not mind my dog or any other dogs that go off leash. Most of the time the dog's owner know whether their dogs are good enough to go on without leashes. They have freedom in their own way without bothering any one. Please, I will appreciate very much if you will consider have Mori Point for OFF-LEASH dogs. Thank you very much for letting me have a voice in it too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1461 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 16:17:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am appalled at the thought that you will forbid dogs on 99% o all trails! The Bay Area's constituents are vastly dog owners and lovers! Do you NOT know who is being served by those parks?? Dogs owners. We need space to exercise them as part of OUR exercise routine. The vast majority of dog owners are responsible and clean up after their dogs. As a concern for the natural habitat, you may insist that the dogs remain on the trails and NOT get off to protect the habitat and you may even install a system of citizens monitoring others to respect those rules, through a volunteering system.

On the other end, cyclists are a complete nuisance and are not respecting pedestrians zooming at all speed and not slowing down.

Just remember that Northern California has millions of residents with dogs and that you will be negatively affecting taxpayers.

We will not forget if we are ignored.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1462 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 16:20:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi, I literally live across the street from GGNRA and implore you to BAN DOGS from our trails. There is so much dog poop across the street, on Oakwood trail, on Miwok, almost anywhere we can walk to from our front door ... it's disgusting. I have two small children and I can't let them play in the woods across the street because it's so polluted and when we use the trails it's become a sick game to point out the piles of dog poop. Furthermore, even on the trails that are supposed to be "on leash only" we still encounter rough and rowdy off leash dogs that don't hesitate to jump on a small child and owners who become indignant when we say things like, "can you call your off your dog, he's afraid of dogs." It's become so unpleasant we've all but stopped using the trails, which is deeply frustrating since

part of the reason we bought our house was it's close proximity to all the great GGNRA hiking. Please, please, please, put people first and ban the dogs and their irresponsible owners from our trails. Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1463    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 16:53:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly agree with those that oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to several of the sites you control.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. I can't see any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1464    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 17:06:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1465    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Mari Yao. I am a life-long San Francisco resident, currently residing in Diamond Heights. As the owner of one dog, we do not frequent the dog park at Walter Haas playground as we do not like the fenced in area and each time we've taken our dog inside, she just sits on the bench, even though it is close by. We abide by the leash laws when we walk to Christopher Park., but we most frequently visit Fort Funston and McLaren Park on a weekly basis and get so much joy from watching our dog get to run to her heart's content.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

Additionally, I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

Finally, I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I am a registered voter and appreciate your consideration.

Thank you,  
Mari Yao

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1466    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Jackson, TN 38305  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 18:01:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Test

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1467    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 18:57:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and I walk regularly with our dogs on the GGNRA trails. Our dogs stay on the trails and we always pick up after them. Access to the beautiful GGNRA is why we moved to Marin in the first place. We love enjoying nature with our dogs and hope that we can continue to do so in

---

the future. Please consider that there are many dog owners in the Bay Area who feel strongly about having access to the surrounding national parks but who haven't voiced their concerns.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1468    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 19:11:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please stop creating new rules for ocean beach every year, this is a city, not a national park. The three main reasons.

1) There is no proof the dogs effect the snowy plover at all, and their decreasing numbers is more likely due to the second largest city in California being 5 feet away. Most environmental studies say the plover mates in Salt lake, Utah, anyway - another piece of science ignored.

2) The GGNRA is incapable of enforcing the leach laws, which leads to the violation of these laws, and stricter regulations. A ranger at the GGNRA meeting told me the dog ban was started because people were not obeying the leash guildlines - well if there were trained rangers there, people might. Also, the tasing of a dog walker in San Mateo by a GGNRA ranger shows the lack of training and inability to handle the issue.

3) It is foolish to ban dogs when you don't enforce the leach laws. I aways walk my dogs on a leash because of the rules, but many don't. This isn't good for the dogs because leached dogs don't like being approached by other free running dogs. Your lack of enforcement of the rules is only causing problems, not fixing anything.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1469    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a homeowner and resident of the outer richmond in San Francisco. We frequently walk our dog at Lands End trail, Sutro Park, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, the Presidio, Marin County beaches and recreation areas and Crissy Field. We benefit from the ability to walk with our dog off-leash in the GGNRA because it gives her the exercise she needs and gets us out for longer, more playful and more interesting walks.

I am opposed to the Preferred Alternative. The boundaries and access for off-leash access are too restrictive and there is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them feel unwelcome. Further, these pens actually promote the running and unchecked intermingling of ill-behaved dogs with people and well-behaved/voice-controlled dogs. The only place my dog has ever been attacked by another dog was in these fenced off areas.



I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Punishing all people for the acts of a few is an unfair and unjust approach that is completely counter to American values of justice and due process.

The new dog management plan did not suitably address comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking. The GGNRA appears to have dismissed nearly all of them and should address comments on issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), instead the plan cites anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan does not allow off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as the recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1470	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94949 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to express my opposition to Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

---

I regularly take my dogs to Muir Beach, the Coastal trail, Miwok trail, and Oakwood Valley Trail. Areas where dogs are allowed in Marin are already extremely limited. One of the reasons I moved to and enjoy living in Marin is the access to these trails for my dogs.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1471	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 21:06:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Generations of families have enjoyed walking their dogs and running with them off leash to exercise the dog and their people. As the world becomes more frenzied and complex, it is essential for people to walk these trails and enjoy having their dog companions with them. The more restrictive rules are made, the more frustrated and damaged the people. We need these places to enjoy and frolic with our dogs. Please include large open spaces for humans and dogs to walk off leash.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1472	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,23,2014 21:23:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of the outer sunset district in San Francisco and walk or run on Ocean Beach once or twice every day. In addition to the environmental concern about dogs disturbing birds, my primary concern is dogs which are not under the control of their owner. Frequently, my wife and I encounter threatening, totally out of control, dogs. Not only does this disrupt our sense of safety, but my wife has a very bad back and moving quickly to avoid an attack often results in additional injury to her back.				

I support requiring all dogs to be on leash at Ocean Beach.

Thank you!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1473	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,23,2014 21:50:35**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i have been a resident of the outer sunset district for 40 years. i walk daily in golden gate park and along the front way at ocean beach.

i believe all dogs should be required to be on leashes. unfortunately there are many dogs with owners who haven't trained them or are so busy doing their own thing that they let their dogs run freely to the detriment not only of wild life but also to those of us who just want a pleasant walk by our beautiful ocean without having to contend with out of control dogs and their neglectful owners.

i was bitten on the leg while i was walking my dog - who was leashed - by a dog who was not on a leash and decided to attack out of the blue. the owner could not control her dog and as i tried to get her dog away from mine i was bitten. the owner stood and screamed and felt somehow that that was her contribution to controlling her out of control dog. certainly this situation could have been if not alleviated, at least less problematic had her dog been leashed.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1474	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Mill valley , CA 94941 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** HI,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dogs on Miwok, coastal trails and many times at muir and rodeo beach. i am very disappointed by these request from GGRA and don't see it clearly why more trails shoudl be ban when there are already so many.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands. I pay taxes and feel this is the least i can do is take my dogs on runs and hikes off leash. My dogs on well trained on voice command at all beaches and we pick up dog waste as well as provide bags for all dog walkers.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I appreciate your consideration - stacy King - Mill valley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1475    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1476    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 09:39:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs deserve a section of Ocean Beach that allows them to run off leash. This section of the beach gets so much use, from humans and others that I can't imagine the snowy plovers want to be there anyway. Your plan is unrealistic.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1477    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94949  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 10:01:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, I am a responsible pet owner, I leash my dog if we are walking the beach and come upon a family picnicking to avoid my dog accidentally kicking sand on them, and my dogs relish the time they get to spend fetching in the waves and rolling in the sand. Please don't take this away from them. There are many other locations that people who don't like dogs can take refuge in, Please don't take the last few from our dogs. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1478    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 10:55:39

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for asking for comments. I am a dog owner and love the ability to allow my dog to walk, run and play off leash in the dog parks and trails. Dogs are an important part of our community. I beg you, please do not limit dog friendly areas any more than they have already been. We need these parks for people to congregate with their dogs to play and run. Dog owners are very responsible and help maintain the parks and trails that they use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1479 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 which ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

I support the NO Action Alternative in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Please RETAIN the longstanding 1979 pet policy.

The GGNRA was established to give outdoor Recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars in search of places to walk with their dogs. THIS IS BAD FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND BAD FOR MARIN COUNTY!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1480 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 11:21:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to GGNRA Marin.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1481    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122-2928  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 11:48:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NONE of the alternatives for Ocean Beach allow dogs off leash west of Lincoln to Sloat.

Leashing dogs here is completely untenable. This is the most urban stretch of beach north of LA. Human concerns trump the birds on this one. The Snowy Plover can find another place to roost, it's really just that simple. We can't turn back the clock. It's too late. The humans have already arrived on this little stretch of beach.

These regulations will create countless negative interactions between dogs and their owners and the legal enforcement of it will be an unwarranted expenditure of time and effort that should be spent elsewhere where real safety concerns exist.

Nor will the birds really even be impacted. There are plenty of other secluded beaches on the Pacific coast for these birds.

CEQA does provide for over-ruling environmental concerns if they are recognized. This is one of those cases. Enforcing this leash only rule will NOT result in any environmental improvement, but it will do a lot of damage to the many human beings who live here by creating arguments and resulting in negative citizen/law enforcement interactions and needless fines.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1482    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in the Bay Area for almost 14 years. While I was a frequent user of GGNRA parks, a few months back I got an ~1 year old Labrador dog from the SF SPCA. So in just this short time I have been using the parks even more - - exploring and enjoying them while getting my dog out for exercise. I make multiple visits a week to our local parks including Chrissy Field, Ft Funston, Lands End, Ocean Beach, and the Presidio. This general pattern of knowing people with dogs tend to more active and enjoy the outdoors should be aligned, and to me it is, with the GGNRA purpose of offering a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population". So I have been confused and dismayed by the efforts to significantly restrict parks with dog-friendly and off-leash areas.

The systems in general seem to be working and where they are not (if this is even the case by-and-large?) shouldn't the most effective use of resources be spent on the existing guidelines? More directly, what specific issue(s) or problem(s) are driving the need for this anyway? It seems as if the changes proposed are based on limited to no study with significant assumptions and "can", "may", "might" type conclusions

---

driving this. Assumptions and a lack of clear harm or impact is not a reason to drive through changes that will negatively impact such a significant base of the users of GGNRA parks.

Specifically:

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

GGNRA is one of the treasures of living here. Being able to enjoy them responsibly with your dog is a significant part of this for many of us - - the very urban population that the parks are designated to support. Thank you,

Darin Boyd

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1483	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Belmont, CA 94002 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,24,2014 13:25:05
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I am old, tired, broke; and am on my 4th dog since this battle began nearly 2 decades ago. Fourth dog will surely cross over the Rainbow Bridge before this entire BS is settled. I'm tired of writing letters, attending meetings, and submitting comments, but I will continue until I'm dead or until the GGRNA honors their promise to the citizens of San Francisco.

Couldn't help but copy and use this comment as it is EXACTLY how I feel. Only we are on our 5th and 6th dog and have used Fort Funston without issue for over 20yrs. I have personally NEVER witnessed a dog/human interaction that even remotely was threatening. The area is without landscape or weather that is condusive for almost any activity but dog walking. Leave Fort Funston as it is.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1484	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Bruno, CA 94066 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,24,2014 13:36:03
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I am a San Mateo county resident with a yellow lab. There are few places where I can take him to run and be a dog. Watching him run with his ears flapping and his tongue hanging out brings me great delight. We have very fun afternoons walking and playing with the other dogs at Fort Funston or at Crissy Field. Taking him out keeps me healthy and active.

Please make off-leash areas a priority. Dogs need places to run and humans need places to exercise with their dogs. There are not enough places as it stands. Let's not close the few areas we have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1485    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 13:47:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider the off leash ban. I am not a dog owner but I have had no issues with off leash dogs in the city and many of my friends have benefited from being able to take their furry companions to large public spaces so they may stretch their legs. Its hard to be a city dog and the freedom to go off leash in large areas is necessary for their happiness. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1486    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not restrict dog walking or off leash areas, these areas are so important to our dogs and our community, espically at crissy field. Dogs need a place to run free, this makes people happier and dogs more relaxed and well behaved when they are walking on the city streets or interacting with humans. it is so important for dogs to get a lot of exercise, and this will become extremely difficult, especially for disabled people or people who can not walk, for their dogs to get enough exercise. Please consider the dogs and the disabled dog owners. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1487    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 14:25:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not restrict dog walking or off leash areas, these areas are so important to our dogs and our community, espically at crissy field. Dogs need a place to run free, this makes people happier and dogs more relaxed and well behaved when they are walking on the city streets or interacting with humans. it is so important for dogs to get a lot of exercise, and this will become extremely difficult, especially for disabled people or people who can not walk, for their dogs to get enough exercise. Please consider the dogs and the disabled dog owners. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1488    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 16:07:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe we can submit multiple comments. If not, then disregard this one and use my previous. However, if we can, I would like to make the point that GGNRA should not be allowed to make the argument if the number of comments decrease on this second SEIS, this indicates any less dissatisfaction.

---



You must consider several other reasons why the number of comments may decrease, e.g.,:

\* The 2nd draft (SEIS) clearly ignored the comments from the 1st, so many are disenchanted with the process and believe it is a waste of time.

\* In general, it is hard enough to get people to find time to make a comment. To ask them to make multiple is exponentially more difficult.

\* Some now want to boycott this process by refusing to participate.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1489    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 16:14:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am NOT in favor of restricting dog walking in any of the park areas in any way. In my opinion there are NOT ENOUGH places to walk dogs, and not enough areas where they can be off leash. It sounds by all the information I have read that the studies that have been done in the past have been skewed. If you look at the number of incidents with dogs (ei dog bites) it is unbelievably few as compared to crimes (violent and otherwise) by adults in these parks. Every way you look at it, adults are more dangerous to each other than dogs every have been or will be. Please do not restrict dog walking in any of our parks more than they already are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1490    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 16:48:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I use fort funston, Crissy field and the Marin headlands to hike with my dog

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1491    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94132  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 16:54:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Just do what you promised. San Francisco did their part making the Park self sufficient and being dog friendly has had an impact. Don't blow up a good thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1492    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 16:54:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Just do what you promised. San Francisco did their part making the Park self sufficient and being dog friendly has had an impact. Don't blow up a good thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1493    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley/Tam Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 17:22:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would love to see the anger directed toward the irresponsible dog walkers who ruin it for everyone. I am in favor of dogs being allowed in the GGNRA, with leash rules strictly enforced, even on Mill Valley residents who are above most rules since it is their backyard.

Allow dogs in Tennessee Valley, on leash. Please cite those walking dogs off leash. Even MV residents.

Require those walking dogs to be in possession of a plastic bag, or bag of feces. No bag, get a citation. Oh, you left it at the bottom of the trail to get later? Sorry! Here is you ticket, Yoga Pants. I see many bags of feces at trailheads that sit for days. If only I could identify the entitled person who left it....

Just like the CHP puts out sobriety checkpoints, I would love to see rangers do regular, unannounced citations of off leash dog walkers. Let the word get around that one will get cited for breaking the rules, even if you have a full Lulu Lemon outfit.

I love dogs, and am a life long owner of dogs. But I don't support the right of anyone to allow their dog on sensitive trail areas, off leash, endangering hikers and bikers, jumping on children, terrifying wildlife, etc. I dont care if your dog is friendly, loves kids, doesn't bite, etc., if he is off leash, the potetial for random mayhem, fecal deposits and increased animosity and strain among fellow users of our precious resources is too high.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1494    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94146  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Dog Days by the Bay Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and dog walker, I feel like it's really important to continue to allow dogs to be off leash at Fort Funston and other parks and beaches in and around San Francisco, CA. Off leashing dogs allows them to play fetch and run to get exercise and as long as the dogs are well behaved, this privilege should not be taken away. Banning off leash will force overcrowding in small fenced dog parks which is not safe and when I walk off leash at the beach I arc around other packs to prevent incidents which isn't possible at fenced dog parks. Banning off leash would negatively affect dog owners and the dog walking industry.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1495    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Erik Larson Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and the surrounding trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Dogs are part of the character of this national treasure, and the outdoor life style of Marin and the Bay Area in general.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1496    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94146  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Dog Days by the Bay Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 18:51:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and dog walker, I feel like it's really important to continue to allow dogs to be off leash at Fort Funston and other parks and beaches in and around San Francisco, CA. Off leashing dogs allows them to play fetch and run to get exercise and as long as the dogs are well behaved, this privilege should not be taken away. Banning off leash will force overcrowding in small fenced dog parks which is not safe and when I walk off leash at the beach I arc around other packs to prevent incidents which isn't possible at fenced dog parks. Banning off leash would negatively affect dog owners and the dog walking industry.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1497    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 20:58:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA regulations say that: Visitors to the park are responsible for knowing and abiding by those rules. This webpage is intended to help people learn about the rules that protect them and their park. Further information is available in publications such as the park's newspaper and from park rangers at headquarters and at the visitor centers throughout the park. On this issue alone, without even considering the environmental degradation of 100's of dogs running in every direction leaving feces and especially repulsive dog feces bags everywhere, this rule is rarely abided by dog owners and I've never seen it enforced. This has lead me to experience deep fear, discomfort, and embarrassing moments when I should be in a hoped for peaceful, commune with nature. Instead dogs have chased me, attacked me, growled at me, bared their fangs at me - not just large canines but small nasty ones as well. I owned and lived on a working sheep and horse ranch for 10 years. I had between 4-6 dogs at any given moment. They were trained to round up sheep. I have many years of experience as a dog owner. I know when voice command works because I used it and my dogs listened or my flock was doomed. There is a complete lack of voice command at the Fort Funston to Ocean Beach area. There are dog fights on a daily basis. Dogs trespass beyond the fence barriers and the owners do not care nor do they control their charges.

I go to walk as early as possible to avoid the hordes but this is no longer the GGNRA format of beautiful natural wilderness, wildlife, flora. This is a dog toilet filled with careless, dog owners and many dangerous dogs.

Please contact me if you need further clarification. I am available to speak on behalf of returning the GGNRA back to its goal of providing city folk with a beautiful natural habitat for ALL to enjoy - not a feces-filled destroyed, empty, wasteland.

jadeinsf@gmail.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1498    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,24,2014 21:03:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have read the Draft Dog Management plan in its entirety. As a homeowner and full-time resident near one of the trail heads under consideration, I firmly encourage the National Park Service to adopt Alternative A - No Action. As a frequent user of the trail system, I have yet to see any negative impacts or conflicts resulting from dog walkers. Many of my friends and neighbors utilize the trails on a daily basis to walk their pets. This is a core part of our community, and encourages the usage and therefore vested interest for the continued stewardship and protection of our park system. Inhibiting park access for local families, lowers our quality of life, and reduces the public interest in the continued funding of the park system itself. I do not have a dog in my household, but certainly do recognize the valuable experience dog access creates for many other park visitors.

We need to be more inclusive to promote usage of our park resources so each generation has a vested interest in maintaining and protecting these lands. If children will not even be allowed to walk their pets in GGNRA, why should they really care about protecting it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1499    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,24,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Caitlin Burkhart and I live in Oakland. I walk my dog in off leash areas in Bay Area parks every day.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for the Bay Area off leash areas because it is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.

What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describe how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be, not as a national park, which is not something that is appropriate in a crowded urban area.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Burkhart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1500    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 09:10:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

Please please keep Fort Funston open to off-leash dogs. I've taken my white golden retriever Grady there many times...it's his favorite place in San Francisco. He loves the beach; I believe all dogs do!

Our dog-walking service Active Dog Adventure Club takes pack walks at Fort Funston on a regular basis along with many others. The area is very well used and taken care of by all.

In all the times I've been to Fort Funston I've found all the dogs to be well behaved and well cared for. The dog owners have always been respectful of others and the environment, being careful to pick up after their dogs.

I urge you to preserve this jewel for the many dogs and dog owners in the San Francisco bay area.

Thank you,  
Cynthia Cadua

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1501    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 13:11:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Once a week I walk along Ocean Beach in San Francisco. I do a bit of coastal cleanup while strolling along (it is a surprisingly clean beach). I have determined that people who drink Corona beer are the least responsible, and that the laundry is not the only place where socks are lost. / Now for the issue. It is a pleasure to see people exercising their dogs. For the most part owners are responsible for cleaning up after them. However, when you come to writing up the final plan, would you please stress that cleaning up is only part of the process. The plastic bag of dog poop needs to be disposed of responsibly, preferably in a biodegradable bag, not left to be swept out to sea on the next high tide (or cleaned up by the likes of me and the others who are out there picking up refuse), or arranged as though it was an offering to the gods (believe me, I've seen this).

I've met one family with very young children who picnic first, then everyone fans out and picks up trash. The small boy digging in the sand was excited about the prospect of doing so.

People have chased me down to donate trash. Even surfers have retrieved refuse I couldn't reach without getting wet.

Good luck coming up with a plan which works for everyone.

Incidentally, I learned about this document from the "sandwich" boards along Ocean Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1502    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Miss Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Jan,25,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Miwok Trail, Coastal Trails, Muir Beach, and Oakwood Valley Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% othe Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed

---

in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

In 2011, the GGNRA tried to implement a similar plan. It was opposed in the public comments by a margin of 3 to 1. These are public lands and the GGNRA need to listen to the public.

We dog owners pay taxes and, by and large, are respectful of the environment. Don't punish, us, the majority, by a minority request.

I own a dog and I vote.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1503	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Brandon, MS 39047 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 13:41:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern;				

I do not see the need to confine the dogs whose owners are comfortable allowing them off leash. People can usually tell if their dogs are suitable for the leash free environment. I think you can trust the majority of pet owners to be responsible about their animal. The ability for dogs to run around w each other freely is a great thing for pet and owner alike. I do not currently keep any animals, but when I did I was a frequent visitor of dog parks and I believe that was the happiest I ever saw my dogs. Certain breeds are just meant to rove about, and the breeds/individuals that tend to be less social are equally less likely to be put in that situation by their owners. Dog owners are, in my experience, sensitive and compassionate individuals, who should be trusted to be responsible with their pets. Please continue to allow the owners and pets alike to roam without the ugly confines of a chain link fence.

Thank you  
Harry Crimm

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1504	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 14:03:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear National Park Service,				

My wife, dog, and I moved from Washington, DC to the Cow Hollow neighborhood of San Francisco last year. One of the main attractions to moving to this area of San Francisco was Crissy Field. We take our bulldog Stella every day to Crissy Field so she can play. Living in a condo, she does not have a chance to run around and get exercise other than the daily trip to Crissy Field. These trips also plays an important role in socializing her to other dogs (i.e., making her a friendly, well-adjusted dog) and has allowed us the chance to meet many of our new neighbors.

We were dismayed to learn that you are considering banning dogs from playing off-leash. I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the Golden Gate Recreation Area. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits in over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. Having studied the issue and travelled around the city, I cannot see any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

My understanding is that you haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. Moreover, you have not conducted any surveys on the actual demand for use by the population. I am sure if you conducted a scientific survey of the citizens who have access to the GGRA you would find: 1) a significant portion of them desire areas where their dogs can play off-leash; 2) the majority of citizens do not oppose dogs having off-leash access to 1% of the GGRA; and 3) those limited few who might have a specific objection would be willing to live with a mutually acceptable compromise position. I recommend you carry out such a survey before taking this drastic action.

A strong part of the fabric of this community is its dog-friendly locations and general love of animals. It is odd that you would consider such a draconian approach to an undefined problem that would so substantially impact this community.

It is especially shocking because your plan provides no alternative to providing city residents with one of their key demands: open spaces for them and their pets in a crowded urban environment. I could understand your approach is a large wilderness area, but this is an urban environment and without this park access, there is no reasonable alternative for us and those like us.

I also worry about the unintended economic and environmental impacts of these decisions. There are thousands of dog owners who use the GGRA every day. If they are no longer able to use this space, they may move to locations that do, which will negatively affect both real estate prices and local business. This is especially true given the fact that many pet owners are high income and highly mobile individuals or couples. Even if they don't move, they will likely drive to locations where their dogs can freely play, increasing both congestion and air pollution.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Furthermore, I understand your 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Accordingly, I strongly urge you to preserve the fabric of our community, choose Alternative A (the No Action Alternative), and allow our pets to have a tiny sliver where they can play freely.

Thank you,  
Matthew Oresman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1505	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 14:12:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Hello, my name is Cat Major and I live in San Francisco which is where I was born. My dog enjoys running along side me on the beach. He is on voice control and I CLEAN UP HIS LITTER WHEN IT HAPPENS! Please don't close the beaches to dogs. Even before I got a dog, dogs

---



added to the positive experience I had walking or running on the beach. To see a happy dog playing in the sand makes me and others happy. Thank you for not closing the beaches to dogs, especially Ocean Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1506    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 15:26:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't even own a dog, but I love going to the beach and seeing dogs and kids running and playing. There is nothing more joyful. Please don't take an important aspect of life on San Francisco beaches away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1507    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1508    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,25,2014 16:49:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it may Concern,

Dear Mayor Lee,

My name is Kelly Cytron and I live in San Francisco. I have walked my dogs on Ft. Funston, Chrissy Field & Baker Beach for the past 16 of years.

I strongly oppose the alternatives because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. I want real research, not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

This will impact our dogs because they will be restricted to walking them on the city sidewalks which is not pleasant and we will have to drive long distances if we want to let them walk off-leash.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Regards,  
Kelly Cytron

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1509	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I live in Pacifica and frequently visit Fort Funston to exercise my dog. There are no parks allowing off leash dog walking in San Mateo county.				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1510	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have a 3 year old Lab mix who is very active. We walk in many parts of the GGNRA on a regular basis, including Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Rodeo Beach and other spots. I prefer to have my dog off-leash, so that she gets enough exercise - - running, playing with other dogs, chasing a ball, etc (due to two knee surgeries, my days of running are over).				

---

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I am very disappointed that the new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1511	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	south san francisco, CA 94080 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 17:39:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My wife and I support dogs with lease in public parks. We do not own a dog and do not plan to own one. We have no problem with dogs, we love small pets. However, in public places, unleashed dogs should be avoided. On Pacifica beach a dog attacked my wife, threw her on ground and climbed on top of her while she was shouting keep the dog away. The owner of the dog lady just stood there and saying.. "oh, he is just playing with you, he is very gentle and very friendly"				

It may be true, however, we are not available to play with other peoples dog and pet them. Dogs and dog owners need to respect non-dog owners privacy.

Therefore, we will support all plans :

1. Requiring dogs on lease at all times when in public places.
2. Creating open space (enclosed) specially for dogs where dogs can be on leash.

Note: In south city, behind Safeway, there is a great dog paly area. We believe more of such places should be created with public funding.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1512	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Vallejo, CA 94590 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 18:16:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The changes to the current Dog Management Plan concern me, as a National Park going dog lover. I understand the environmental impacts, to the habitat as well as to endangered wildlife.				

---

I also support the educational pieces to this plan. I think it is important to have information specific to dog walking in the parks; and the consequences related to non-compliance.

What troubles me, and many dog walker, would be the loss of off-leash and dog access at some of the suggested sites. Dog walkers need to take their animals out daily. We need to socialize them with people and other dogs. It is a loss to society when we have anti-social companions, due to environmental restrictions.

It would be a shame to loose National Parks donations from such a large base of people, after their access has been denied.

Thank you,  
Cate

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1513	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 18:33:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Give it a rest. There are FAR more important things to worry about than coming down on dogs and dog owners.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1514	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Bruno, CA 94066 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 19:57:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	PLEASE allow us to keep our rights as dog owners to allow our pets to run freely. Local city parks are just too small to allow our dogs the exercise they need. Walking around on leash certainly doesn't tire them either. Dogs need to run free, as WE enjoy the GGNRA with our pets. I beg you to let our beloved Ft. FUNston as is!!! thank you				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1515	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Menlo Park, CA 94025 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 20:54:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern,				

---

I write to support Alternative A, specifically regarding Fort Funston, but also for every site. The "need" for action is a fiction.

The urge to add additional regulation is a knee jerk reaction and will be a costly and dangerous mistake. It cannot be the role or policy of the park service to do anything but maximize the quality of experience for all who wish to take part in the park system. I fully support setting expectations of visitors to all parks clearly. However I do not support the needless creation of laws or the make-work enforcement of those laws. The fewer the regulations, the greater the promotion of community and culture, and the better

---

trained all park personnel are in how to educate \*not\* regulate their customers, the better.

For example, instead of ruining one of the best experiences for dog lovers in the \*country\* by imposing fines, employing police, and aggravating people during what should be a relaxing and enjoyable experience. A simple sign at the entrance of Fort Funston that says "This park is for people who love dogs. If you don't love dogs, you will not enjoy this park." The idea you would try to create a space where every type of person is happy is an infantile and inane goal. People want to congregate in communities with shared expectations. Fort Funston is for dogs to run free.

I will also note that in your environmental impact statement you make no mention to the quality of life for dogs. It is an unfortunate necessity that dogs be leashed sometimes for their safety. But no dog wants to be leashed, nor is it their natural state. You seem to take the side of a tiny minority of squeaky wheel humans who want to ignore the rich cultural traditions of an area and use it as \*they\* see fit, and of course to protect the voiceless animals native to the area (which I support) but completely ignore the massive population of non-human, non-protected animals that benefit the most from the status quo.

To a dog, a walk on a leash is \*nothing\* like a walk off leash. The immense, categorical difference between the two experiences would be obvious if you simply substituted "dog" with "child." Do you, for one moment, believe that you could institute a rule where leashes for children were required? Do you think that any beach community in the world would stand for that? No. And it is only your lack of empathy (most likely to do a lack of belief in the intellectual and/or emotional capacity of canines) which lets you even consider the idea.

While the inception and perpetuation of this process disgust me deeply, I will at least take some solace (when the farcical and inevitable conclusion arises) that I did not remain silent.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1516	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 21:40:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My dog and I love walking, hiking and playing off leash. It allows him the freedom to really sniff, run, play and frolic in a way that he can't when indoors or in my small yard or on leash in on leash areas. It provides him with much needed exercise which, in turn, makes him a well behaved dog. My dog, and many dogs, are better able to socialize with humans and each other off leash. They are less protective than they are when on leash and my dog is just happier that way. He is very good at listening to my instructions. Many dogs are better behaved off leash and these areas are a precious resource for dogs in the Bay Area. There are already so many restrictions on where dogs can play off leash, please let's keep these areas for off leash fun.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1517	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94949 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 21:49:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Often I meet my son Danny and walk with him and my dog at Crissy Field along the beach. We meet many other folks with their dogs and children and it is always so sweet to experience the way we all get along, grown ups, animals and children. You rarely see a dog on leash nor does there appear to be a logical need for it. People pick up after their dogs and sometimes after the occasional overlooked doggie deposit. This walk serves so many purposes for myself and others, it is good for my mental and physical health and the socialization for all of us has a positive affect that I'm sure ripples out into what has become an increasingly negative world. I'm sure there are some folks who would like to not have any animals on the beach, why not reserve a section of the beach for them and a section for those of us who want to continue to walk our dogs off leash.

Thank you for allowing this space and extended time to comment.

Adrienne Ames

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1518	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	ROIworks Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 22:01:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Off leash areas currently represent 1% o the total available land so it's unclear why this would need to be reduced. Even if you don't like dogs, or don't have a dog, you can still use the other 99% o the land and not be bothered by any wayward canines. Dogs need to be able to go off-leash and run free sometimes - and its cruel to spend your whole life sitting, laying, or running on a leash. Have you ever seen the pure joy an animal has when it runs free? I am 100% oposed to this plan.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1519	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sacramento , CA 95842 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,25,2014 22:56:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** My black German Shepard and I love playing frisbee in parks and restricting us to do so would be wrong, I pay my share in taxes which goes to parks and to take my right away to do so would be unfair and unjust, you put restrictions on us you might as well close up all parks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1520	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 01:04:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I am not a dog-owner and do not expect to be one in the foreseeable future. I visit San Francisco's parks frequently as a hiker and lover of nature and wildlife.

Yet I oppose the plan to restrict dogs and support the No Action alternative. Here's why:

1) People walking dogs are among the most ubiquitous users of the parks, particularly during the off-peak

---

hours. Frequently, I visit a park to find only dog-people and maybe joggers. Joggers race by, often with ear-buds, internally focused. Dogs and their people walk slowly and pay attention. By doing this, they make the parks safer for everyone - especially lone older hikers like me.

2) San Francisco has a large number of dogs, and the number can only be expected to grow as people focus on the health and emotional benefits of pet ownership. All these dogs need to be exercised, twice a day. All dogs need off-leash time. Dogs that don't get off-leash play do not get properly socialized, any more than children would who are never allowed out from behind their desks. We need city dogs to be better socialized, not less so. Obviously, dogs do need to be under control. Existing leash laws should be sufficient to achieve this, together with a stronger dog-owner education campaign.

3) If areas where dogs can be allowed are restricted, it makes those areas less safe for others, while overcrowding the remaining parks. Restrictions in the GGNRA will inevitably push the dog population into the city parks in larger numbers. This seems counterproductive on every level.

4) There's no evidence that dogs do any damage to wildlife or the environment. While a few anecdotal tales are produced about dogs attacking birds or animals, this is a vanishingly small number compared to the ordinary threats these birds and animals face from natural predators, from habitat loss due to "Native Plant Restoration" or from normal urban risks - glass windows, moving cars, windmills.

5) GGNRA, and by extension, the Parks, lose the support of the public if they lose sight of the needs of the public. The users of the parks are its potential allies - the people who vote to support, who fund-raise, who come to the defense of the National Park system when it's threatened. Making policies that turn them off is bad not just for those with dogs, but for all of us who care about the environment and want others to care about it too. Many people feel their comments earlier were not considered in preparing this SEIS.

The biggest threat is definitely not dogs or dog owners; it's that people will drift away from our parks, and then wonder why such a huge piece of valuable real estate is sitting there doing nothing much. As someone who cares about saving our parks for generations to come, this in itself is one of the most negative aspects of the plan.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1521	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Address:</b>	private, San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America						
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual						
<b>Affiliation:</b>							
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello Golden Gate Park Recreation Area Committee,						

I'm writing because I've noticed the off-leash advocates all over facebook asking people to send you comments and I'd like to do so, but in favor of keeping dogs on-leash.

Of course people should be able to play catch with their dogs, but not everywhere. I don't appreciate dogs running at me out of nowhere (like, on trails), I don't like them running over my beach blanket, or eating my picnic.

My last bad experience was this summer having a dog urinate on my umbrella at Crissy Field and the owner didn't even notice. We just have so many people as it is that use these popular places that adding

dogs and people's inattention to the mix causes a real pain.

I'm not sure my annoyance is a reason to vote in favor of leash laws, but certainly if there's some environmental harm there is.

I think that dog-lovers and dogs should have their own large areas, but keep them on short leashes in the popular people places.

Thanks for your time and good luck with all the comments.

Please also hold my information from public review.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1522	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94605 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 07:40:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Hello. Even though we live in the East Bay, we still frequent the GGNRA parks. My dog's favorite place in the whole world is Fort Funston. That place couldn't be more perfect for dogs, especially down on the beach, as the cliffs make perfect natural fences. There are plenty of places out there that do not allow dogs off leash and very few that do. Dogs, just like humans need to run, jump, spin around, and play. Movement is life. Without these activities, life quality and expectancy are drastically reduced. As a student at Life Chiropractic College West, I truly understand the magnitude of this. As a pet parent, we can only do so much on leash for them. My dog is way faster and way more agile than me, so playing with him off leash is the only opportunity he has to be very active. Please don't take away Charlie Doodle's favorite place to run and play.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1523	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 09:00:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern;  
My name is Len Carella and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Fort Funston and Crissy Field for the past three of years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for these places because it is too restrictive. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo



County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, I oppose these new rules because they would cause great hardship to me and my dog. I would have to drive long distances to take my dog to a place where he could get the kind of off leash exercise he needs on a daily basis. Dogs that do not get enough exercise are problematic but when they are properly exercised they are a benefit to the larger community. Please do not make dogs and their human companions suffer because of your unfair and unnecessary new rules.

Sincerely,  
Len Carella

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1524	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 09:23:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't punish all dogs and dog owners with the no off leash law. Punish only irresponsible owners by citations and fines.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1525	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95125 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 09:33:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My husband and I have a dog and as such we plan accordingly. We almost always vacation in places where we can take our dog with us. Several times a year we have mini vacations (weekend stays) in San Francisco largely due to the abundance of off leash areas in which we are able to relax with our dog. If the off leash areas are removed from San Francisco we will be less likely to go to San Francisco and spend our money there. If off leash areas are removed we will be more likely to take our tourist business to other cities like Carmel by the sea.				

In the Bay Area the majority of the outdoor recreation areas are there for people with out dogs to enjoy. Despite the fact that so many of us have dogs and would like the option of bringing our dogs with us. We hear all the time how important it is to socialize dogs so the do not become dangerous threats. If the places that we socialize disapear how will anyone be able to do the right thing? Won't that increase the number reports of injury caused by dogs when they are in public.

Please don't remove the off leash dog areas from S.F. Parks & Recreation.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1526	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san jose, CA 95112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 09:57:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** We need more off-leash dog parks and beaches, not less! Many dog owners live in apartments or condos with no yard and dogs deserve their intrinsic right to run free! Would you want to live your life on a leash at all times? Some dog owners are irresponsible, but do not punish all dogs for human error.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please reconsider punishing dogs for bad human behavior.

Thank you!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1527	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 10:25:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please change nothing. If you restrict access we tax-paying dog owners will have no place to walk our dogs. Unelected officials who do not have to answer to citizens should not have this kind of power to take parks away from dog owners. Change nothing to current laws.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1528	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 10:45:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, General Superintendent Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Fort Mason, Bldg 201, San Francisco, CA 94123-0022 Attn: SEIS				

I am concerned about the changes suggested in the GGNRA 2013 SEIS which drastically reduce the off-leash areas available to domestic dogs. There are very few places in the undeveloped areas of the county, GGNRA or otherwise, where dogs can legally explore off-leash. Surely in a county of this size and with so much undeveloped area there must be SOME places where a dog can, well, just be a dog. Yes, we have our dog parks but saying that dogs can get all the exercise they need there is like saying that we humans can get all the exercise we need at the county's numerous gyms and that all we need to see of wild animals can be seen in a zoo. Technically true, but it is just not the same as an outdoor ramble which provides exercise for the spirit as well as the body.

I understand that we humans must live in harmony with are non-human neighbors, but can't there be some balance here? We make accommodation for cows, horses, and other 'domesticated' animals, as well as for species completely out of numerical whack due to human intervention - deer, turkeys, raccoons, skunks, big cats, feral cats, etc. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL (not wildlife preservation) opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area.

It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Surely the Recreation Area which accommodates human impact from ranches and restaurants can accommodate reasonable off-leash areas for Man's Best Friend as well.

David McConnell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1529    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 10:56:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not end off leash dog areas. It would be utterly devastating.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1530    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94104  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 10:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Of the proposals, I feel strongly that the dogs should be required to be on-leash throughout the park system. From my experience, dog owners do not pay attention to the granularity of specific regions being off leash vs on leash. If they see dogs off leash in a certain area, they'll feel like the entire park is off leash. Another important item will be actually enforcing the on-leash requirement. It seems every time I'm at Crissy Field, I see a dog off leash and out of owner's control terrorizing the birds in the lagoon. Unfortunately for the small percentage of responsible dog owners, the majority of dog owners cannot control their dogs, and do not think about on vs. off leash areas; if they see another dog off leash they assume their dog can also be off leash. I've also noticed an explosion in the number of dogs in the city, so we need to lock this down.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1531    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Cupertino, CA 95014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 11:05:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it may concern. For those who love and understand animals, they are beautiful social beings. We as dog owners use these public places to let them enjoy socializing as much as we humans do. Now granted there are people who are afraid to venture out into the public and choose not to interact socially, but that is their choice. Unfortunately dogs do not. Like young children, dogs need a lot of supervision and attention to nurture a healthy mental and emotional being. Of course a dog can survive strictly living within the compound of ones home, but a child could also be locked in a closet and physically survive. As for their mental state of mind.... Children whom have been isolated have difficulties getting reintroduced into society due to the lack of development. We can get into the debate on why man domesticated the dog, but ultimately remember that it is an "animal" and has more natural animal instincts and has the need to run and have moments to be free. It's no different then seeing a rehabilitated animal being re-released back into the wild. The mental state changes and you can see their need to escape captivity. They (dogs) are animalsâ€ we owe it to themâ€ It's not like they have a choice.

---

It is our responsibility as humans to take care of what we can control. That is why this decision is so important.

Thank you for your time,  
Aki Yoshikawa  
Professional Dog Trainer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1532    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-4117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Doggie Do Right Dog Training Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Sue Minsuk and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dogs on Crissy Field for the past 16 years. I belong to Dog Connect SF Bay Area & Dog Pro Network

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for (name the area or areas) because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, As my own dogs age they prefer a smaller city park experience and if the GGNRA areas become even more restricted our city parks will become over run.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1533    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Newark, CA 94560  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Bay Area German Shepherds Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 11:16:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need more off leash areas not less. Sate and county parks are already off limits. I spend thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours training my dog. Our orginazation with over 250 members stand strong in not reducing the areas that we can visit. We already have to go to the same areas over and over. 98% o the people we come into contact are amazed about how well we are organized, and how well our dogs behave. Off leash areas should increase not the opposite. Thank you very much. This is very very important.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1534    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 11:19:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love bringing my dog on hikes at Funston, and allowing her to swim at the beach. It provides me with great exercise, and the children really do love playing with her. Please keep off-leash alive in SF!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1535    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I live close to the Presidio and enjoy off-leash walking with my dog, Wendy, on Baker Beach, in the Presidio, and along Crissy Field. My dog walker takes her to Fort Funston every day during the work week to get needed exercise and stimulation.

The Preferred Alternative is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the

GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Finally, the plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

I urge you to reject the current plan and to adopt the original 1979 Pet Policy which was affirmed as legal and the current law of the land by Federal Judge William Alsup in 2005.

Thank you,

Melanie Loftus

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1536	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 11:36:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thanks for taking the necessary steps to preserve our shared resources city park resources from both an environmental and practical perspective. I doubt it's much fun going up against San Francisco's vocal and solipsistic dog owners, but I applaud your efforts. Stay strong :)				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1537	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 11:39:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Mayor Lee,				

As a 15 year resident and conscientious dog owner I object to the GGNRA's plans to restrict access to public recreation areas to dog walking. The GGNRA's charter is to protect and maintain the city's urban recreation areas for use by all its inhabitants. Pet policy was explicitly addressed in 1979, and I ask that they honor that commitment. Their plan would leave only 7 remaining RAs that allow. Most San Franciscans do not live within walking distance to these remaining few, and if we did those parks would potentially be overburdened with dogs (if indeed that were possible, which the proposed GGNRA restrictions would seem to suggest)

These parks are important to the health San Francisco's dogs. Being that we dog owners take every opportunity to walk with our dogs, these restrictions would effectively ban us human residents as well from these parks.

I would propose an alternative of higher fines and penalties for abuses of these important places. If

maintenance cost is cited as the largest issue then perhaps a small license fee to be able to walk dogs in the parks. For instance, a \$5 per year additional fee for stamp on a dog license. Even the simple requirement that the dog be licensed to enter the RAs at all would likely result in an increased rate of dog licensing, funds from which could help maintain them.

I ask that you evaluate the lack of substance supporting the dog restrictions and lack of studies concerning the impact to the rest of SF neighborhoods when evaluating your support of these GGNRA policy changes.

Sincerely,  
Tim Dietz  
19 Woodward St  
San Francisco, CA 94103

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1538	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Elizabeth Hudson and I live in San Francisco. I have been walking my dogs on Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Baker Beach and Ocean Beach for the past 16 of years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for these areas because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, the proposed new regulations will force me to use my car and drive long distances to walk my dog (who is solidly under voice-control) off leash, and will cut down on the time I spend with my family enjoying this outdoor space. The interests of responsible dog owners who clean up after themselves and their dog, and who respect the environment around them should be considered along with the scientific concerns.

Sincerely,  
Elizabeth Hudson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1539	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94942 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative, it is too restrictive and punishes responsible dogs and owners. I support the formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo, San Francisco, Marin Counties and any new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround off leash areas they just end up being pens and lead to problems between owners and dogs. I oppose the Monitoring Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash rules just because some folks think not enough people are complying with the leash rules. I oppose any regulations that prohibit off leash dog walking on trails, beaches in GGNRA and any new areas acquired by the GGNRA. Dogs who are under voice control of owners should be allowed to be off leash anywhere in the GGNRA or future areas acquired by the GGNRA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1540    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 12:42:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I regularly take my dogs to Crissy Field for a good run up and down the beach. It is the safest place to play fetch and I've never had a problem with other dogs or dog owners. Everyone is respectful of one another and the dogs are happy. Please do not take this lovely spot away from us. I have been spending time at Crissy Field since the early 1980's, first as a windsurfer and now as a dog owner. It is my favorite place in the world! Thank you for listening. With sincerity, Maureen Morgan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1541    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 13:25:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love taking my dog to Fort Funston and to other parks in the bay area. Pretty much everyone I ever see at Fort Funston is there to let their dogs play on the beach. I cannot believe that you are even considering such a ban. Please repeal this planned law immediately!

Taking my dog to Fort Funston and other such parks is so important to my mental and physical wellbeing. It is how my dog and I get our exercise, and seeing my dog run free brings me such joy. I know there are many others like me who feel the same way but may not even know this ban is being discussed. I was not aware until this morning and at first I thought it was a joke! How is this even possible! So many parks restrict dogs, please do not take away the ones that allow them! They mean so much to me and many others.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1542    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 13:46:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** It's not fair to remove the right for dogs to be off the leash. It has been this way since these beautiful places became open to the public. There is nothing a dog loves more than running around in the ocean or playing on the beach. Don't take this right from us dog owners! Please do not ban dogs from being off leash in the Bay Area!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1543    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Dogs are a part of our families and fortunately are a reason many people enjoy the outdoors and exercise regularly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1544    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 15:02:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not let a few ill behaved dogs spoil it for the rest of us. The beaches and trails of Marin are, in large part, why we are here!  
Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1545    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

My name is Emma Allison and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Fort Funston for the past 2 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, even though we live in a city, dogs still need a place to run and expend energy to make for a safer and happy dog in more dense areas. My dog goes to Ft. Funston 5 days a week with a dog walker, provides jobs for SF dog walkers, and also helps to get me out in nature and explore some of the most beautiful areas of the Bay.

Sincerely,  
Emma Allison

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1546	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110-5743 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 15:20:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Walking dogs has become a major source of employment in SF, and with 200k dogs in the city, this profession is guaranteed to increase....so having large open spaces for dogs to run and play offleash is crucial for the dogs exercise regimen and subsequently their parents sanity....what ive seen mostly at these offleash areas are responsible dog walkers who pick up after their dogs, keep them on leash when necessary and follow along with good dog etiquette....so please keep these areas open for offleash dogs, drastically reducing the unrestricted areas would be a serious blow to our citys well being				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1547	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 15:33:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	First of all, the fact that the dog plan is over 1500 pages in length abusrd. It is angering that our tax dollars are misappropriated in this folly.				

These are urban parks and in urban areas a large percentage of the people utilizing them are dog owners.

I walk my dog almost everyday at Mori Point, she is on leash and I pick up her poop. I pick up trash off the beach every day I walk on the beach. I have even removed tires from the surfline. I utilize the Mori point beach with my children almost very weekend. Yesterday we built a large castle on the beach all with found driftwood, stones, feathers, and shells. Our dog stayed with us and played for 2-3 hours. The

thought that my access to Mori point will be limited by a a crew of governmental bureaucrats is beyond infuriating.

The GGNRA is utilized by many people. Restrictions on the number of dogs people are walking are entirely reasonable. Restrictions on responsible dog owner such as myself is completely inappropriate.

These restrictions and the dog plan should be thrown out in its entirety. The organization or individuals that wasted our tax dollars in compiling it should be fired.

Sincerely,  
Rob West, DVM

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1548	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	pcs Consulting Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Lyle Sweeney and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Crissy Field and Fort Funston for the past 5 years.				

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for GGNRA because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

If owners are not following rules, then set up self funding patrols that incur steep fines that will self fund on-going patrols. If a single patrol can fine 1-3 people per day at \$500 per incident, that would be more than self funding.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, as a resident of San Francisco without a yard, I will lose the few options I have left to go out and enjoy recreation with my dog. These restrictive measures are helping rich people who can afford large houses with large yards.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1549	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 15:50:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This policy change is an unacceptable restriction on the lives of dog owners and dog walkers. There are more dogs than children in this city, and they depend on exercise for good behavior just like we do. Eliminating off-leash areas for dogs to run will result in higher bite incidents, more				

---

euthanasia of problem animals, and lower mental health for dogs and dog owners alike.

There is literally no positive reason to restrict the major dog walking areas (Fort Funston, Chrissy Field, Marin Headlands, Ocean Beach), particularly considering that any major environmental impacts from dogs occurred long, long ago.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1550    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Change.org Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 15:53:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not pass this. We must keep the area off leash for dogs. Do not implement restrictions. Dog owners are the ones who take the best care of the beach - cleaning up after others and keeping it safe given the additional people in parks and beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1551    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 16:33:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off leash play keeps our dog happy, healthy, and in a calm and relaxed state. She needs it and we need it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1552    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Andrea Flynn and I live in Mill Valley. I walk my dog on the Miwok, Oakwood, Fort Funston, and many other beautiful trails for the past 12 years. It is one of the big reasons I love living here.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Marin Headlands and Muir Beach because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science, not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, parks and recreation struggles daily with the high demands on the community fields. As parents of children in multiple sports, we see that this is a real land management issue, and redirecting the families and pets out of the hills, these fields come under greater strain.

Sincerely,

Andrea Flynn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1553    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Whistler, UN V0N 1B2  
Canada

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 16:46:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Just saw on [www.dogtrekker.com](http://www.dogtrekker.com) that dog access will be severely limited soon in SF's Golden Gate parks. We have avoided travelling in California in the past due to what we felt were too stringent dog restrictions. We recently found the [www.dogtrekker.com](http://www.dogtrekker.com) web site and have started to change our minds...there appear to be lots of great hikes and places to visit WITH a dog...particularly in the East Bay Area. We always travel south for a 1 or 2 month camping trip in Oct. - Nov and head to set up base camp in areas that are dog friendly....if you changes your dog rules in the golden gates area we won't be visiting. Please keep your parks dog friendly!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1554    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My partner and I adopted our dog, Dunkin, almost three years ago. We moved to San Francisco from Boston not too long ago and immediately fell in love with how "dog friendly" SF is compared to Boston. Dunkin has a lot of energy, loves playing and running on the beach and trails. We frequent many of the parks that could be affected by this project. Well behaved and trained dogs should have the right to run freely. You can't play frisbee on a leash! I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please keep San Francisco a dog friendly and dog welcoming city. So many pups and owners enjoy the beauty and nature here. It would be a shame to change that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1555    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 17:05:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I agree with the proposal to keep dogs ON LEASH in more areas of GGNRA. National parklands are for preserving wildlife and open space. The lands should not be geared for the use of a specific interest group like dog owners. My friends have seen dogs in GGNRA chasing endangered snowy plover. Most dog owners do not have sufficient voice control over dogs, and when hiking, I do not want a strange dog running up to me. Above all, if you permit rampant dog off leash areas in GGNRA, the dog owners will then ask that even more sensitive areas such as Yellowstone, Yosemite and other great national parks to be opened up, to the detriment of wildlife. Please maintain on leash rules for all national parks and recreation areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1556    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Yountville, CA 94599  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 17:50:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please consider continuing to allow dogs on Muir Beach. It is an excellent experience for people and their dogs. The ability to exercise, to socialize and to enjoy the ocean is good for dogs and their owners. There are very few places that allow dogs off leash, which is unfortunate because they can exercise better that way. In nearly 30 years of going to Muir Beach with my family and my dog(s) I have never seen a problem. Most people bring only well socialized and friendly dogs to this area. I truly appreciate the opportunity to enjoy this beach with my dog and other people. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1557    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 18:30:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not take away our off-leash areas! We need them and our dogs need them!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1558    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Carlos , CA 94070  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 18:42:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a Bay Area dog owner, it's important for us to have a place to take our dogs for recreation. It makes for a happier dog and provides an inclusive community where all recreation needs are accounted for and provided. By SEVERELY limiting the areas for recreation for dogs and their owners, you are essentially saying that this is an area that dogs are not welcomed. Isn't SF an area where everyone is welcomed and we provide recreation for everyone? I understand why some parks are off limits and why certain areas are not conducive to allowing dogs, but the new plan takes away such a LARGE amount of area- where are dogs now allowed to run free? Please reconsider this proposal as it has such a massive impact on such a large population.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1559    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 18:59:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Fort Funston and Ocean Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1560	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 19:11:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom This May Concern:				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my two dogs hiking on Mill Valley's Oakwood Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Regards,

Susie & Denis Roy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1561	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Friday Apaliski and my dog's name is Sunny Louise. Sunny is 5 years old and she grew up in San Francisco. She has graduated from three levels of obedience class and continues with training on her daily walks. Every week day she goes for an off leash walk to Fort Funston, where she follows the rules and is under voice command at all times. Every weekend my husband and I take her to Crissy Field where we let her run on the beach in the off leash area. She never goes into the fenced off protection zones. This activity is not only good for Sunny, but it's good for my husband and me too. Sunny comes home happy and calm, and we are able to enjoy our beautiful. If Sunny weren't able to join us on our walks we would go on them.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. €

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Rather, they should work on enforcement, than try to make even more restrictions that even people who want to comply won't be able to comply with.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of



needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Thank you very much for your time. I hope you'll take this matter as seriously as I do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1562    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAUSALITO, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:17:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There needs to be a few places to allow dogs off leash. If it is not provided then owners will still let dogs off leash, but spread out over many natural lands and impacting more habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1563    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:34:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Your dog off the leash policy is bullshit.. and i dont own a dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1564    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:36:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and an avid user of GGNRA trails and lands, I applaud the requirement that all dogs be on leashes. I think that you should consider not shutting down all trails listed to all dog use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1565    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:43:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** My name is Megan Price and I live in the (outer) Sunset in San Francisco. My husband and I frequently take our dog, a rescue named Tesla, to Fort Funston. Fort Funston is such a great park, for dogs and humans. We love to spend weekend mornings walking, enjoying the gorgeous views, and watching Tesla open up and run at top speed (something impossible to achieve on our leash walks). She loves these trips, and has the opportunity to get much more fresh air, exercise, and socializing with other dogs than she has an opportunity to experience on our much more efficient on-leash walks in the morning before work.

I want to formally object to the restrictions proposed in the 'preferred alternative' plan. These restrictions would essentially remove all off-leash opportunities, something of great benefit to both dogs and their humans. Dogs with the opportunity to run and socialize are much happier and better behaved. I understand that off-leash areas are hard on the local ecosystem, so I can certainly understand if the city needs to limit access to some areas. But no alternative off-leash areas have been proposed. If the suggested restrictions are put into place, alternative open spaces must be created and provided.

Additionally, many points are raised in the SEIS about the discomfort of some non-dog-owning visitors to areas frequented by dogs. Certainly, it is the responsibility of all dog owners to train their pets and to ensure that they are under control and well-behaved when out in public. Enforcement of these social norms should be expected. However, residents who are simply uncomfortable around dogs do not have special claim to access areas frequented by dogs. Just as I cannot take my dog to many public areas (state parks, beaches, etc.) these individuals could choose to frequent one of these many alternative public spaces where dogs are not allowed. I do not find these points in the SEIS to provide any compelling evidence of the need for the restrictions proposed in the 'preferred alternative plan.'

I whole heartedly support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy instead of the restrictions proposed in the 'preferred alternative plan.'

As a dog owner who frequents many areas in the GGNRA (most often Fort Funston), I hope that all of the comments submitted during this period are taken into consideration and that we are able to find a true alternative that meets the needs of the city, the local ecosystem, and all residents, including their furry friends.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1566    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:46:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Human Society of Marin estimates that there are about 90,000 dogs living in Marin. I'm told there are more dogs than are children in Marin. For many people, their dogs ARE their kids. Even if a person doesn't go quite that far, their dog is still a treasured member of their family. Dogs and kids both need outdoor, exercise time. It's healthy for their mental and physical well-being. Why does the GGNRA want to take even MORE space away from where dogs can exercise off-leash? Would the same be true if we were talking about children? The people of Marin have so many dogs - - dogs are a part of life here. I find it unimaginable that the people who live here want LESS places to go to enjoy time hiking, biking, camping, romping, swimming, picnicking, playing frisbee and ball or .....all the activities we enjoy with our dogs. And off-leash play is essential to that mix. Imagine putting your child on a leash in order to let him climb a jungle gym or go down a slide. How do you play ball with a dog on a leash? If this is truly a democratic society than let the people vote and then stick with that decision. If the people of Marin actually vote to accept less space for off-leash play for their dogs than I'll eat my words and move

---

to a more dog-friendly location. But I think the GGNRA will be eating dog biscuits instead. Take it to the people!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1567    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland , CA 94609  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:47:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't close our parks to dogs and the people who love them!!!! I drive into San Francisco every weekend to take my dog to Fort Funston, shop at the local mall, and have a meal at a local dog friendly restaurant. Without this park there will be no reason for people like me to support this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1568    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 19:52:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs need a place that they can run in the surf freely. I am opposed to Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Hoover, my Yellow Lab should have a beach that he can play and also one where i would feel comfortable going in the water with him ( preferably with my wet suit).

Muir beach has always been one of my favorite beaches because it is a Dog friendly beach. I really like what you have done with the renovations/restorations but the dogs need a place. It was just beautiful today and Hoover played in the surf.

Please don't restrict this beach.

Thanks you

George Hill

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1569    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94949  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 20:16:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We enjoy the GGNRA with our dog, there are not many other places for us to go.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1570    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 20:40:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We love and use Fort Funston on a weekly basis. It would be a travesty to loose this public park as an off-leash area.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1571    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 21:09:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I was very dismayed to hear about the proposed plan to remove off-leash capabilities from the GGNRA. While there are a number of form letters out there to copy, I'd rather not waste your time rehashing the studies and evidence supporting a pro-dog position; rather, I just want to relate my experience. I have been to many parts of the GGNRA with my dog many times, probably at least a hundred trips over the past few years; dogs off-leash are very common, and it lets them explore the wilderness and be free. I have during this time never seen a single owner fail to clean up after their dog, nor have I seen any incident where a dog accosted a person or wildlife (the wildlife areas are already segregated and I see nobody being disrespectful with their dog).

I simply don't see what harm the dogs are causing to anyone, and they are immensely happy to run around and enjoy nature and interact with each other. My two most common trips are to Crissy Field and the Marin Headlands, and it's always wonderful to watch my dog scamper around the trails.

I urge you to reconsider this plan and keep GGNRA the wonderful place for both dogs and humans to play as it is today.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1572    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 21:11:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please maintain current off-leash dog areas!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1573    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 21:21:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dogs are the lowest on the totem pole. Dogs are unwanted! However 50% o SF households have dogs. You cannot deny them. You worry about people who do not have dogs, you worry about tourists, you worry about wildlife, you worry about that all other recreational activities have space enough. But the GGRP does not worry about dogs,

if the needs of the dogs are not met and seen, they will become very unhappy. Dogs need space to run, dogs need the free run, not being leashed and restricted, or being in a backyard only. Dogs need the free run and the fun.

Dogs on leashes are more aggressive, dogs who do not have adequate socialization and free run are unhappy, Unhappy animals are aggressive.

Fort Funston, is great. I love FF and my dog as well. If off leash areas are restricted as you plan, it will be overcrowded in the areas where we can actually keep them off leash. You set up problems, dog aggressions will increase.

We need more off leash areas in the city and in parks around, more opportunities for peaceful dogs/dog owners to enjoy nature. We have the right! you want to take if from us. I disagree.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1574 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 21:58:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You elimanate those parks and we won't have anywhere to take our animals. Spend the money educating dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1575 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 22:07:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep some areas open for off-leash dog activities in San Francisco. I believe we can all get along. Will you be banning off-leash horses too?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1576 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san mateo, CA 94403

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to multiple areas of the GGRA. I love going to new areas and bringing my pal along with me. Without her I wouldn't be motivated to visit new areas of the GGRA.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin and surrounding county residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1577	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 22:18:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't ban off leash areas! This is one of the few places my dog can actually run and get enough exercise. We enjoy exercising together. Off leash trails and beaches are the main reason I continue to live in Marin.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1578	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 22:20:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not limit the off leash areas in San Francisco - it is one of the reasons we LOVE this City. The dogs are well behaved and the owners respect the areas we can use - it would be devastating to the city to restrict these areas.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1579	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacific, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,26,2014 22:25:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please reconsider the off leash ban in San Francisco locations. I currently walk my dog routinely at Fort Funston and always bring my toddler daughter with me. I have never once been concerned for the safety of my dog or daughter. I believe having off leash areas is essential to the development of dogs as well. If all off leash areas are reduced we will likely start seeing even more dogs				

---

in shelters with temperament issues due to lack of socialization. People who walk dogs at Fort Funston also arrange monthly cleanup. Additionally using resources to enforce leash laws would take away from other more important social issues that could be addressed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1580    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 22:30:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Imagine if 90% srt clubs will be shot down and no much other places to exersize for us.  
That is how it is important to have open dog area's for running and exersize.  
It's health of our beloved pets we are talking about! Please be kind to all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1581    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Jeremy Hughes and I live in San Francisco. I regularly walk my dog in golden gate park, chrissy field, fort funston and ocean beach for the past 9 years. My dog is a golden retriever and has never harmed a thing except for possibly a tennis ball. On leash would prevent my dog from doing what is innate in him... retrieving and swimming& not easy to do while on leash, no?

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for all areas of GGNRA because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, this is going to impact me and my work schedule and well being because I will be having to get into my car and drive long distances to walk my dog or not going out on walks with your family because you can't take your four-legged friend etc., feeling like my dog doesn't have anywhere to run free, etc.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1582    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 23:14:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow dogs to roam in open areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1583    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Millbrae, CA 94030  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,26,2014 23:39:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't restrict dogs at fort funston.

I've been going there for years and there is no reason to restrict at that location

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1584    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:01:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** WTF IS THE deal with Hating on the doggies? When have any huge problems occurred. Show me the data.. usually dogs on leash have more aggression.. Seriously you guys are out of control

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1585    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 08:28:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been a resident of SF for 21 years and always appreciated the city for its diversity and love for not only humans but as well as animals. I do not support the banning of off-leash here in SF. My dogs and I will be affected by this. My neighborhood is crowded and I do not have a back yard or a front yard for my dog to run around freely and play. The street I live on is busy with traffic sp I never let my Happy run around in the neighborhood. I take her to Fort Funston and Ocean beach because it is open and big enough for her to run freely with other dogs. Please do not ban off-leash dogs because I feel like she would always be on the leash aside from home where her space is too small. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1586    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 09:12:21

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA,

The areas you are trying to restrict are RECREATIONAL areas, not national parks. By restricting the use of these lands, you are forcing dog owners to flock to smaller urban parks, which will cause overcrowding and congestion in the neighborhoods these parks are in. We live in the outer sunset and during the federal furlough when Fort Funston was closed, we saw Pine Lake Park inside Stern Grove get jam-packed with dogs & people - - just awful.

By restricting these parks, you are also limiting the amount of exercise pet owners get when they take their dogs for a walk. For example, the loop my husband and I walk at Fort Funston every day is just under two miles of various topography. In addition to it being a great workout, we love coming here WITH OUR OFF LEASH DOG, to take in the scenery (it never gets old).

Please leave these recreational areas as they are today - - off leash to dogs.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1587	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Eric Plumb and I live in San Francisco. I take my dog Chewie to Golden Gate Park, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, Fort Funston, and various other local parks all the time. I would love to be able to continue doing so.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for (name the area or areas) because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

On a personal note, Chewie and I both thoroughly enjoy long romps on the gorgeous beaches and trails in the Bay Area. We are obedient of and respectful of off- vs. on-leash areas and of wildlife. While I understand the need to protect other species, I would need to see convincing studies such as those mentioned above before I became convinced that a proposal such as this was in the best interests of the community as a whole. Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,  
Eric Plumb

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1588    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 09:55:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to muir beach

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1589    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Mariano Peterson and I live in Daly City. I walk my dog at Fort Funston for the past 4 years, and my dog before that at Fort Funston for 12 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

These restrictions reduce the scarce resources my family, children, and I have to enjoy outdoor space together with our family dog. Please help keep San Francisco a family and pet friendly place by preserving the right to explore open areas with our pets.

Sincerely,  
Mariano Peterson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1590    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 10:33:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Why should dogs be excluded or leashed in open space areas? Where can one exercise a dog that is NOT a dog park? Dog owners deserve to spend quality time exercising their dogs (and themselves) and not have to be fenced into a bare-dirt lot. More and more public areas are becoming dog-friendly; such as the Town Center, Corte Madera Mall, San Anselmo Avenue (and other town areas). As long as a dog owner or walker has a leash to contain their dog(s) if necessary, bags to clean up after them, and the dog is controlled whether on a leash or not, they should be welcomed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1591 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 10:50:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The federal land belongs to the people of the United States. Dog walking is a vital part of the Marin/San Francisco communities. It is good for the dog and good for the dog owners. We dog owners need designated areas in which to bring our dogs for fresh air and exercise. The plan to restrict these areas is unacceptable. There are plenty of other protected areas that dogs are not allowed. We need our share of dog friendly areas on NPS land (which again is paid for with taxpayer dollars).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1592 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 10:50:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and the marin headlands.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1593 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 11:16:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs need a place to be dogs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1594    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 11:20:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are very few beaches left near San Francisco that allow dogs to run free. Taking away the public's right to allow well behaved dogs to experience the beauty of California Beaches without being inhibited by leases is part of the joy of the experience. National Park Service should encourage complete families (including dogs) in their invitation to visit. Restricting dog access to these beaches may mean a reduction on visits by the public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1595    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Mark Kater and I live in San Francisco. I've been walking my dog at Fort Funston for the past 5 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I've always loved how dog-friendly San Francisco is, but I would go so far as to say that I'd consider moving out of the city, if I can't let my dog run around off-leash anymore. It's a plan that doesn't solve any problems, it only creates them!

Sincerely,

Mark Kater

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1596    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 11:31:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Additionally, in the SEIS the GGNRA asserts they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" as utilized in its enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI and the GGNRA's first Superintendent, the Honorable William J. Whalen, in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA.

The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it, e.g. the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management. Alternatively, for sites heavily utilized by dogs and their guardians, such as Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1597    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94159  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** concern citizen Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

Concern Citizen  
Shiufan Lee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1598    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 11:46:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to GGNRA trails and Marin County beaches

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. I and countless other Marin and SF residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1599    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Belvedere, CA 94920  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 11:54:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir beach, on the coastal trail and Miwok trail. I have been a resident of Marin County for over 50 years and I hold my doggy trips to Muir Beach and Marin's trails sacred.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1600    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** fairfield, CA 94534  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 12:12:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Please retain the 1979 pet policy! I travel one hour to get to Muir beach just so I can let my minature poodle run free and have a wonderful time, just as I do at Muir beach. We only stay an hour or so. It is the closest place I know of to be able to do this on the beach. We have never run into ANY trouble with other people or dogs, please don't take this away from us.  
Thank you, Susan Shoger and Molly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1601    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Fremont, CA 94539  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Wally and I live in Fremont. I walk my dog on fort funston for the past 3 of years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for fort funston because it is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.

What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describe how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be, not as a national park, which is not something that is appropriate in a crowded urban area.

And finally, (please state in your own words how the restrictions will impact your life- examples may be having to get into your car and drive long distances to walk your dog or not going out on walks with your family because you can't take your four-legged friend etc.)

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1602    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Kristen Trubey and I live in Hayes Valley, San Francisco. I have walked my dog on Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and Ft Funston for the past four years.

I strongly oppose the proposed changes to the GGNRA Pet Policy (off leash walking) for all three of these areas because they are too restrictive. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

More than 50% oSan Francisco residents have dogs. For the health and happiness of the dogs, and the people that care for them, please work against this unfair and over-restrictive policy. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Kristen Trubey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1603 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 12:56:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Ocean Beach is a wonderful resource for many types of people, and home to a number of species, including the snowy plover. I understand that there are many competing needs to be accommodated. However, NPS' preferred alternative seems completely unwarranted and unfair. Banning leashed dogs from Ocean Beach between Sloat and Stairway 21 will deprive hundreds of dog owners and their dogs of daily exercise and enjoyment. I am on the beach almost every day (I live across from it), with my dog. I see dozens of regular dog walkers & runners, surfers, walkers, dog-less runners and fishermen; less frequently, I see families with children, homeless people, sunbathers, partiers, etc. On gloomy days, which are frequent, however, the beach is deserted but for people with dogs and surfers. My observations are obviously anecdotal, and I do not have data to back them up. But based on my experience, the preferred NPS alternative will have a disproportionate impact on dogs and their owners, and a minimal impact on those people who only occasionally use the beach. Are there dog owners who fail to prevent their dogs from chasing birds or jumping on others? Yes, I've seen them. But the vast majority of people who walk their dogs on Ocean Beach respect the seasonal leash laws or have their dogs under tight voice control. If NPS wants to protect the snowy plover, it can enforce the existing leash laws and hand out hefty tickets to deter further infractions. Banning dogs entirely just seems unfair to all the people whose dogs are well-behaved. The days Ocean Beach is most trashed is after a sunny day has drawn crowds who do not value and respect the beach. I, and other dog owners, love and respect the beach. We try to take care of it, not just by cleaning up after our own dogs, but by cleaning up after others and carrying trash off the sand and dunes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1604 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 12:57:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider further restricting dog access to public lands. The focus should be on helping people learn to responsibly manage their dogs and be respectful of these public lands not on banning them. Please continue to allow access to the current dog friendly areas and let us all enjoy our lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1605    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 13:05:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep rules around dogs on-leash at Ocean Beach. Around the middle of the beach which is not patrolled often, its disturbing to watch pet owners stand idly by and let their dogs chase the Snowy Plovers in their own protected habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1606    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 13:27:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to thank the National Park Service for the thorough and thoughtful manner in which they've addressed this sensitive and contentious topic, as well as thanking them for their work to maintain some of the most beautiful places in this country despite decades of underfunding.

I walk in GGNRA lands several times each week. I support the use and enjoyment of these places by all, but I do not believe any one group has a "right" to their preferred use. People that fish for crabs at Crissy Field are subject to regulation. People who want to mountainbike can only do so on certain trails. I have no right to pick wildflowers when I walk at Mori Point. And people with dogs do not have a "right" to walk those dogs off-leash.

I support restricting off-leash dog-walking and regulating commercial dog-walking; I also support a strong and well-funded monitoring and education program. I see dogs walked off-leash in the GGNRA part of Mori Point each week. These dogs race off the trail and scatter the birds and rabbits in the area. When I mention to owners that the dogs should be leashed, even those that comply release their dogs when I go on my way. The GGNRA has invested time and money in improving access and preservation at Mori Point. Dog owners do not have the "right" to undo that work.

Likewise, I ask that there be increased monitoring and education around proper handling of dog waste. I see and smell piles of dog waste in every park I walk in, every single time. At Crissy Field, the waste barrels are sometimes overflowing with bags of waste, and a pleasant walk along the waterfront is spoiled by the pervasive smell. Fort Funston reeks of dog urine on a warm day. I also believe that, even if compliance with good dog-waste handling procedures were improved, dog waste will still have a large

and negative impact on the public's experience in the parks. There are almost no grassy parks in San Francisco where I can play frisbee or tag with my kids, or have a picnic, without needing to be on guard for dog waste.

I would support permit requirements for all dog walkers at the parks, with the fees to be used to fund monitoring and education programs. I would also support user permits for non- -dog-walkers, as well. These parks are beautiful, and we should all be willing to spend money to keep them that way.

Unregulated, unmonitored and heavy use of GGNRA lands by dogs diminishes the parks: the plant and animal populations are impacted, and the accumulated dog waste is unpleasant and unhealthy. Regulation and monitoring would improve the parks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1607	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 14:04:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it may Concern,				

My name is Billy Campbell. My wife Patty, two sons, Jeremy and Liam and well trained dog, Shasta spend EVERY weekend at the parks and beaches that allow us to take Shasta. Shasta is a very well trained Golden Retriever/Shepherd mix dog that has a passion for Frisbee, tennis balls and the ability to run off leash. I live in the Bay Area specifically for it's mostly dog friendly environments. If these restrictive laws were to pass, not only would it affect Shasta's quality of life but it would also affect my family's quality of life. We LOVE the parks and beaches throughout the bay area. I will do everything I can to ensure that my family and dog have the best life as possible. I would even consider moving to a more family oriented place. To me, this is not a pet thing but a family thing.

There is no doubt that there are a few people in this dog owner crowd that spoil the freedoms we have by taking advantage and even abusing the system.

I would propose that all dog owners go through a training or evaluation. I too have run into dog owners that have blatant disregard for leash laws and picking up after their own dog. Some of the dogs I know for sure would never pass behavioral acceptance. This could possibly eliminate a good portion of the problematic people and dogs. I would gladly pay a one time fee of \$20 to \$50 per dog for and license to be in the parks unleash. Not only is my dog trained for voice commands, Shasta also knows sign language and whistle commands. I'm not expecting everyone's dog to be like this but there should be something in place for this.

Thanks for not passing these restrictive laws.

Billy Campbell

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1608	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 14:08:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:**

Areas where our dogs have been welcome to walk or play off-leash for decades could be severely cut or banned outright under the revised GGNRA dog plan. The new rules would affect off-leash as well as on-leash access at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Muir Beach, Rancho Corral de Tierra on the slopes of Montara, and many other parklands.

The San Francisco City Council recently unanimously passed a resolution objecting to the GGNRA plan, which prompted the head of the Sierra Club to say that SF is pandering to a small group of dog extremists.

However, I believe that as responsible citizens, we must be realistic and fore-thinking about how to accommodate more than 100,000 local dogs in a city with limited space.

There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

I am not suggesting unlimited dog walking access, and we advocate responsible dog ownership in all GGNRA lands. But there is no credible reason to deny fair and reasonable access for both on- and off-leash dog walking that has taken place on GGNRA land for more than 50 years.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1609	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 14:16:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off leash space is so important to this San Francisco community!! You need to keep the beach at Chrissy Field, (west of the foot bridge) the open grass area, and Marina Green off leash. So important for the dogs to be able to run!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1610	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 14:51:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We need space for our furry friends to play. These are PUBLIC spaces! Are our kids put on leash to play?				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1611    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Moraga, CA 94556  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 15:07:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I frequently visit family members that live in San Rafael and we typically enjoy, with our children and dogs, the few remaining hiking trails open to leashed dogs in Marin.

I am very upset to learn that the GGNRA wants to, once again, eliminate or even further reduce the enjoyment of its park area by people with dogs. This is terrible stewardship of public lands that are supposed to be fully enjoyed by the public.

We have visited the Muir Beach area many times and it is very beautiful. The expanded parking area is greatly appreciated and was very needed. Now to eliminate the use of the area by a segment of the public...makes no sense and would seem to be an enormous waste of tax dollars.

We keep our dogs on leash and have never witnessed any problem caused by any dog or their owner on GGNRA recreational property.

I very much hope this mean-spirited proposal will be withdrawn or rejected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1612    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 15:41:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. We have lived in the county for over 30 years and feel there are more than enough no dog areas.

George Eisenberg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1613    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 15:43:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The demographics of our country are shifting rapidly. The population is aging and there are a significant number of individuals living alone. This last has been a marked, important change. Many people (like me) depend on their dogs for their day to day companionship and exercise. There is ever-growing science that shows that these animals have a strong, positive influence on the health and well being of this population, and therefore of society as a whole.

It is urgently important that our parks recognize the import role that our dogs play in our lives and not

---

continually seek to make it more difficult to own dogs in our metropolitan areas. Dogs need to be off leash for their health and socialization. No amount of walking replaces a good run. Not to mention the joy these animals bring to all involved in these activities.

I am 72 years old and take my dog to an off-leash location every day, rain or shine. I can't imagine my life without this activity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1614    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 15:49:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Further limiting the areas in which dogs are allowed is absolutely absurd. Pet ownership is certainly a responsibility, and one that people should not take lightly. As a pet owner living in the Bay area I am constantly aware of the diminishing number of places I am allowed to take my dog so that he may enjoy a bit of freedom. A vast majority of living spaces in the Bay area do not provide enough space to allow a dog ample room for regular exercise, this is why most dog owners turn to parks and recreational areas to allow their dog the ample space. Further limiting these spaces will only result in a negative outcome for dog owners, their pets, and even those who do not own dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1615    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support No Action Alternative in the SE IS for Muir Beach Homestead Oakwood Valley Marin Headlands  
the SE IS contains no peer - reviewed site - specific or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public ' s use of public lands. Retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy. GG NBA is for RECREATIONAL use to people in a densely populated area. Management approaches as in wilderness areas such as Yosemite do not apply.  
people will be forced into cars to find places to walk their dogs. Not good for environment and bad for Marin County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1616    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Woodside, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 16:02:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As the owner of 2 dogs I am in full support of the dog management plan. A dog on a leash is the responsible thing to do. I would like to see GGNR open up Phleger Estate to leashed dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1617    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 16:46:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with proposed changes that will eliminate dogs on trails and eliminate off leash dog areas.

I believe you should uphold the terms and conditions of the 1979 grant, these were the basis of the gift that was made to you. I think your proposed changes unfairly penalize an important segment of the community and users of the Park and that all of the proposals that eliminate or reduce access for that segment seriously undermine the spirit of the original grant.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1618    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Emily Leproust and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Crissy Field, Ft Funstan, Ocean Beach, Sweeny Ride, Stinson Beach, Baker Beach, and Rodeo Beach for the past 10 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Crissy Field, Ft Funstan, Ocean Beach, Sweeny Ride, Stinson Beach, Baker Beach, and Rodeo Beach because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Sincerely,

Emily

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1619    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Although I am not a dog owner myself, I often help walk and hike my boyfriend's dog throughout the Bay Area where it is allowed. There are already so many trails and parks that are off limits to dogs off-leash or even completely. Given about half of San Francisco residents own dogs, dog

---

owners should be allowed spaces in which to exercise them.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1620	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Antioch, CA 94509 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Pam Lambros and I live in Antioch. I walk my dog at Ft Funston and Chrissy Field for the past 16 years. I belong to the Vizsla Club of Northern California but walk at these locations as an individual.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Ft Funston and Chrissy Field because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, I walk at these locations with my dogs and use them as opportunities to meet up with friends from the Peninsula area and their dogs. If is a great socializing opportunity for the people and their canines. You shouldn't make a rash decision to negatively affect so many lives.

Sincerely,

Pam Lambros

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1621	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 16:53:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have read the SEIS and the proposed changes to the dog management document. I have also read the thousands of suggestions from the public, so I consider myself well informed on the topic.

The proposed changes you outline in your dog management plan seem to ignore the concerns and suggestions of a large number of public commentators.

I do not see the comments of dog owners adequately reflected in your proposed use plans. In fact it seems the plans have been proposed with a very one-sided view in mind, that is, to restrict or eliminate the access to lands by a significant segment of the population, namely those residents and tax payers with dogs.

Because your plans do not include balanced options for the public to vote on, including options that increase access to the area by all segments of the community, I do not believe the issue has been adequately evaluated. I do not support any change to the current use rule, mandated and set out at the time of the grant of lands in 1979.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1622 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:10:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the Plan to increase control of off-leash dogs in the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1623 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:20:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have two dogs and it is essential for them to run free and off-leash in designated areas. Do not let SF become a less dog-friendly place. Please let my voice be heard.

Thanks,  
Jon STOA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1624 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:27:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't limit the space that I can walk my dog off leash in the GGNRA. I walk my dogs there every day. We would be very sad if we could no longer walk off leash in the GGNRA. We especially love going to ocean beach and fort funston. I am a responsible dog owner and walking off leash in the GGNRA benefits both my dogs and myself. Also, that is how we utilize these spaces for recreation.

Thank you,  
Margaret Derring



---

**Correspondence ID:** 1625    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:43:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The recently proposed further limitations for dog walking and required dog leashing are far too strict. Over 99 percent of the GGRNA is already severely limited for dogs and their owners. Not only do dogs need areas where they can run and play freely, the owners too required areas where they can walk their animals without being leashed themselves.

I understand that a minority of owners are irresponsible and do not properly manage their pets, however, the response to that is not to punish the great majority of responsible dog people. The proper response to to take appropriate action against the few who allow their dogs to terrorize other beings or the land. We do not penalize all drivers because some drive drunk, or punish all parents Because some have dangerous children. This should also be the case with regard to dogs and their people.

Also, with respect to protecting the land of the GGRNA , require dogs to stay on the paths and educate walkers about the importance of not allowing their animals to chase the wildlife. These are more measured and appropriate ways to care for the wildlife and habitat of the area.

Some people believe that the answer to the dog leash issue is to send dogs to dog parks. For many of us, and our dogs, such parks are neither pleasant nor worthwhile. Dogs, and their people, need to walk and run freely, not be penned up in a confined area with lots of other dogs, some of which are not that friendly. Also, as the MHS will tell you, some of the biggest problems with dogs these days are attacks that occur at the dog parks.

Please do not take over zealous actions with respect to the majority of dogs and their humans within the GGRNA boundaries. It would be a great loss and hardship to us all. Thank you. victoriagold

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1626    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 17:54:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** San Francisco is known as a "dog-friendly" city. It appears that everything the ggnra and the city are doing is anti dog/owner.  
Give you an inch and you expect a mile!  
The places where dog owners are legally allowed to let their pets run and play off leash are rapidly dwindling.'  
I don't ask much as a tax payer. I don't have any human children that get in the way, make noise in the wrong places, try to get an education in the public school system or get caught in the surf at the beach. I do expect to be able to walk with my dog off leash ( where I have been for the past ten years) in Fort Funston and occasionally at Crissy Field. I'm a responsible owner and clean up after my dog.  
/All you are accomplishing is angering a large population of the bay area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1627    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 18:10:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi,

I've read that there is a plan to reduce the amount of off-leash dog areas, particularly at Crissy Field, even unbelievably at the beach east of Crissy field which is a popular and problem free playground for dogs.

This is insane and the draft plan needs to be revised; the current arrangements work well (enough) and shouldn't be curtailed any more than they already are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1628    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94978  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 18:10:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow us to continue to enjoy the beaches, spaces, etc, etc, with our four legged family members. I'm a responsible, clean, pick up after any pet persons...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1629    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** many see comment for list of some of many Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Richard Lynch  
584 Castro Street #366  
San Francisco, CA 94114

21January 2014 (your site down) 27 January 2014 (your site up and submitted)

(Sent via online process at: <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/commentForm.cfm?documentID=55416>)

Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Attn: SEIS

Dear Madam or Sir:

Hello and Greetings! My name is Richard Lynch, I live in San Francisco in the densely non park no green area of SOMA (South Of Market). Regularly, I visit parts of the GGNRA, specifically, at least once a week I visit Crissy Field all the way to water's edge with my dog for OFF LEASH as well as Fort FunDog for OFF LEASH at least once-a-month and all the way to water's edge. Additionally, I frequent Pacifica, CA coastal access areas after dog acupuncture with holistic vet in Pacifica at least 3-6 times a year

including all the way to water's edge at the beach and on the walking trails. I have travelled up and down the coast as far south as San Diego and as far north as Mendocino with my pet companion (so far with trips South occurring at least once-a-year for last seven-plus years) via the slow route gearing my travel and lodging plans specifically around travel with my pet companion and I notice how vital it is to maintain open off leash in the Bay Area as the opposite as witnessed by me and mine causes nastiness in dogs and people outside the San Francisco Bay Area.

My dog adopted in 2006 at age 2 is a special needs animal now of the three-legged variety since January 2009 due to systemic cocci AKA Valley Fever and doing excellently with a lot of energy benefiting from regular exercise and continued socialization with people and other dogs. For me I get a closer connection to the area which is increasingly becoming hard to get closer to as I live in the ever-densely-growing, very unplanned, non green area of SOMA with its skyrocketing pricing and fast-killing vehicles (for example, in 2013 alone, 21 cyclists and 4 pedestrians were killed dead due to poor planning by the area). Nearby city parks are non existent. Although I do walk to distant parks in distant areas of the city with my companion dog and I enjoy them often as well (at least 1-2 times per week); however, these excursions are not sufficient to our off-leash needs. Daily I tweet for green parks and dogspaces to be added in SOMA and daily the local powers that be ignore my and others' efforts. I belong to and support SFDOG, WALK SF, SFBike, as well as am an original member of BAY AREA BIKE SHARE PROGRAM prior to its opening and recent inauguration, among others. I disagree with the positions of the executive boards of the Sierra Club (whom I have supported with cash), and I would like to point out that these local boards do not speak for their members/supporters and they do not speak for me at all. I also volunteered as a trained dog-walker for SF ACC tenants and did serve weekly prior to my own dog's onset of special needs arising 2008-2009.

1) I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I strongly support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) I strongly oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) I strongly oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

4) SEIS still lists impacts that "might", "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

5) SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1).

However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that "In many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities." (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - "The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to ... expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972).

You can learn more about me on LinkedIn as well ([www.linkedin.com/pub/richard-lynch/71/293/219/](http://www.linkedin.com/pub/richard-lynch/71/293/219/)), if needed. Thank you for your consideration.

Warmest regards,

Richard Lynch  
415-377-3686  
[richard@richardlynch.net](mailto:richard@richardlynch.net)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1630	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent,				

My name is Evan Mizrachy and I am a San Francisco resident and dog owner (Kayo is my precocious 4 year old mutt who was rescued by a wonderful organization). I can be found several times a week walking Kayo at Chrissy Field or Fort Funston (and occasionally at Fort Mason, Rodeo Beach and Muir Beach). Being a responsible dog owner, I have always kept my dog under voice control in any area where off leash, I clean up after him and keep him from passing fenced off areas. My time walking Kayo off leash is a critical part of my lifestyle, and I don't doubt Kayo's as well. As any dog owner will tell you, dogs need more vigorous exercise than they can get while on leash.

Beyond being a dog owner, I am an avid environmentalist so I understand the need for habitat protection - that said I do not believe those two things need to be in conflict. This DEIS and Plan doesnt seem to recognize that environmental values include both recreation and nature. The document doesnt acknowledge that people care about both and that people with dogs are often also good stewards of our environment. Further, today the vast majority of GGNRA land is already off-limits to dogs (>99%),cutting that back further would be a great disservice to the city's dog owners. It also needs to be pointed out that the discussion is around park land that is clearly in an urban area - as such the needs of the city's citizens need to be looked after as well. Having places where I can take long walks with my dog allows me to get the exercise I need while also meeting my dogs needs. Without access to the small amount of land in the GGNRA currently available, I worry that many dogs and dog owners will not have sufficient opportunity to engage in recreation. It is thus critical to me that places like Fort Funston and Chrissy field remain open for off-leash dog walking access.

As such, I do not agree with the GGNRA's current preferred alternative as it significantly restricts and eliminates off leash dog walking in many areas within the GGNRA. The proposed changes to the existing conditions (1979 Pet Policy) and to the new lands in San Mateo County are not based upon sound science

or long-term monitoring of site specific conditions.

As presented in the DEIS, the proposed dog management plan eliminates dog-walking (on and off leash) access for all new lands (additions to the GGNRA sometime in the future) within San Mateo county lands. The GGNRA's mission applies equally to new lands as existing lands and it is essential for the GGNRA to consider reasonable and balanced alternatives for dog walking on new lands.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I also oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular areas simply because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

When Congress created the GGNRA in 1972 - it did so in part to "expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. A great many citizens in the area look to engage in recreation with their dogs as companions and not recognizing so does a disservice to these citizens.

We all know that families with children have left San Francisco in droves due to a dearth of affordable quality schooling. I would hate to see my dog owner friends (myself included) be forced to follow due to the lack of available dog-friendly dog walking options.

This is a really important issue to me and I sincerely hope that my voice, and the voice of the great many other city dog owners, will be heard in this matter.

Respectfully,

Evan Mizrachy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1631	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	palo alto, CA 94306 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	These are comments for the proposed dog management plan for GGNRA.				

We are opposed to this plan. We visited Muir beach for the first time with our dog 2 days ago. What a great spot for people, for families, for dogs. Eliminating space for dogs to run free on the beach or for folks to walk their dogs is wrong.

Changes made to the 2013 SEIS do not address the comments filed in 2011 and the comments ran 31 against the plan.

We support the No Action Alternative for Muir beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

The SEIS contains no peer reviewed site specific studies.

Retain the 1979 longstanding pet policy.

Where will people in urban areas have to go with their dogs?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1632    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 18:49:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Committee Members,  
Thank you for taking the time to solicit input from the citizens of our potentially impacted communities. It is a testament to the thoroughness of the committee and its recognition of the gravity of this debate. I would like to start by requesting the committees acknowledgement that our dog owner community is currently already drastically discriminated against in its access to our Bay Area parks. In Marin County, families with dogs are permitted access to merely 1% o our parks land! This alongside the fact the recent surveys show nearly 40% o all Californians are dog owners.

As frequent users of parks, dog owners are often the most committed volunteers to park maintenance and fund raising. In addition, our parks are funded equally by all tax payers, dog owner or not. This discrimination alone should give any fair analysis pause before considering further reduction of dog friendly public space.

Lastly, I would like to address the economic sense of further restricting parks from dog friendly space. Any tightening of dog restrictions would naturally require additional resources for policing and enforcing said policies. With our park systems already under intense financial pressures (park closers, etc.), could our park dollars not be better spent reopening and maintaining our parks system instead of degrading the experience of some the parks systems biggest advocates and supporters?

In closing, I ask you to please reconsider any changes to our current dog friendly park space. It is unfairly over-limited as it is and to add to this discrimination makes little sense in regards to neither economic factors nor general equality.

Sincerely yours,

Katrina Kehl

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1633    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 19:20:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not pass this bill. My dog and I enjoy the to-be affected areas on a daily basis. I feel it is the people who use the GGNRA frequently are the people who help take care of it the most. I surf on a daily basis and I notice the beach is filled with happy dog owners who are also helping to take care of the beach by not only picking up their own trash and dog mess, but other trash and broken glass because it can hurt our dogs. Dogs are a major part of SF culture and the GGNRA should reflect

---

that.

Thanks for your time and thanks in advance for not passing this.

andy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1634    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 19:50:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We Oppose GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1635    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 20:01:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose this dog management plan. City dogs require the opportunities to run and play like any other dog. A lack of adequate exercise can often lead to behavior problems. Let us have the space to maintain good dog ownership practices.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1636    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

I live in San Francisco, and I walk my dog on at Chrissy Field and have for the past 4 years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Chrissy Field because it is too restrictive. I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1637    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 20:12:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would much prefer you eliminate bikers from trails rather than dogs off leash. Bikers are far more destructive, disruptive and are quite frightening when they zip by without a word of warning!

Bikers are the ones that need to be on leashes, and I am a biker! And a dog owner.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1638    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94119  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Page Realty Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 20:33:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please let dogs be free to roam in the few open spaces left in SF.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1639    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to many beaches and trails that are threatened with closure to me.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Less than 1% of trails and beaches in the GGRNA are dog-friendly. That means anybody who wants a dog-free experience has 99% of the 80,000 acres to play in.



There hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. They should have to prove it before they legislate it.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog-walking since the original pet policy in 1979. The GGNRA is not a wilderness national park like Yellowstone and shouldnt be managed as if it were.

If the dog management plan is adopted, Marins estimated 60,000 dogs will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

In 2011, the GGNRA tried to implement a similar plan. It was opposed in the public comments by a margin of 3 to 1. These are public lands and the GGNRA need to listen to the public.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1640	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 21:03:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Please allow responsible dog owners to let their beloved pets run free. Please don't let a few irresponsible owners ruin it for everyone.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1641	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 21:17:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

I moved to Pacifica about 10 years ago specifically to enjoy the large open spaces with my dog. I soon found out that most of those spaces, on County or State Park land, are already off limits to my dog. But we still had plenty of GGNRA land to hike on together. That would be the "R" in GGNRA. The highlight of my week is to use a little time off on the weekend to go hiking with my dog. Please don't take that away.

I have friends with dogs in the East Bay. Over there they have a regional park system, not a national one. Their regional park system is larger and much older than GGNRA. It's the East Bay Regional Park System, and it allows dogs off leash on ALL trails and open space. What is so different about the East Bay? Is it the fact that it's managed by "regional" and not "national" authorities that makes the difference? Then maybe you national authorities could leave, and return control to the regional people who seem to be doing a far superior job

in the East Bay at least.

If you choose to stay, then why don't you have a look at what they are doing over in the East Bay. Try to become a part of the regional community. Stop fighting us. I for one am tired of this. It's been over 2 years of threats to ruin our dog walking lives. Please stop.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1642    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Frances Hochschild and I'm also writing on behalf of my 83 year old mother, Christie Hochschild. We live in San Francisco and for the last 50 years mom has been walking her dogs in the area. Our favorite places to walk are the Presidio and Crissy Field. I also have a 10 year old daughter and believe that a good park works well for both kids and dog owners.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative currently under discussion - - they are much much much too restrictive. My mother walks with a cane and one of her few remaining pleasures in life is walking her dogs off leash. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study as required by law.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. I know my parents have been supporting dog walking and this definition for years (although my dad sadly passed away 7 years ago). These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, please consider that her daily walk at crissy field and the presidio with her dogs is one of my mother's few remaining pleasures in life - it both gives her exercise as well as provides her with a community of like minded peers of all ages. It would be very sad if this were no longer part of her life

Sincerely,

Frances Hochschild

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1643    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 21:23:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello

I very much oppose the changes that are being outlined in the current plan to limit off-leash areas for dogs, specifically at Fort Funston. There is no better place for off-leash dog walking in the city. The Dog walking community is friendly, and frankly more friendly than the general population at-large (dog/non

---

dog owners put together). I say this because recreation areas have a primary role-for recreation. There are many, many places one can go if they really don't like dogs and only one great place in the area, Ft. Funston. If we take this area away, it will impact the lives of dog owners and dogs in the surrounding area. My dog loves to be at Funston, she does not wander off paths, she is kind to other dogs and I get to meet people in the city and socialize while enjoying the beauty around me. Please do not limit that for me, my family, my dog or my fellow residents. I hate the idea of a fenced-off area for my dog. Dogs need a big place to roam free. Since when does GGNRA provide dog runs? If I wanted one of those, I'd put one in my backyard. Many of us do not have large yards in the city, or some folks, none at all. This does not mean they should not own a dog-it means they walk them in places like Ft. Funston. Where will they go if our space there is limited? To another park where there are dangerous needs/rubbish in the grass for dogs to eat or step on?

I have been around Funston for years. I just don't see dogs ruining the greenery like some suggest as an ecological concern. I don't know who the people who dislike dogs are, but I ask them to go to all the places where dogs are not. Dogs can already only be free in a few places. Most owners are very responsible and I think that more dog issues could arise if dogs are so severely restricted.

I love Ft. Funston. I go there to de-stress. Please don't take that away from me. If my dog cannot relax freely there, frankly, I won't be able to either and any support for GGNRA that I would provide in the future would end.

Thank you for your consideration. I am a regular citizen.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1644	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 21:31:21
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have lived two blocks from ocean beach for eight years and have walked my dog on the beach everyday for six of those years. There are many responsible dog owners who clean up after their pets, keep them from harassing the plovers and make sure their animal is under voice command at all times. As a responsible, respectful dog owner and a daily visitor to the beach I feel that dogs are one of the least detrimental elements to the native environment of ocean beach. I see more damage in the form of trash and human feces in the sand dunes on a daily basis than ever from people's pets Please save and even extend the off leash policy at our beach and if you are concerned with preserving and nurturing the environment think about addressing the problems caused by number of homeless on the beach.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1645	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94107 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 21:35:56
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	the federal government does a good job of managing our resources...sometimes they are too aggressive in managing. Case in point. Golden Gate Natural recreation area...why do you want to restrict people with their dogs??? They have apparently gone "leashless" for a number of years and things are fine. Now you want leashes.
------------------------	---

---

Let it go.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1646    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416    **Private:** Y  
**Address:** private, San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** [please withhold my personally identifiable information from public review]

Our family applauds your efforts to implement a balanced and comprehensive dog management plan in the GGNRA and we support the NPS's preferred alternative. We have seen and experienced too many situations where careless owners allowed their off-leash dogs to knock over children, attack wildlife, invade protected areas and leave feces on public paths. This has been particularly pronounced when professional dogwalkers have been unable to provide sufficient attention to all of the animals under their care. We support the new measures to allow all visitors to enjoy and experience the GGNRA and preserve the environment for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1647    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 21:45:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE KEEP our off leash dog parks open!! The parks are for RECREATION! Hense your name - The GG National Recreation Area! Where else do you want us all to go? Doleres Park?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1648    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 22:04:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Laura Hopper  
415-332-3117

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1649    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 22:09:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Alta Trail and Rodeo Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1650    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 22:51:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a San Francisco resident. For over a decade I have been an avid outdoor recreationalist and environmentalist - I hike, swim, surf, bird watch, and I walk my dog at Fort Funston. I understand that the GGNRA needs to manage and make policies about recreation in its jurisdiction. However, the proposed Dog Management Plan, in my reading of it, is overly restrictive, based on incomplete analysis, and a drastic over reaction to a non specified problem. In addition, I worry that, if enacted, it will create a series of so called "dispersion" problems such as traffic and over crowding at the few remaining places where people are legally allowed to exercise their dogs. In my experience, most of the people who exercise their dogs at Fort Funston are regular visitors who feel a sense of guardianship and gratitude about the space. We appreciate its beauty and feel a sense of obligation towards it. Every day I pick up about 2 pounds of plastic from the beach - bottles, balloons, food packaging, clothes left by tourists.....and I pick up dog feces. Fort Funston is an urban zoopolis, populated by a diversity of flora and fauna and it bears the trace of its proximity to SF, a large and polluted city. It's not a pristine wilderness. Rather, it is a multi use urban park. Please don't legislate the fiction that it is anything else. To do so will deprive a large number of people and animals a sense of belonging to it, a sense of guardianship towards it, and a chance to experience its specialness. A specialness that is, in large part, created by its many users

---

and its status as a multi use recreational site. Thank you for your consideration  
Irene Gustafson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1651	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 22:53:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Golden Gate National Recreation Area				

Please continue to allow unleashed dogs on Muir Beach.

I have taken my dog there about once a week for years and have never seen a problem between the dogs and people or wildlife. My dog has a great time with long runs and playing in the water.

Local dog parks are no substitute for Muir Beach. At dog parks my dog just follows me around. I do not know why, but I suspect that she is a Hurricane Katrina rescue may be a factor.

Arthur Davidson  
Mill Valley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1652	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94945 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,27,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I am a Marin native and have lived in Marin for over 50 years. One reason why I love Marin is because on the weekends, my family and I take our dogs out on hikes or to the beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. I don't agree with amount of limitations that there are already on dogs in the GGRA and there isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of OUR public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents (especially dog owners) rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

People and horse back riders that do not want to interact with dogs (as per some reasoning that I've read in support of your plan) can use the other 99% o the GGRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1653    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 23:13:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a frequent walker with my 2 dogs, sometimes 3 at Ocean Beach and Fort Funston. Right now, Ocean Beach in my area only allows off leash from May-July. I abide by that policy and will take the dogs off leash to Ft Funston. At Fort Funston, I walk with my nephew, his 2 children and friends and our dogs. It is a highlight of our week when we make the trek around the loop from the parking lot, down near the beach, around the Skyline Blvd side and on up back to the parking lot. The kids stop and hang around the trees in some parts that are not blocked off. They play at the fort where the old sandbags are sometimes torn down and work to build it back up. It is a wonderful couple of hours spent with kids and dogs and family. There are many wonderful people walking around with their dogs off leash. Rarely have I witnessed any incidents of any out of control dogs or people. It is a gem of an area for people who own dogs to enjoy fresh air and a short or lengthy walk. Nowhere else in the area can you have this opportunity to allow your dogs to run and run and enjoy life with their owners/caretakers. I recall hearing that one of reasons for restricting dogs was the wear and tear they cause. Well, if you frequent Fort Funston, you know that it is not the dogs or people - it is Mother Nature blowing wind and sand to cause erosion and change. Please don't punish dogs and dog owners for what nature does to the environment. I think you will find more trash and debris where people frequent than where dogs and dog people are found. Please keep off leash available for the people who are in need of places to go where there are no restrictions for exercise of their pets and family. There are many alternatives for those who don't like dogs. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1654    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 23:14:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA needs to be FAR more accommodating to the most pet-friendly community in the country. San Francisco residents have more than 120,000 dogs; limiting them to less than 1% o the public space supported and maintained with their tax dollars is ludicrous. The GGNRA is NOT PAYING ATTENTION TO THE CITIZENS with their promotion of this draconian, anti-dog bill. And it is insulting us with a "revised" plan, 2 years after the original plan, which is almost identical to the first plan, not taking the public response to the first plan into consideration in any meaningful way. San Franciscans care deeply about our environment, which is why it is one of the most pristine and beautifully preserved and protected areas in the country. It is ridiculous to maintain a position of "protecting" the environment from San Francisco's dog-loving AND nature-loving citizens.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1655    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Vallely, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 23:19:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our family, which includes two small dogs, frequently visits MUIR BEACH, where other visitors include people with dogs as well as those without. In all our years enjoying this special place we have had no problem with other dogs and owners nor they with us. Everyone gets along beautifully, sharing the enjoyment of a place we all treasure. There already are areas where dogs are not allowed, like the south half of Stinson Beach to name one, for individuals who prefer this experience. It is vital that families, which often include dogs, continue to have access to our local open spaces and park lands, and not just to a tiny few areas which may be at a distance and become overcrowded as a result of your restrictions. Individuals who visit nature are healthier, both physically and emotionally, so discouraging people from public lands would directly impair the general health of society. Your mandate established in 1916 to bring people into nature must be upheld and maintained, not set aside or parsed. Responsibly managed dogs are the norm, not the exception, so making these drastic changes regardless of that is unwise and unnecessary.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1656    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 23:35:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please pass along to the appropriate individuals such as Secty. Sally Jewell that it is long past time for NPS to make available this forum for public input on the DRAKE'S BAY OYSTER FARM eviction in INVERNESS, CA, which NPS is orchestrating against public will, in the face of real science, and in spite of the letter and spirit of the original lease agreement. My mailing address is above and below so you can explain to us when you are going to reach out to those who are affected, which is much of California.

Anne Bell  
331 Melrose Ave  
Mill Valley CA 94941

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1657    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,27,2014 23:50:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not harass the dog owners and their pets. They pay taxes and are entitled to use the parks like everyone else. I see no reason to clamp down on their use of these park lands so severely- have there been a bunch of dog attacks or has something drastic occurred? If you restrict usage as proposed, then the local dog parks will become inundated. Where else will dog owners be able to go to let their critters romp about? I'm not a dog owner, but I support responsible tax-paying dog owners. Live and let live.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1658    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---



**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:07:59**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** When asked, "What is your favorite thing to do in your free time?", without hesitation I reply with "Take my dog on a walk." My dog has a lot of energy that she only expels playing with other dogs. We've tried taking her on long walks, but she doesn't get tired or seems to enjoy it. My dog, my husband, and I along with our friends and family bond over walks with our dogs. Everyday we get a text or send a text to someone that reads "wanna walk the dogs at Funston?" I respectfully encourage and support the petition to keep off leash dog parks as they are. Our dogs are our family members, who are only welcome in certain "places", let's keep these places alive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1659 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,28,2014 01:17:47**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you thank you THANK YOU! for limiting the dog situation in San Francisco, which has gotten terribly out of control. Many animal lovers undermine the problem, but it's serious and needs to be reigned in. THANK YOU for passing the Dog Management plan!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1660 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,28,2014 01:26:55**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a dog owner in San Francisco for the past 10 years.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1661 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Redwood, CA 94062

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,28,2014 01:46:48**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have had my canine companion of one type or another since I was a small child..I watched in Half Moon Bay how they concreted the beautiful sand dunes into parking lots and bathrooms

and put up over 187 signs..the road was flattened allowing and drawing Masses of people to this beautiful part f the coast at Venice beach where i had surfed and picnicked with my parents..The crowds came as they had set up the area to draw in.They left their trash,they walked on the bluffs and left their scents everywhere. But they paid..The ravens came following the trash the people leave..The ravens bothered the Plovers..Then the dogs got the blame for it. Then the rangers trucks left tracks and went up and down the beaches spewing exhaust and noise stating that they had to comply with multi use functions..Of course,once again,this didnt include the loves of our lives...our companions,our dogs..the happiest and most selfless creature on earth..And the people with dogs...,love the environment,the waves,the sand,the smell of the wind..The bird experts admit now it isnt the dogs that are causing the problems but its in their cheapest interests to blame them. At Ocean Beach,where the dogs are most off leash,the Plovers flourish.. Dogs and humans and children need to be offleash to be healthy and to be mentally in balance. Please so not let these people speak for a small number of humans who have a large amount of money..

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1662	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san jose, CA 95125 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 02:55:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Your job is to listen to the people who use the parks you are looking after.				

Your personal opinions are irrelevant. Just because you hate dogs does not mean you can ban them for no reason.

You are abusing your positions, and should be removed from office if you ignore the wishes of the public that use the parks and entrusted them to your care.

As I understand it these lands were loaned to you to manage, and if you do not manage them appropriately they should be withdrawn from your control.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1663	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 04:39:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs are part of Bay Area families. They get us outdoors, help keep us healthy, teach our children compassion and responsibility. There are too few pet friendly areas. I oppose the "Preferred Alternative"! I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1664	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I do not approve of the Golden Gate National RECREATION Area's Dog Management Plan.

1. I support a "no action alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Bueach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands.
2. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and the comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan!
3. The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands
4. The GGNRA should retain the longstanding 1979 pet policy.
- 5.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1665 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,28,2014 08:03:57**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I am against limiting dog access to these lands. These areas provide so much joy to the citizens of the Bay Area who have dogs.

I am a strong environmentalist and I disagree with the argument that dogs are putting these lands at any more risk than poor developmental planning/growth and humans.

Please keep these lands open to dogs and have defined off leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1666 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94401  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,28,2014 08:05:09**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Please save our off leash doggy play areas. They're important for the well being and ongoing great quality of life we provide our companions here in the Bay Area. When our pups are well exercised when they get to run around instead of walking around. Therefore a busy working owner doesn't have to spend more time walking our dogs due to the fact that we'd be worried that our dogs will tear up the house or even run away due to boredom. Please save our recreational areas where we can enjoy nature at its best with our best friends!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1667 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Mill Valley, ID 94941  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,28,2014 08:42:41**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not restrict the dog-loving, dog-walking population of the Bay Area to a few narrow, short trails on which our dogs have to be leashed.

More and more it is being recognized how important pets, specifically dogs, are to one's mental well-being. Being able to allow these creatures to run and walk off-leash to get their exercise (and allow their owners to exercise) has benefits more far-reaching than colored trails on a big map.

The Bay Area's dog owners have to have alternatives when walking their pets. If you regulate all off-leash areas to a few select 'mini trails' we could see over crowding of those trails and more intense debate from the 'non-dogloving folks'.

Let us have our access to the Bay Area's vast resources. Most of the single-track trails are already off limit. In many areas, one cannot even hike a loop, because the trail ends for the dog. Walking with my dog in the open space is safer than walking by myself. It brings us both joy.

We have a very peaceful existence right now with our rangers - why create tension? If you need to ask dogwalkers to register and put a cap on the number of dogs one can take - fine. Cap it at 5 dogs. That allows the walker to make some money. Don't punish all of us because of complaints from a few people. There are SOOOOOOO many trails hikers can select that are off limits to dogs and walkers now. Show them where they are and leave our trails ALONE!!!

To curtail the ability of owners to take dogs out for walks could result in many pets left in the back yard with little exercise - a cruelty to animals and an injustice to a well-meaning owner.

PLEASE allow for voice-control, off-leash trails where they currently exist and quit limiting our access to the outdoors.

I donate to the GGNRA currently, because I am able to take advantage of its beauty. If you ban me from my source of enjoyment, I will look to other places to donate. I heard about this from a local blog and the postings at the foot of my trails.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1668	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 08:42:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi,				

I am completely against ending the no leash dog areas in SF. Dogs bring great pleasure and protection to our lives. They should have the right to be able to have some freedom. I have seen no reason in the 12 years I have had a dog to limited their access. I understand that there should be dog free places for children but limiting the dogs to a small amount of off leash areas has it problems for such a large city. However, I do think we should increase the fine when someone doesn't pick up after their dogs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1669	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 09:01:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Emily Ceisel and I'm a dog owner, walker and sitter in San Francisco. I strongly oppose the proposed restrictions on off leash dog walking. Dogs are a part of the San Francisco fabric, and families, the elderly and young singles alike all enjoy the benefits of outdoor exercising with their dogs in areas where the dogs can truly romp and play. Responsible dog owners don't let their dogs dig or hunt wildlife. I walk every day and have not seen severe destruction caused by dogs.

I frequent areas such as Crissy Fields, Glen Canyon Park, the Presidio and Golden Gate Park. If the GGNRA restrictions take effect, I can foresee overcrowding in nearby city parks, causing new issues with dogs due to the overcrowding. I am a member of local groups that seem to support the new restrictions, but do not feel they speak for me on this.

San Francisco won't be the same if these restrictions take place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1670    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sonoma, CA 95476  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 09:10:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It would seem that walking your dog in one of the country's most beautiful areas shouldn't be a battle. What you are trying to do is attacking my most basic right. I want to bring my dog or dogs to these areas and do already. I want to enjoy the beauty and restfulness of these sites. Stop this insane action. I do realize that humans are bad and that nature is best. But, have you not realized that humans are part of nature. Animals and humans are all one family. I have as much of a right to visit these parks as the birds that fly over them. This action is just one more visitation of big government. I do not want to live in a police state. I will continue to walk my dogs where I damn well want to. I have had enough of this crap.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1671    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SF, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 09:31:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would not have rescued my dog Petunia if I wasn't able to take her to Ocean Beach or Fort Funston for leash free adventures

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1672    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 09:46:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please leave SF dog friendly. Most dog owners work to make sure their dogs behave responsibly in these beautiful outdoor areas. I work a lot and my favorite thing when I get a break is to walk my dog among the beaches of Fort Funston. Thank you- Aleks Petrovitch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1673    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 10:19:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Committee,

I've been a long time (20 years) of San Francisco, homeowner for 10 years and dog owner for 9. In addition to being a dog lover, I got my dog to help me enjoy the city in live in, because i found i was no longer enjoying the high cost of living here and enjoying what the Bay ARea has to offer. In addition, my health would benefit from walks and being in nature. And that's what my walks with my dog at Fort Funston and Chrissy Field do for me. They've allowed me to stay in this city, to make it more livable, and to make my life have a much higher quality. I'm not overstating the case nor being melodramatic when i say that if your plan goes forth as planned, if i can no longer walk my dog off leash in the areas you propose closing to dogs, I will undoubtedly leave San Francisco because what keeps me here right now, would be gone. I'm a responsible dog owner. Most of us are. and we care about these areas tremendously. the same way there are irresponsible people who damage the coast line with trash, unruly children, lack of care, there are of course some people who do the same with their dogs. you'll always have those people. But most of us are not. Being in an urban environment like this, packing the huge number of dogs that live in this city into its streets limiting off leash running/exercise areas the way you propose, is a recipe for disaster. you'll have under-exercised dogs in tight enviornments, and i can assure you the beautiful areas of this city that make things worth it, will not get the use they're getting now. The quality of life for all in this city will decrease - i have no doubt of that.

Please consider that these off leash areas are the only places where San Franciscans can enjoy nature, get exercise and exercise their dogs that are free and that add a different perspective to an increasingly unaffordable inhuman city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1674    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 10:35:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F. Dogs and dog owners should be able to enjoy GGNRA along with everyone else. Dogs are a big part of the bay area and they should be allowed in existing dog permitted areas inside GGNRA. Please consider not shutting down the existing dog friendly areas.

thank you

William Higgins

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1675    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94942  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 11:07:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

There is nothing so disconcerting as having an unleashed do run over your picnic and the owner laugh it off with a cute smile and a "so sorry" , it doesn't bring back the moment of enjoyment nor the adrenalin spike you feel when rushed by a wayward dog. I believe the GGNR was created for the "enjoyment of people" not the enjoyment of dogs.

PLEASE KEEP UNLEASHED DOGS OFF OF MUIR BEACH.

Thank you  
Greg Maloney

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1676	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern:				

I am writing regarding the proposed changes made in the 2013 SEIS with respect to dogs and their access to GGNRA.

According to the U.S. Census data from 2000 and 2005, there are more dogs than children in San Francisco (and that's just one city in a very large Bay Area community). I grew up in Mill Valley with a dog in my home, raised my own after graduating college (who happily makes up a family of three with my fianc  and I) , and know countless others in Marin and San Francisco who share their homes and their lives with these wonderful, loving animals. I could go on at length about how important these pets are to our lives, our children and families, our happiness, and even (many studies will tell you) our health, but I think it may fall on deaf ears considering the proposed changes; I cannot imagine a person who has spent a blissful day at Muir Beach frolicking in the waves with his overjoyed canine, or hiking through the shaded paths of Oakwood Valley as his panting puppy follows behind ever making such restrictive changes. There are already such limited spaces that we can enjoy time with our dogs, limiting it further seems downright cruel.

One might argue that these changes do not impinge on one's right to own a dog; the happiness that such a companion brings to one's life will remain unchanged. But this argument ignores the fact, as stated above, that dogs are very much a part of the fabric of family life here in Marin, and disallowing owners the ability to include beloved pets in the normal recreational activities of the family: hiking, going to the beach, sightseeing on our beautiful coastline, etc. will hurt not only the dog, but the family as well. Walk through downtown Mill Valley, or through any of the picturesque towns of Marin, and you will see a trend: people with dogs, dog water bowls in front of businesses, businesses handing out dog treats and waste bags, and even providing tie up areas for pets to relax while their owners shop. We bring our dogs everywhere, to shop, on errands, and on vacations; to limit our recreational abilities with our pets would remove a core part of our lives that we spend with our pets.

But removing many of the core places Marin and Bay Area residents spend with their dogs will not only hurt families (especially families made up primarily of one or many dogs and one owner), but also the dogs themselves. Dogs need spaces to exercise, and spaces to exercise with their owners provide a wonderful opportunity to keep both happy and healthy. Dogs also, and this is indisputable, love to be with their owners (one look at the face of a forlorn dog left at home while his family piles into the car to head to the beach would certainly convince you of that); take away the spaces we can enjoy with our dogs and you stand to have many unhappy, depressed puppies whining at home. Alternatively, the SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars, in search of places to walk with their dogs; this is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

If the above does not convince you, the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and further, comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan. As a member of the community for the entire 27 years of my life (and will continue to be as I raise my own family), I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

Moreover, the SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies OR vital monitoring as required by law in order to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands. The GGNRA should thus retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy. The space is, after all, called the Golden Gate National RECREATION area, its longstanding purpose and use is in the title itself, to provide RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. Recreation, for many of the Bay Area's residents, includes their dog(s). Considering this fact, the GGNRA also requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

Again, I repeat that there are more dogs than children in San Francisco. Our dogs are central to our lives. Please do not take these beloved spaces away from us and our dogs, it will disrupt the very core of our lives here in Marin and negatively affect us for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1677	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Micah Hamady and I live in San Francisco. I have been walking my dog at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Ocean Beach (among other areas affected by your plan) for the past 9 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for these areas because they are too restrictive. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---



populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, walking my dog in these areas is a great form of exercise for us both, and my furry friend absolutely LOVES swimming and running around these areas after being cooped up in the house all day.

Please don't take that away from him.

Sincerely,  
Micah Hamady

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1678	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 11:42:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a 78 year old retired physician living in Tamalpais Valley, CA. I have been using the GGNRA almost daily to exercise myself and my dog. It is most important for both our continued well being.				

The proposed plan is far too restrictive. I have in my practice suggested that people acquire dogs to assure that they would participate in outdoor healthful activities.

The propose plan unnecessarily limits several of the areas that I use, particularly Oakwood Valley and the Miwok trail.

It will cause far more harm than good. I have heard no voices from my neighbors in favor of the restrictions you propose.

Please reconsider the restrictions for the health of many citizens besides myself. I urge you to maintain off leash areas as most dogs can be controlled without a leash.

Stuart R. Schwartz MD

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1679	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sonoma, CA 95476 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 11:55:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Tell the GGNRA you support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1680	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 12:20:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off leash dog spaces in SF!! We live in tight quarters here, and this is the only way my dogs can run off their energy!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1681    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 12:28:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It sickens me that so many dog lovers may not have access to the "off leash" areas at fort funston soon. I go up there nearly everyday with my two dogs because there are so few places to take dogs off leash in this city. It disgusts me that with all the taxes I pay in this city and state that one of the few "perks" might be taken away! So shameful!  
Holly Freise

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1682    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 12:30:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To: National Park Service: Planning, Environment and Public Comment  
From: Patricia Kremer Pacifica CA 94044  
Date: January 28, 2014  
Subject: Proposed Dog Management Plan

---

Although there have been some modification to the extreme restrictions of the 2011 plan, I have several objections to the proposed NPS Dog Management Plan for GGNRA issued in September 2013. As I live in Pacifica, my specific comments focus on that area, as well as the coastal area a bit south.

I know this memo is lengthy, but I sincerely hope the GGNRA and the NPS will read it (!) and consider my arguments. I attended an NPS public meeting in Paifica about 2 years ago, I submitted comments then, and Ive read the new proposal. This is a serious quality of life issue that I have been engaged in. Dog Management Policy is a central issue to making GGNRA properties fulfill their intended mission. My main plea is: Please do not let a small number of problems interfere with the enjoyment and use of trails by dog walkers.

First a few general points:

" GGNRA includes the word recreation but not wilderness. These lands are located in a densely populated urban region with a population that highly values its quality of life and access to outdoor activities. This is NOT a National Park in the same sense as Yosemite, Yellowstone, and Zion! This land is typical of what used to exist in coastal northern California. The GGNRA is land with trails intended to be USED, not land to be set aside and protected from the public.

---

" The vast majority of the land area is not conveniently accessible to people because of the nature of the Coastal Scrub vegetation, and the abundance of poison oak! If people (and dogs) are limited to trails, they represent a relatively minor impact on the ecosystem as they will travel on only a small fraction of the total land area. The endangered species (i.e. checkered butterfly) live primarily in places where humans and dogs do not and will not be going.

" I do not know the number of dogs in the greater San Francisco Bay Area, but I would guess it is upwards of a million. Walking ones dog is a great form of exercise, especially for an aging human population. We dont jog and mountain bike forever! The demands of the dog for exercise, inspires the dogs caretaker to exercise too. This is of uncontested benefit to both the dog and human. Prohibiting leashed dogs on most of GGNRA trails just doesnt make sense, either from an ecological or health perspective.

" San Mateo County Parks prohibit dogs. California State Parks prohibit dogs on trails, allowing them only in campground/picnic area and on fire roads. San Mateo County has a lot of open space, but too many of the trails are off limits to dogs. Places a dog can be legally off-leash are nearly non-existent. If we are going to get our human population moving more, we need more not fewer open places to walk dogs, including some off leash areas larger than city lot.

" I recognize some people are frightened of dogs, others just dont like them. Some dog owners are irresponsible and let their dogs approach people uninvited. Others allow their dogs to foul the footway, without picking up the poop! However, I suggest that the vast majority of dogs and their owners are law abiding, respectful do not represent a threat to others on the trail. Why must all dog walkers be punished because of a small fraction of irresponsible people? Instances of dogs attacking people are VERY rare, even if dogs are not leashed. Unprovoked attacks on people by leashed dogs are probably nearly non-existent.

" I also want to say something about leash specifications. We have an adjustable leash for our dog that works VERY well. We make it short when we are passing strange dogs and people, and let it out long when we are away from others. It is unacceptable and narrow-minded to limit leashes to a single (short) length. A responsible dog walker can do perfectly well around both unfriendly humans and dogs with an adjustable leash.

" Dogs provide a sense of security to their companions. I like to run or walk alone with my dog. Many of the GGNRA trails (i.e. Sweeney Ridge) are in areas far away from neighborhoods and where normally there are few people. The presence of a dog with walkers is a deterrent to those who might wish to do harm.

" Lastly, I want to comment about enforcement of leash requirements. It is true that many dog walkers will choose to let their dogs off leash to be under voice control, even in areas where leashes are required. It is also true that there are not enough NPS staff to patrol trails at all times. I suggest a program where citizens are allowed to report to the NPS dogs/owners who are not obeying the spirit (if not the letter) of policies included in the final management plan. People who are upset by a dogs behavior could take a photo of the dog/owner or get the dogs license number in order to make a report to GGNRA staff. Most people routinely walk their dogs in the same areas, so rangers on patrol could be on the lookout for dogs that had been reported. A suitably substantial fine would encourage better compliance. The nature of this offence is such that only periodic enforcement may be adequate.

Specific Comments about GGNRA land in Pacifica and nearby:

1. The proposed areas for leashed dogs on Mori Point are not acceptable and represent more than a 50%

reduction from the current situation. I see no reason to limit dog access on nearly all the trails. It would be especially sad if dogs were banned from the western end of the Point which is such a great place to see the sunset. Please let my dog and me continue to get a workout on Bootleggers steps!

2. The proposal for Milagra Ridge trails to allow leashed dogs is acceptable

3. The proposal for trails allowing leashed dogs in the Cattle Hill/Sweeney Ridge area is egregiously unacceptable. I strongly object to having to drive to San Bruno in order to hike to the Discovery Site with my dog. Portola came from the western side to first see the Bay and we should be able to make that same trek with our leashed dogs. I did not find any convincing evidence that leashed dogs on any of the trails in the Sweeney Ridge area would present a problem. Leashed dogs should be allowed on all these trails, including the Notch Trail. If horses are allowed, why not leashed dogs?. Most of the trails in the Sweeney Ridge area offer panoramic views and are more like roads than narrow trails. Dogs should not be excluded just on the off chance that someone will be on the trail who is afraid of dogs. This is not Chrissy Field or Ocean Beach. These trails are not crowded and the countryside is wide open.

4. My same point is relevant to the Rancho Corral de Tierra as well. Unless there is a compelling reason to forbid dogs, leashed dogs should be allowed on all trails.

5. I have participated in the planting/restoration efforts at the Pedro Point Headlands. If leashed dogs are kept on the trails, there is no reason dogs should not be allowed on all the trails in this area as well. It is essential to have at least a single loop out to the bluff so dog walkers can experience one of the most magnificent views ever!

6. The Summary of the Management Report states clearly that the impact of leashed dogs to the endangered red legged frogs, garter snakes and butterflies would be negligible and would be minor to other wildlife. If the ecology is not threatened, such a restrictive policy is totally unjustified. It is hard for me to comprehend. Are a small number of people who are afraid of dogs really so powerful in setting policy?

7. My last point has to do with the definition of leashed. When hiking or running, it is MUCH easier on both the dog and human to use a retractable leash of about 12. We have hiked/run hundreds of miles with our dog and we know. He does not wander off the trail to any extent that the habitat would be damaged any more than if he were on a 6 leash, and he is perfectly under control when meeting other people or dogs on the trail because we just pull up on the length of the leash. Am I really going to be ticketed on these trails using my retractable leash, when my dog NEVER strays more than a foot to either side of the trail/road? You have to be kidding!! It seems to me that this regulation was made by someone with little real experience. Just because it is the rule in campgrounds, dont make it the rule on trails.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1683	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Anchorage, AK 99517				

	United States of America
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 12:56:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, I am a born and raised San Francisco and dog owner, currently in Alaska and would like to one day return to San Francisco. However, it is very disheartening that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is going to decrease off leash dog-friendly areas. The problems at hand are already illegal and you should enforce the laws that are currently in place instead of creating more rules.

---

1. No Littering - dog poop is litter so fine people who don't clean up after themselves.
2. Its illegal to tamper with foliage and wildlife in a national park - If a person's dog is running through sensitive areas of a park, fine the individual.
3. No Animal Cruelty - It is the responsibility of the owner to tame aggressive dogs and not allow them to hurt others. If they do, clearly they are being cruel to the animal and should be charged as such.

Most of these parks will still allow horseback riding which is far more detrimental than off leash dogs. Finally, if the GGNRA cannot enforce laws already in place, how will they enforce new laws?

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1684	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 13:38:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not move forward with this. Off leash areas are very important part of my and my friends' lives. This is very upsetting. I oppose GGNRA's dog plan.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1685	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Cecilia and I live in San Francisco. My dog and I as well as my friend's and their dogs frequent Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston and Lands End multiple times a year. I take my dog off leash at Crissy Field's East Beach between 3 and 4 times a week. I will outline my opposition to this below:				

â€¢I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â€¢I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

â€¢I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1686	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 13:56:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I have followed this debate for a number of years and can do no better in brief than to say that I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

In my own words, my wife and I have visited Fort Funston regularly for about five years with our little Norwich terrier, Emma. (In fact I proposed to Linda, my wife, on one of our early excursions to this beautiful site after watching Emma tear up and down the sand dunes in complete ecstatic puppy joy.)

In all those visits I have never seen any dogs behaving aggressively to other dogs or people. Any suce must be very rare. The very great majority of dog owners at Fort Funston realize what a wonderful place it is for their dogs to enjoy the great outdoors and to become socialized with other dogs and other people. They respect the site and opportunity accordingly. Almost everyone picks up after their dogs, in my experience, and some of us who come across scat from others go ahead and pick that up too!

There is no other place so close to teh western part of San Francisco that can afford the benefits to dogs and dog owners as Fort Funston. To restrict or prohibit its access in the name of a general policy suited for places more distant from a major city environment would deprive many good citizens of San Francisco of this uniquely positioned recreational opportunity.

Please, a little common sense here!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1687	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94080 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 14:12:31
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have a therapy dog that I've raised as a puppy who is now 7 years old. He specializes in the children's ward of various local hospitals and we rely heavily on the exercise that he receives at local off-leash dog areas for his overall health. Limiting access to local off-leash dog areas would limit my dog's ability to thrive by depriving him of much needed exercise areas, not to mention the family time we (as a family) enjoy while interacting with our dog in these areas.
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1688	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 14:21:17
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	My Labrador and I use Fort Funston on a regular basis. I have not encountered any difficulty with dog walkers or other dog owners. This is the only off leash area close by to Burlingame. In my opinion, there are many places that park users can go to avoid dogs, but only a few that are available for those of us who love dogs. I oppose and do not understand the need to limit our area.
------------------------	---

David Campbell

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1689	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 14:21:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS ~

We could not be more adamantly opposed to the further limitations GGNRA is considering with regard to dogs in the National \*\*\*RECREATION AREA.\*\*\*

We regularly take our dogs to Muir Beach and the Marin Headlands, and have for years. We cannot imagine the Park Service prohibiting our use of these areas with our dogs.

The Marin County portions of the GGNRA which are currently dog-friendly and which have been for decades, have been and should continue to be governed, monitored and regulated differently from more remote wild land areas. In those properties under NPS' control and direction, off-leash dogs may pose a significant threat or have a significant impact on the plants and animals around them. In Marin County, different rules - a different philosophy - should apply; off-leash dogs are extremely unlikely to pose a substantive threat to the plants or animals which are already adapted both to a) the presence of dogs in the environment, and b) the relatively harsh conditions which exist specifically because the surrounding environment is a harsh one.

Further, to delete from the already-short list of dog-friendly \*\*\*RECREATION AREAs\*\*\* in the area, will force more and more of us to DRIVE ever-longer distances to find the last remaining parks where we can walk and play and exercise with our canine companions. By maintaining the GGNRA, isn't the objective to keep people OUT of their cars to pursue these activities?

Furrrrther, it's my understanding that site-specific, peer-reviewed studies are at least called for, if not required by law, for changes of this nature to be made. Is that really true? If so, please send me copies of the studies conducted in this matter, relative to Muir Beach, Homestead, the Headlands and the other areas which you are now considering making off-limits to us dog folks. I've not been able to find even a trace of a study on any of the properties under consideration.

And lastly - wasn't this issue already considered by NPS in 2011? I've been reading that the public comments received by NPS numbered 3-to-1 \*\*\*AGAINST\*\*\* further restrictions on dogs in the Marin County portions of the GGNRA. Is that true, too? If so, what is NPS management thinking? I know - the objective is to solve problems. But where will all the dogs go, if not into the National Park lands we love soooooo much (and which is supported by our tax dollars)? Riiiiiight - dog parks! Put the problems out of the GGNRA and into the local, municipality-owned parks sprinkled around the County. NO! We pay for the GGNRA, too! We want to keep the GGNRA open for ourselves and our canine friends and companions! Packing us all into the tiny municipal dog parks that are available will only create BIGGER problems!

Don't take away our access to the GGNRA!!!

We're paying attention - and we vote.

David E. Gurley  
Corte Madera

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1690    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is James, and my dog Woody is a well-behaved hound-shepherd mix that gets along with everyone and everything. Woody walks off-leash in the GGNRA several times per week. We regularly visit Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, and Lands End. On special occasions we walk from Muir Beach to Rodeo beach and back along the Pacific Coast Trail. Off-leash in the GGNRA, Woody and I both derive the benefits of exercising, socializing, and getting in touch with nature. It is one of the most crucial pieces of the San Francisco lifestyle that I love so much. It balances out the high cost of living and other downsides of the urban environment. Please don't ruin that.

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Optional Points to Make (choose as many or as few as you want):

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says



the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1691    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 14:35:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been a dog owner in San Francisco for most of my life. Keeping recreational areas off leash for dogs is crucial to their socialization and exercise. I live in a small one-bedroom apartment with a 65pound dog and rely on these areas to give her the space to run off her energy so that she can be a well-behaved San Francisco citizen. There is no reason to limit or reduce the area that is currently off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1692    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 14:46:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs should be allowed to run free under the supervision of their owners in Crissy Field, Ft Funston, Ocean beach, Sweeney ridge, Stinson beach, Baker beach, Rodeo beach and multiple other areas.  
The owner can pay some kind of small fee to allow it's dog to run free in those areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1693    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 14:59:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sirs: Your proposed changes to dog walking areas and off leash areas personifies the public perception that GOVERNMENT CANNOT DO ANYTHING RIGHT. Your draconian response to problems where minor adjustments are more appropriate is just one example: reducing 22 current off leash county areas to just 7. With your documents you might have also considered including an application for Tea Party Membership pushing this liberal democrat over the edge!

---

These proposed changes are unacceptable and obviously written by people who have no domesticated pets of any kind imagining that the constricting geography of an insane asylum a.k.a City Parks can accommodate animal needs. With all due respects my advice is to "get a grip".

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1694    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 15:15:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please carefully consider how you address dogs and their access within National recreation areas/parks. Most dogs are very well behaved and contribute in multiple positive ways to their communities. Perhaps you consider a registration system to allow off-leash dogs that meet a standard. We love spending time outdoors with our dog and cherish the fabulous open spaces we have in San Francisco and very close by. As tax paying citizens we hope our interests are represented and balanced when a decision is made.  
Keep spaces open to dogs and their people!  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1695    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Leandro, CA 94577  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 15:18:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Well-socialised and well-exercised dogs are happy and healthy dogs, who in turn are well-behaved dogs. My dog is a part of my family, and I take him with me when I go out. Why are we being asked to leave our well-trained and well-behaved dogs at home, rather than taking them out with us so that we all remain healthy?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1696    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 15:32:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The public has spoken. You all are PUBLIC SERVANTS. Leave our off-leash areas alone. And yes, they are OUR off-leash areas. This land belongs to the citizens, not the GGRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1697    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:10:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm afraid that after years of listening I have finally lost patience with the dog owners who insist on their right to destroy any part of GGNRA in service to their own selfishness. I'm

---

sorry if that sounds harsh, but after listening to them I have to conclude that they view any attempt to regulate their furry friends' ability to kill wildlife, tear up terrain, and terrorize other walkers as a violation of their god-given rights.

NO.

Fenced dog runs. YES

Leash requirements on all trails YES

Protected no-dog zones for wildlife YES

Protect the wonders of GGNRA for all users, human and not. YES

Thanks,

-eric jaeger

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1698	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Renee Ballinger and I live in Burlingame. I enjoy walking my 4 yr old Pointer/lab mix regularly at Ft. Funston, Pulgas Ridge, Sweeny Ridge, and Redondo Beach. I belong to the Sierra Club.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Ft.Funston and all the other closures because it is too restrictive and there is no factual basis for not allowing responsible dogs and dog walkers to use this recreational space.

I feel that it is difficult already to find open space, and to reduce this by 90% is unacceptable. Dogs need to run for their health and well being.

This new plan does not incorporate feedback and has only minor changes from the publicly opposed 2011 plan.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

This proposed management plan will take a toll on the whole family and limit our regular family weekend hike/beach days if we are not able to take our dog with us on these outings.

Sincerely,

Renee Ballinger

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1699	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94602-3006 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Mrs. Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				

---

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:31:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Responsible dog owners will be reprimanded for living a wonderful life with animals.  
People with kids who leave their pampers, people who party leaving their garbage will be able to continue to enjoy the beaches.  
Not really fair :(

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1700    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:40:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Although I support the new policies, I wish to see stronger enforcement as well as visible fencing and/or natural barriers around off-leash areas.  
Protection of our natural resources and wildlife (especially threatened and endangered species) in our National Parks should be the PRIORITY. Enforcement is CRITICAL with dedicated Rangers for these areas to educate dog-owners.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1701    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:41:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There is not reason at all to let dogs run wild at GGNRA. There are too many instances when the dogs disturb wildlife. Give the dogs an area to run, but it can be much smaller than it is now. Things change and you now know how much the damage the dogs are doing to birds. The dogs owners just don't want or care to know.

Just because the dog owners are loud and there are many of them, does not make them right. Stand up for the birds!

Thank you, Jo Ann Herr

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1702    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Davis, CA 95616  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:44:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I grew up in San Francisco and even though I did not have a dog growing up I have very fond memories of walking fort funston with my family and loving seeing all the happy dogs. I went to college and began working at an animal rescue and now have two dogs of my own, both which absolutely love visiting and running around fort funston now. Fort funston is an important recreational

area for dog owners and lovers alike. I doubt you will find more advocates for maintaining the beauty and nature of the ggnra areas than dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1703    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:49:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** TO the NPS: please do not restrict dog walking activities in the GGNRA. Dog owners are very responsible people, and there are existing laws for punishing bad behavior by people and dogs both. Dogs are a source of companionship and joy and they deserve exercise in healthy places, along with their owners!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1704    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:52:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Tell yeah what, guys, I'll buy into parts of this proposal if you also submit a proposal to deal with the homeless situation in SF, including the vagrants that have vicious dogs as companions.

This is ridiculous. We are seeing an overreach by the government here, and whoever drafted up these ludicrous proposals has clearly never had the joy of a pet in their life. I'm all for enforcement of owners who are jerks and don't pick up after their dogs, but restricting mine and my pet's shared enjoyment of park areas makes no sense. One of our greatest joys is to walk and explore uninhibited in Fort Funston. It brings pleasure to both of us to roam freely and interact with the other dog owners in the park. How dare you try to take that away from me and my family.

California mismanagement once again at its finest.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1705    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:53:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent visitor to Chrissy Field, which is covered under this document, I fully support the clear rules around dog control. Even with the current system, which seems to let unleashed dogs in many places, dog owners are constantly ignoring all the signs and letting dogs roam and dig everywhere and bother non dog users of the park when they are purposely using areas not allowed for dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1706    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:54:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** keep parks open for dogs and keep off the leash...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1707 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Jose, CA 95128  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1708 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:55:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is insane.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1709 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 16:57:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Leave our parks and off-leash areas alone. Scrap this awful plan - it isn't needed. Stop wasting our money.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1710 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94111  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 17:06:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are more tax paying dog owners than parents of children in San Francisco. San Francisco is a city that embraces its canine population and has for many years. The fabric of the city is changing so much already with the price of housing going up and the tech companies moving in. Please do not take this basic freedom away from the dog loving community of San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1711    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Elizabeth Wiens and I live in San Francisco. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Golden Gate Park, Ocean Beach and Fort Funston for the past 3 years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I oppose the preferred alternative for Ocean Beach and Fort Funston because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.

I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

And finally, with these restrictions I will be forced to use my car to access off leash areas and dog recreation, may look to other cities to meet my and my pet's needs and will in general not go on as many walks with my family as my 4 legged friends options will be restricted.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Wiens

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1712    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 17:18:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The protection of nature trumps, and always trumps, the indulgence of human recreation, including destruction by dogs. Set aside unused plots in the city for the indulgence of humans

---

and their pets, if you find that necessary. Protect nature, the coast, the beaches, the wetlands, any and all of the few remaining natural areas - NO dogs; and limited human intrusion only around the edges. Stand up for what's right, in the face of entitlement and arrogance.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1713    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Leandro, CA 94577  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 17:35:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

My name is John Hyde, and I live in San Leandro. Every weekend I travel to Muir Beach, Fort Funston, or Crissy Field to walk my dog. These are some of the only dog friendly places to visit in the Bay Area. If not allowed to visit these areas with my dog, I will not visit them at all. Although I am a member of the Sierra Club, and have been for over a decade, I disagree with their stance on restrictions of dogs in these areas.

It has come to my attention that there are going to be sweeping changes in the dog leash policy in the GGNRA, which I oppose. I understand that the existing policy was created in 1979, and I support that it be continued in future GGNRA land acquisitions.

I oppose "fenced in" areas to walk dogs, in these areas as well. I believe that these parks should remain "open", and now these areas will be like fenced in dog parks.

Please don't restrict dog access in the GGNRA.

Regards,

John Hyde

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1714    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 17:48:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I recently learned that the GGNRA has plans to significantly reduce off leash dog areas including Ocean Beach, Fort Funston and Crissy Field. I am writing you to urge You NOT to reduce areas of off leash use. I recognize that GGNRA must strike a balance between a variety of recreation uses and the protection of wild life. The proposal does not strike a reasonable balance. There are few remaining off leash areas in the Bay Area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1715    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** none Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 18:34:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The joy of having a dog is to be allowed to have it under voice command but off leash in some areas. People who dislike dogs can have certain areas to themselves but they cannot have ALL the parkland. We do not live in a city, on the contrary, we live in Marin where it is acceptable to



have a dog and enjoy the outdoors without having a park ranger track you down and give you a ticket.

Having lived here for 22 years and having a dog for a good part of that time I can tell you how mad I am about a further clamping down and reduction of the reasonable places to walk a dog.

If you do this all dogs will be in one spot and I can tell you it will get to be dangerous.

If you remove an area for dogs you should be required to add an area!!! It is our parkland.

I am mad as hell about this!  
Heather Selick

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1716	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94129 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 18:52:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support Alternative F: NPS Preferred Alternative.				

I live and work in the Presidio of San Francisco and I regularly use GGNRA areas such as Baker Beach, Crissy Field, Ft. Mason, Ocean Beach, Lands End, and the Marin Headlands. Over the many years that I have lived in San Francisco, the number of dogs, and in particular the number of off-leash dogs, has grown. I am not a dog owner, and my primary reason for visiting the above mentioned sites is for hiking, biking, and bird watching.

I believe that the GGNRA, and the Presidio, are unique in that they represent National Park lands within a major urban area. Dogs are part of that community, and these areas represent logical places for dog walking. But the number of off-leash dogs has become unsustainable, and commercial dog walkers are abusing their free access to these areas. The limit of six dogs/person is especially important, as is enforcement of leash laws in sensitive wildlife areas. I believe that voice control of off-leash dogs is rarely happening.

In principal, I support Alternative D: Most Protective of Resources and Visitor Safety. However, I believe that some of the recommendations in this alternative will be very difficult to enforce, creating a law enforcement nightmare. That is why I support the preferred alternative.

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1717	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 19:10:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please please please don't ban off-leash dog zones in San Francisco or anywhere. You have no idea how happy it makes and how much difference it will make to the lives of our loved ones!!!				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1718    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** private person Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 19:15:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent walker at Fort Funston for the last 49 years. I support the off leash policy for well behaved people and dogs.

Don't ban all dogs because of a few bad ones. Get yourself one and find the joy in an early morning walk with a best friend, your dog.

Thank you,

Danny Risor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1719    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 19:34:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As the mother of an infant son, an animal lover, guardian of two dogs, and wildlife rehabilitator, I am asking that you reconsider the ban of off-leash dogs in Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I frequently take my dogs and son to Chrissy Field and Rodeo Beach. My dogs are both large and require lots of exercise - - running, not walking - - in order to be healthy and well. It is impossible for me to get them that exercise without letting them run off-leash. I understand the need to protect wildlife and, especially as a wildlife rehabilitator, I understand the need to reduce threats to wildlife. But very few dogs pose threats to wildlife. Let's get real here - the biggest threat to wildlife is humans. Let's focus on how to reduce our impact but not punish those of us who choose to visit and use the parks responsibly with our dogs. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1720    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Belmont, CA 94002  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 19:36:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is unnecessarily restrictive. The status quo allows dog access on less than 1% o GGNRA lands and is a reasonable solution to allowing those with dogs access to these public lands while still allowing those who don't wish to interact to have dog free space. It also provides for sensitive habitats. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

There is no justification in the plan for such restrictive changes or for creating fenced-in off-leash areas or a Monitoring Based Management Strategy that would allow the GGNRA to arbitrarily change leash status without public comment or opinion.

The dog community is an important one in our communities and off-leash access is critical in an urban area such as ours. Restricting access will cause overcrowding in our cities' parks and take away outdoor recreation access for thousands of dog owning households in our area. There is no justification for taking away this access in a recreation area, especially one that was specifically delineated as such upon its creation. Access to 1% of GGNRA land is a reasonable compromise to allow thousands of Bay Area residents the benefits of health and well-being that access to these lands allows. Please keep the 1978 Off-Leash Pet Policy and direct your valuable and limited resources towards something that will actually benefit the parks and the people who support and enjoy them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1721    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Union City, CA 94587  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 19:48:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't change the off-leash laws in your parks. I drive 35 miles to Fort Funston every Saturday to walk my dog along the beach. We go to a lot of different off-leash parks, but she is never so excited and full of energy as she is at the beach. From my experience, park users have been responsible with their pets and I have never witnessed any serious problems between dogs. I would even be willing to make a donation or pay a fee to help GGRNA with the funds needed to maintain off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1722    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 19:58:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You know, California is a very expensive place to live and raise a family because of property costs and the many forms of state and local taxes. We live on my wife's teacher salary and what we have in savings, while I care for an elderly parent and the one child who still lives at home, which is why rarely travel beyond this area. That we must stay close to home isn't such a hardship because ours is a beautiful place. The weather is conducive to being outdoors in our fantastic local, state, and federal park lands. Since two little "rescue" dogs from the Marin Humane Society joined our household a few years ago we began regularly making the short trek over the hill from our house in Homestead Valley to our closest beach where dogs are welcome off leash, MUIR BEACH. These forays, while simple and modest, have become essential to our well-being. Should you decide that we can no longer take our little dogs with us on these restorative outings, that they and we can no longer enjoy their off-leash, voice-controlled romps, you will be depriving us of something that helps us manage our limited funds and family constraints.

Furthermore, we have never, in 25 years of going to Muir Beach(or any other area beach) when our kids were young and now just with our dogs, had anything but positive experiences with other dogs and the people with them, or the people there without dogs. There is no dog problem at Muir Beach. There is nothing to remedy. We and other dog owners abide by the "sensitive habitat" signs. We care about our beach and we take care of it!!! We never see dog feces, and we do see people cleaning up after their dogs, something we do without fail, also(however, it is our practice to "walk" the dogs in our neighborhood before going to the beach).

When dogs are off-leash they lose that territorial watchfulness and are not focused on being protective of their owners. On trails, yes, dogs should be leashed for their own safety because of fast and furious bikers

---

and the close proximity in which people and other dogs may be passing each other. On certain trails I think that dogs should not be allowed. But beaches are different from trails. Forcing people with dogs off most area beaches or mandating that dogs be leashed where currently they are not required to be so, is a serious over-reach of government and a nonsensical, damaging one. Discouraging park attendance through increased restrictions to access, eventually, will mean fewer people will develop deep connections with nature. A decrease in nature literacy will mean fewer stakeholders and THIS will bring real harm to our environment long term. -Mark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1723    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Lindsay Dellas and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Crissy Field and Ft. Funston for the past 30 years. yes, I'm a native San Franciscan and have always had dogs, fabulous ones adopted from our local shelters. I have volunteered at Pets Unlimited, the SF SPCA, Rec & Park specific to Lafayette Park and Golden Gate Park and at the Marine Mammal Center.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for all those beaches because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

If you could see the joy it brings my sweet 15 year old dog, Chloe, when we get to go to crissy field. She has bad arthritis and walking stairs is impossible for her, but at the beach, she is able to walk from the car (which I lift her in and out of) straight to the water. There she is able to get some relief from her pain and enjoy getting out and socializing with other dogs and people. I simply can not deny her this joy at her late stage in life because of a poorly written and unscientific law that singles out and targets one group of people. Please think of our four legged friends.

Sincerely,  
Lindsay Dellas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1724    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 22:34:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow the GGNRA to not reduce off leash dog parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1725    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** SFUSD Environmental Science Center Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 23:05:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi There,

I love the plans for alternatives to the Fort Funston Dog Zoning. Anything is better than the current system for our campers! (( It seems like current system is plan A?)

Options we like in this order are:  
D, C then F

Each of these seem great and really fair to the dog-walkers too. The dogs and dog walkers have ACRES and MILES of parkland north of the main parking lot, both in uplands and on the beach, so it would be wonderful to have some space that are free of doggies and their poops on the south side of the park, in the uplands and on the beach. ((I CANNOT EMPHASIZE HOW MUCH THE POOP, and random dog poop baggies filled up are just left EVERYWHEREEEEE!!!!))))

Our program works around the current dog walkers as much as we can. More and more we use the area from the skyline blvd. road native plant area restored zone, as it is peaceful, lots of wildlife, and a calm and useful area to learn and enjoy. This is not much space, and for the sake of timing will hike students to the Batteries, but steer clear of the east side of these as there are many many dogs.

As soon as we enter the westbound or northbound section of our footprint, offleash dogs are everywhere, often barking, running up to kids and pooping everywhere, I mean everywhere. There is a heavily used unloading zone on the north side of our building that is really used as a big poop pit. It is very sad to see the park disrespected and full of dog poop and trash. Even more than that, it is sad to see the off-leash walkers and up to 20 dogs in tow trampling through the restored native plant regions that we use to teach, even more frustrating is dog walkers interrupting our programming of kids in the middle of a game, or exploring the sand/beach for the first time in their life, and the walkers asking us to 'move our kids' out of the way b/c "this is an off-leash dog park" and "can't we go somewhere else".

Lots of dogs and owners are friendly, but it would be nice to be a truly 'mixed use' park not just an off-leash dog and poop park! :)

Thanks for listening:)  
-Lisa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1726    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My name is Phil Clevenger and I live in San Francisco. We've walked our three rescued dogs in McLaren park for the past 3 or 4 years, though we also venture to Chrissy Field, Glen Park, and other places for variety.

---

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Phil Clevenger, Pam Clevenger

and our dogs:

Lucy, Kali, and Veda

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1727	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 06:37:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The dog community in the Bay Area is very respectful of non-dog owners and of the land that is available for use with our furry friends. This land use is one of the major values of the Bay Area. If there is something us dog owners need to do to better align to usage please let us know. Otherwise, please keep this space as is. We really need this to help with our open people peace of mind and the mental state of our pets.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1728	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Las Vegas, NV 89146 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 07:55:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Do not change rules!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1729	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 08:59:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Crissy Field and all of the GGRA should be kept open for dogs off leash, please!! San Francisco dog owners are responsible.				

---

The access to the lagoon under the cross over bridge could be fenced to keep dogs from entering the lagoon where the birds are during low tide.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1730    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94947  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:48:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose changes in the GGNRA to further restrict dog access or mandatory leash laws in designated areas. Therefore I support Plan A.

Dog ownership in the United States is approximately 37% of the population according to the American Veterinary Association.

The GGNRA is a large part of Marin County with very limited access for dog owners already, further restrictions will force dog owners to even more limited open space preserves and thereby increasing the number of incidents in those areas. This high density of dogs in small designated areas can already be felt, causing increase incident rates and environmental impact.

The public park and open space system is created to enjoy our natural resources. Although I have funded parks with contributions in the past, my inability to access them when I want to go out with my dog is shifting my resources to fund alternative projects.

We enjoy our natural resources with out dog companions who get us out into the parks. I shifting my focus to the Eastbay with a more liberal view on the issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1731    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** MILL VALLEY, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:53:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Muir Beach has been a favorite spot for myself, my family, my friends, acquaintances, and many people in the Bay Area as well as the furry, four legged creatures that make up our families.

Most of us have animals, dogs that are our pets, that we consider family. Most of these dogs are well trained, and follow voice control, and most pet owners are responsible, and clean up after their pets.

To create a rule that dogs should be on leash at a beach is like saying children should sit down in their seats at recess. Dogs need to run and play. This creates healthy non-neurotic dogs that are easy to be around. Leashing dogs makes them aggressive and territorial.

Of course there are some owners who should leash a temperamental dog and don't, and there are some owners who do not clean up after their pets. Please do not enforce rules and regulations because of a few irresponsible pet owners. I personally have one dog - a border collie who is completely under voice

---

control and will lie down when I give him the signal from 50 yards away. My other dog is different and she is on the leash because she is unpredictable and untrusting of strangers since she an abandoned dog, that was rescued.

The law should read that if the dog is not under voice control, or is aggressive, then that dog should be leashed, but let's not create a new breed of hostile dogs, in an already too litigious society. Let's not have an adverse impact on family life, preventing a child from throwing a ball for his dog and allowing the child the pleasure of watching his dog catch it in the waves and bring it back to him.

Please think of all these things, and avoid initiating a leash law at Muir Beach.

Thank you

Sincerely,

Charlene Frischer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1732    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Greenbrae, CA 94904  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 09:58:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in the bay area now for over 12 years and cherish the access that I have to the outdoors. I take advantage of it daily with my dogs. We run trails, play at the beaches, have adventure. We are responsible dog owners and greatly appreciate the access we do have to the outdoors. Please do not completely further limit our access.

Sincerely

Laura

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1733    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 10:58:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the existing off leash areas in SF parks. There will be a huge outcry if you reduce them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1734    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:04:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Living in the city without my own yard, parks play an integral role in me and my dogs' lives. This is where we exercise together, get fresh air and enjoy nature. One of my dogs can't play in city dog parks, because none are fenced and she loves to run. Only GGNRA parks are big enough for her to romp freely, where I don't have to worry about her being hit by a car. Please don't take away this wonderful resource.



**Correspondence ID:** 1735    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Stacey Dirzuweit and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog at Golden Gate Park, Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, and Point Isabel Park for the past 14 of years. I belong to SaveOffLease.com and Hayes Valley Dog Buddies.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for the Golden Gate National Recreational Areas because it is too restrictive. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco and San Mateo Counties, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please don't force families like mine to have to drive long distances to find dog friendly outdoor areas.

Sincerely,  
Stacey Dirzuweit

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1736    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Northern California Shiba Rescue Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:28:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please add me to those who oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes, other than indications that some folks may not be following the law.

After reading it, and it took some time to find, I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Further, I support the forming of a volunteer taskforce, complete with docents, and guides, to help support the GGNRA, specifically for the training, education and support of Dogs and their owners while enjoying the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1737    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94502  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:38:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1738    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:40:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1739    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 11:41:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1740    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. I do support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

The GGNRA was established to provide recreational opportunities to local residents. Unlike a National Park, the GGNRA original charter was to offer open space to a densely populated area. Considering that 50% of that population has dogs, it seems highly illogical to restrict that portion of the population from enjoying this open space. The fact that 99% of the GGNRA is already off-limits to dog owners is a shame. To reduce this further seems completely unreasonable.

For dog owners, the enjoyment of walking their dogs in the GGNRA, as well as offering them off leash access, is essential to the dog owners well being and health. I personally do not have a dog. However, my mother does and her taking her dog for walks in open spaces provides my mother an essential form of

exercize that benefits her as well her dog. I believe this was the intent of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. The National Park Service should not impose any further restrictions on this essential use of our puplic lands.

Best Regards,

Kathy Johnston

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1741	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 11:52:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support limiting dog use and requiring dog owners to follow the stricter rules.				

My two picnics with my kids this summer at Chrissy Field were run through by dogs.

In addition my toddler's face has been licked by an off leash dog at the park. Thankfully, he wasn't bitten.

I have lived in other cities and consider the lax dog rules in San Francisco to be unsafe and unfair. I feel unsafe around other people's off leash dogs and don't think my family should be forced to interact with other people's dogs when I go to a public park.

Often people have their dogs off leash when signs say it is forbidden. I find this disregard to the rules as hard to explain to my kids. In Seattle, where we moved from, police gave tickets to violators of leash laws in parks. As a result, such violations became the exceptions, not the norm.

In no other public space, have I seen dogs allowed such freedom because their respective owners deem them safe to do so. Dogs are unpredictable around other dogs and around kids and people they don't know- -a park contains all theses elements.

A new dog policy that enforces leash laws and clearly marks off leash areas would make the park safer for everyone.

Thank you for working on this!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1742	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 11:55:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We live in SF and have a new puppy/dog. What I've realized is that she HAS to have off-leash activity at least once a day - to run, play with other dogs,, etc. - or she digs, chews household items, decks, etc. Young dogs need room to run. Period. On leash is fine on trails, but there must be areas, open areas, protected areas, where dogs can run. I don't believe that can not be done without protecting the environment. Put up fences where you don't want the dogs to go. Tell us how many feet from the dunes you want us to keep the dogs. Dogs are not like cats. They need space to run and play. In that way,				

---

they are very much like children. Please keep spaces in the city: by the Cliff House, at Crissy Field, on Baker Beach, for example, with off-leash areas. They do not need to be huge, just there. I will have to let my dog off least part of each day. The dirt covered, bland dog parks near us are unacceptable for us. Dog parks like the Upper Douglass park are a godsend, but when will it open...??? Dogs are not going to go away. Please help us all work together to live together.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1743    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for (name the area or areas) because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, (please state in your own words how the restrictions will impact your life- examples may be having to get into your car and drive long distances to walk your dog or not going out on walks with your family because you can't take your four-legged friend etc.)

Sincerely,  
Pamela Figueroa  
and my dogs Chico & Chela Figueroa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1744    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 12:49:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not restrict the areas I can take my dog off-leash. The Bay Area has always been so dog friendly, please do not change it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1745    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 13:18:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Over 50% of San Francisco residents own dogs. Please don't reduce the dog areas in the GGRNA!

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1746    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 13:29:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let dogs roam free in your parks!!!!  
Please. Otherwise you'll have angry dogs!  
This proposed law is crazy and I'm not even a dog owner  
Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1747    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Carly Earnshaw and I live in San Francisco. I have walked my dog in Chrissy Field, Fort Funston, Land's End and the Marin Headlands for the past 12 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for park spaces in San Francisco and the Bay Area because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Sincerely,  
Carly Earnshaw

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1748    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Miwok, Coastal trails and Rodeo Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. I haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I am a responsible dog owner and have trained my dog to be under voice control and be socialized with people with or without dogs. I pick up after my dog and am considerate of my fellow citizens who do not have a dog. Please don't limit our off-leash access to the trails and the beach.

Rozanne Cazian

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1749	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	K9 Scrub Club Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 13:56:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

Please do not pass this unfair ban on local beaches and parks - - as a dog owner and manager of a local pet shop, I know first hand that the happiness and lives of dogs and owners alike will be severely impacted if you take away local parks and beaches from being popular dog-friendly locales. Dogs do not harm the environment, the parks, the beaches - - sure sometimes there is poop but in the grand scheme of everything, we all poop, so don't hold it against the dogs that they have to do it in the outside world.

Many of our customers go to Funston and Crissy Fields every day, and most of those dogs REQUIRE a lot of daily exercise that is unrealistic for a modern dog owner to compete with - - we simply can't keep up with them, jogging isn't always an option, and hiring a dog walker instead of participating in bonding playtime at a local beach or park is just an obnoxious idea.

Please reconsider this motion to ban allowing our precious animals/children (which is what they are to us!!!) from having a healthy, active lifestyle! We all share this city, please don't exclude us from enjoying nature with our pets and family.

Christina Valence  
Store Manager of K9 Scrub Club Noe Valley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1750    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-3065

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 13:57:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a dog lover who enjoys encountering dogs on the street when I walk in my neighborhood. And having had a free roaming dog as a child in a small town, I understand the need for dogs to have a place to run free. However, the GGNRA is not a huge place and is home to wild species for whom the presence of dogs is a threat. There are millions of pet dogs in the country who are cared for by their keepers, but no one is feeding the wild creatures or taking them to the vet. These animals must be protected and keeping dogs out of their environment will help do that. There are many places in this city that are dog friendly, we need not sacrifice the open spaces of the GGNRA to their needs while ignoring the real threat to wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1751    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 14:23:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am absolutely heart broken that we may lose our ability to walk on the trails that dogs will now be banned from. One of the biggest joys in the world is hiking with my pup. I am not the only one. There are already so little trails that we can go on, now only Rodeo? Mountain bikers are a bigger issue than dogs. Honestly, I have been hiking the Marin trails for over 20 years and have never seen dog doing anything on a trail other than smiling and having fun. Isn't that the point? Please reconsider.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1752    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN JOSE, CA 95132

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Madeleine Pao and I live in San Jose. I walk my dog on Fort Funston for the past 2 of years. I belong to Fort Funston dog group.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for San Francisco, Bay Area because it is too restrictive. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Madeleine Pao

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1753    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My name is Ken Mao and I live in San Jose. I walk my dog on Fort Funston National Park for the past 3 of years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston National Park because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I have three well trained dogs, they love Fort Funston National Park, even i need to drive 45mins to 1hr just to get there. but as long as my dogs are happy and run free over there. i feel very hopeful. please don't banned off leash in Fort Funston National Park.

thank you so much

Ken

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1754    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sunnyvale, CA 94085  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Lucy Lu and I live in Sunnyvale, CA. I walk my dog on Fort Funston National Park for the past year.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for (name the area or areas) because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are



not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, (please state in your own words how the restrictions will impact your life- examples may be having to get into your car and drive long distances to walk your dog or not going out on walks with your family because you can't take your four-legged friend etc.)

Sincerely,  
Lucy Lu

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1755	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941-1132				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi,				

My name is Sharon Salisbury and I have lived in Mill Valley for over 30 years. During those years I have always owned dogs and one of the pleasure of living here was that there were a few places we could wander off-leash, with our furry pals by our side. It is such a joy for me and the dogs to watch them splash through mud puddles, run after sticks in the creek, or just run across a meadow. As our dogs have gotten older, we now make use of the dog park, which is very crowded and where often dogs fights occur. And even there, if a dog goes in the water after a duck(what dog wouldn't) we get fined. I am a member of Audubon, volunteer at WildCare and IBRC and do not condone dogs chasing birds, but i didn't chose the location of the park either.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

"I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. And is this just not another dog park?

"I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

And what happened to all of the comments that were made back in 2011 as they seem to have disappeared or not even been considered. I went to each and every meeting and wrote letters, as did many of my friends and I can tell you the overwhelming response was from people who supported dogs off leash in certain GGNRA areas. There is a reason the GGNRA has a R in the acronym, as well you know, it stands for recreation. It is not a pristine wilderness area. It was created and meant to be used by all groups of people, including people with their off-leash dogs. As it stands now, we only have access to !% oall the beautiful park land in CA. Bikers, birders, hikers all go off trail and there are many more of them but they

keep being allowed on more land, while we are losing some of our most wonderful walkie places. I am a birder and can also attest to birders going off-path en masse to peer into nests and pishing to lure birds into the open. The new plan does not cite any specific examples of damage, nor is there any scientific evidence for keeping dogs on-leash.

I oppose the current plan for many reasons: dogs kept on-leash are almost always more aggressive, dog fights are occurring more frequently in dog parks due to overcrowding (there was a near-fatal attack at the MV dog park last week.) as well as a place for being a vector for parasites, dog owners pay taxes too and then there is just the pure joy it brings us and our dogs to feel freedom if only for an hour. After 30 years of hiking and walking dogs off-leash, I have never, ever seen a dog fight nor any dog bringing any animal down. On the contrary, I think the coyotes are winning in Mill Valley and I wish them no harm for that. Their home first.

Mary Oliver, the Pulitzer Prize winning poet speaks for me and Badger and Emmy when she says:  
"You may not agree, you may not care, but  
if you are holding this book you should know  
that of all the sights I love in this world-  
and there are plenty-very near the top of the list is this one: dogs without leashes."

Sincerely,  
Sharon Salisbury

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1756	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. The plan proposes to either eliminate or severely limit dog-walking access in 21 locations in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo counties - including traditional off-leash areas like Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Marin Headlands, Mori Point, Muir Beach, Ocean Beach, and Rodeo Beach.				

The GGNRA is located in a major urban area with minimal open space, so these restrictions will have a dramatic impact. I believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRA's original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan FAILS to do.

Please listen to the residents of San Francisco- WE OPPOSE THIS PLAN.

Sincerely,  
Catherine Foreman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1757	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United Kingdom				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 17:14:59				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take our dogs to Muir beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1758	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 17:15:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take our dogs to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1759	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 17:42:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Diane Janakes-Zasada and I live in the outer Richmond district of San Francisco. The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a				

---

densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land. since the original pet policy in 1979. The off leash areas are a sanctuary for my dog to be able to run and explore and to be trained off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1760    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 18:43:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I used to take my dog on the trails behind my house all the time in the GGNRA (Miwok, Coastal, etc). I no longer have my dog but I love seeing other dogs on the trail when I am hiking.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1761    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Google Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am very upset at the proposed changes to ban dogs off-leash at certain beaches as well as being banned from on-leash trails.

The changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

I would like the GGNRA to retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

The GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor

---

RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

Please ensure that we keep our beaches open to all types of people with or without dogs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1762	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Nearly every day for the past 18 years, we've walked our dog off-leash in Oakwood Valley, which is about 100 yards from our house. We've never had to get in our car to go there.

Over the years, we've spoken with many of the thousands of people we've seen there and we have yet to meet anyone who seemed bothered by our dog.

We oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to Oakwood Valley and other parts of the GGRNA. We support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

We don't understand what all the fuss is about. Is this just so some bureaucrat can get a merit badge? This same issue came up three years ago and it was soundly defeated. What has changed since then? There has been no environmental degradation at Oakwood Valley during that time or during the nearly two decades we have taken our dog there.

Dogs are already off-limits in 99% of the GGNRA. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The GGNRA was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space as a place for recreation within walking distance. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in your 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,

Tom and Amy Davey

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1763	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 19:24:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off leash parks are limited enough around the Bay Area. Fort funston and golden gate park are fabulous weekend destinations that one can enjoy with their dog. I am for keeping these areas as off lease areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1764 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love Point Reyes National Seashore. Its 71,000 acres of mixed-use territory that is saved from development is fabulous. I love the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. To have a further 80,000 acres designated for recreation is beyond wonderful.

I also love our dogs. They are well-behaved, healthy, friendly, devoted members of our family. We are responsible dog owners who walk them leashed and clean up after them every single time.

Perhaps not all dog owners are as responsible as we are, but they can be educated to change their habits. I remember when California roads and highways were decorated with ribbons of litter for their entire length. Cans, papers, cups - hundreds of thousands of them. The anti-litter campaign took many years to change the habits of Californians, but it worked, and it worked well.

Simply banning dogs from National lands is not the right solution. An outright ban on dogs prevents a huge percentage of the population from enjoying the parks except from the confines of their car. The only place I can walk legally with my dog in Point Reyes is along Highway 1 - a narrow highway with 55mph traffic passing my left shoulder just inches away. At every trailhead or side road along the highway there is a sign that bans dogs from leaving the highway. This makes no sense to me.

I remember in 1995 the Mount Vision fire burned 12,000 acres and 45 homes in Point Reyes National Seashore. Damage was in the tens of millions of dollars. The fire was caused by 4 boys who acted irresponsibly.

Using the same logic it would make even more sense to ban children. Think of the savings in graffiti clean-up alone.

And no dog has caused a wildfire - ever.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1765 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 20:22:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Chrissy Field is our favorite place in the WORLD to take our dogs. It's clean, safe, friendly and an all out great time. Taking this away would mean that I walk my dogs in the city every weekend rather than letting my dogs swim and enjoy the beach. Also, no one will come to this beach

---

without their dogs, so what's the point? To limit the amount of people who enjoy that area?

This is a big mistake, please take this into consideration.

Steve

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1766	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 20:25:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Unfortunately due to some fog owners who careless about others, it is a great initiative to restrain off-leash of dogs in public spaces. I had dog bite my 6 YO and the reply I got was: "nothing I can do about it". Or, stepped more than once on dog feces in the beach or our community park and garden. There is no harm with respecting everyone's right to clean safe public spaces.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1767	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 20:32:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I care about Fort Funston and the Marin Headlands the most. I want there to remain a trail system and a beach for dog owners to let their dogs off leash, but understand that there is a need to protect habitat and to make a place where people without dogs can feel safe and comfortable.				

I am a dog owner and a citizen of San Francisco. I value having a place for my dog to run off leash because in San Francisco I cannot afford a yard to myself where I can exercise my dog. I like the following options:

At Ft. Funston:

Option A (no cation) is the best.

Option E is second best.

Option F is third best.

All of the other options are no good because they take the best off-leash dog walking in the city away.

In the Marin headlands only option A (no action) leaves a place where I can walk my dog off leash.

I have no strong opinions about any other location.

Thank you for you time and work.

Please do make sure that there is still wild beach and a robust trail system so I can exercise my dog off leash.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1768	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** novato, CA 94949  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 20:43:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are in favor of option E...we feel that there are hundred miles of trails in SF and Marin county thar are off limits to dogs and these few locations should have off leash rules for dogs. We do think owners should follow rules to be able to voice control their dog and also should be fined for not cleaning up after their dogs and/or having aggressive dogs out of theircontrol.

Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1769    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 20:50:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA's Dog Management Plan would have negative impact on EVERYONE; dog owners and the general public.

Off leash areas are a fundamental necessity of any city with population of dogs. It is a fact that their are more dogs than children in San Francisco county. So, why are they proposing to substantially decrease the amount of off leash areas, when their is already not enough.

If GGNRA's Dog Management Plan is passed, the remaining off leash areas would become hazardously overcrowded.

Their would be a huge increase in the number of under exercised and under socialized dogs, which only spells disaster and poses huge danger to EVERYONE. Under exercised and under socialized dogs are more likely to be out of control and the likelihood of them biting someone would be greatly increased.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1770    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in San Francisco for ten years. I have enjoyed the immense beauty of Fort Funston and Ocean Beach with my dog for the past two years. Exercising her off leash, while respecting the beauty of these natural places, has made me a healthier and happier citizen, which I believe fulfills the purpose of setting aside such recreation areas in the first place.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston because it is too restrictive. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though



much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Fort Funston is like no other place. It is the best part about living in San Francisco. It makes our city unique, because we can live an urban life and vacation every day in wild nature with our dogs. Please reconsider your position.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1771    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir BeaCH, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 21:00:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly prefer the 'No Action' alternative.

that is,

Alternative A:  
No Action (36  
CFR 2.15, 36 CFR  
7.97 (d); 1979 Pet  
Policy; GGNRA  
Compendium)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1772    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 21:09:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have a very energetic, well-behaved dog who loves to run, play, and be social. I live in the city of SF with no backyards and very few places that allow her to run free, sniff, and explore. In recent studies, it has been noted that San Francisco has more dogs than children. There are eight playgrounds within walking distance of my house but no where for me and my dog to fetch or play. So we go to both Bernal and Ft. Funston multiple times per week.

My mild mannered Aussie shephard has lived in SF her whole life. She is friendly, quite, and brings smiles to the faces of the people she sees. In order to keep her this way, she needs a public place where she is allowed to hangout with her friends and burn off energy. All the walks in the world could not compensate for seeing a big empty park and not being able to play after being alone inside most days. Dogs like humans needs interaction and to have a little fun.

As her responsible parent, I have trainer my dog to behave, not bark, and stay within park limits. We spend 10 hours on average per week at public parks that allow dogs. And in my experience, the dogs she

plays with are equally as respectful.

City dogs need a place to play. Don't take that from us. By taking away Funston and requiring leashes at more city parks, you would turn my dog into a cooped up, moody, bored member of society rather than the happy, positive participant that she is.

If anything, dog families need more not less space to congregate, share stories, and enjoy the outdoors. Good conversation and a little sunshine makes everyone in this city just a little bit happier.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1773    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 21:35:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please oh please don't do it. Don't close our trail. Every day after school me and my dad walk my dog Lou on the Oak Creek Trail. It is my favorite part of the day and I know it is my dog's favorite part too. I just got my dog a month ago and I can't believe this might happen. We meet so many nice people and their dogs, and really the only people we see on this trail are people with dogs. It's a small short trail but it's a big part of our day. Please don't close this trail to me and my dog and dad. We would miss it so much. And our new friends.

From, Gus Mehrkam 6 years old, Tam Valley student.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1774    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Rodeo Beach and other trails around Marin County and this proposed dog management plan is the wrong way to go. It will create more problems than it intends to fix ... traffic, overcrowding, and overuse. The dogs aren't going anywhere, just their space to roam!

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Glacier or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. My family and I travel to National Parks every summer, we don't bring our dog and realize the difference between a wilderness area and a recreation area.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1775    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 22:06:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a San Francisco resident with kids, I strongly support restricting dog access to the parks. Off-leash dogs can be dangerous - my wife has been bitten here in the city - and they make beaches and other park areas less usable for humans. I think dogs are wonderful, and this city has some fine dedicated dog parks. But people come first. Our parks need to be people-friendly first and foremost, and off-leash dogs degrade the quality for everyone else. Thank you for your time!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1776    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Esomar Association for Research Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Nate Bolt and I live in SF. I've walked my dog at Fort Funston and Chrissy Field for 10 years, and my dad took us to those same areas with our family dog growing up in SF. I went to Lowell High and now manage research for Facebook so am deeply invested in the culture of the bay area and our ability to escape the hectic pace of life in any urban area. Our access to nature makes SF incredibly special - please don't radically alter it by over-regulating off-leash dog access.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston and Chrissy Field because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. I'm a member of Esomar for research standards, and any of our thousands of members would find your methods and justification severely lacking. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas.

And finally, some of my fondest family memories are letting our dog play at the beach off-leash under voice control, and in my entire 36 years of going to Fort Funston and Chrissy field, I've never seen a single problem with any off-leash dog, ever. Yet you're trying to take away one of the richest experiences of nature for pet-owners in SF and other areas. I'm pleading with you to reconsider. This is far too severe.

Sincerely,  
Nate Bolt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1777    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DearSuperintendent Dean,

Myname is Dean Rizzi and I live in San Francisco. Iwalk my dog on Crissy Field anf Fort Funston for the past 3 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for the two areas above because it is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in SanMateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a marginof 3:1.

What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describe how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be, not as a national park, which is not something that is appropriate in a crowded urban area.

And finally, we would have to seek out altunative off leash areas further away from San Francisco so our family could get some exercise.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1778    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** For the people, by the people....

PLEASE, avoid more beaurocratic nonsense that will result in costly lawsuits, etc. Nature is paramount which is why Marinites, etc. happily concede so much land to park with associated restrictions.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1779    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 23:54:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs need play areas and areas to run. We need off leash areas for people and their dogs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1780    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** USCG Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 08:04:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave the Oakwood Valley trail and Fire Road as is. We've been walking the dogs there for almost 30 years. The valley used to be a dump, but is now a beautiful complement to our congested Bay Area. Thank you for cleaning it up all those years ago. Please leave our slice of heaven in its present state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1781    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 08:10:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The GGNR proposed changes to off-leash rules severely impact my husband and our dog. As is the case for many dog owners in San Francisco, our dog is "our child." We chose to live in the Marina for the amazing access to Crissy Field and the Presidio. Our dog loves nothing more than a run on the beach. And I love nothing more than doing that with her! In these outings, we see friends and make new ones.

We considered moving to Marin County 10 years ago. But because of this unique city where we could work, live, and enjoy access with our dog to outdoor spaces with other people and dogs, we chose to stay in San Francisco, specifically the Marina.

We are very much against this change, and ask that you consider the severe impact to the quality of life to individuals like us who have chosen to stay in San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
Jodi & Bob Morris (& dog Sydney)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1782    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Jayne Verdon and I live in San Rafael. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically (name the areas in which you walk with your dog) for the past 20 of years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I oppose the preferred alternative for (name the trail or beach, for example Muir Beach, or Fort Funston) because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.

I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

And finally, (please state in your own words how the restrictions will impact your life- examples may be having to get into your car and drive long distances to walk your dog or not going out on walks with your family because you can't take your four-legged friend etc.)

Sincerely,

Jayne Verdon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1783    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Ruby Rieke Design Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 09:57:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please save our off leash area. As a couple with a dog who we love we find it unfair that the places we can take him are under fire. A lot of people live in SF who have dogs consider them their children. Limiting leash free areas will affect so many of these families in a negative way. Please Please don't take our dogs free space to roam and be a dog away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1784    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 09:59:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't make Crissy Field on leash only. Our dogs are our kids and they need room to run and play too. There is plenty if room for all to enjoy. Please

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1785    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Muir Beach Community Services District Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 10:16:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very disappointed that the NPS is proposing to prohibit dogs on leash on the trails surrounding my home. I have been walking my dogs on leash since the early 70's. I am particularly disappointed that it is proposed to prohibit dogs on leash south of Muir Beach on the Coastal Trail . I also note that the NPS is purportedly prohibiting dogs on leash on the Owl Trail and the old Banducci road connecting Highway 1 to the Coastal Trail going up to Pan Toll. There is additional signage prohibiting dogs on other trails connecting to the Coastal Trail. To my knowledge there has never been any advance notice of this unilateral prohibition and as far as I'm concerned is without justification.

I have been able to hike with my dogs on leash on the coastal Trail for years and years. We don't impact any water on our hikes, there are very other people and dogs on the trail at any one time. In all my years of hiking on these trails I can't recall ever seeing any Park Service people out on foot on the trails either south of Muir Beach or North on the Owl Trail or the old Banducci Farm Rd. I've only seen them in NPS vehicles driving on the fire roads and creating large ruts when muddy. Certainly that is far more destructive of the environment than a few isolated people with dogs on leash. If you folks hardly ever walk these trails I don't see how you can justify prohibiting people like me from hiking with my dogs on leash. You can't possibly know what the conditions are or even if they affect the environment at all. What's the point of having this recreational area if citizens like me who live in the area can't use it with our dogs on leash? One of the unique things about where I live is that I can go out my front door with my dogs on leash and hike out either north or south in a beautiful countryside without getting in my car. Now your proposals threaten this unique and valuable place that I live in. I am very disappointed in the NPS and feel intimidated and hostile to you folks for taking this activity away from me. Alex Johnston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1786    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 10:17:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Golden Gate Planning Team

Please do not reduce the area available for dogs to be and be off leash in SF. Dogs are an incredibly positive factor in making SF special - and provide so many health benefits for the people who live here.

Please AMEND or DO NOT PASS the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Draft Dog management Plan as it stands.

Sincerely,

Anne Moellering, 9 Coleridge Street, San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1787    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 10:21:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Michele Batista and I live in Pacifica next door to Milagra ridge and Sweeny ridge. I often visit Milagra ridge with my dog Flash. He is well behaved and I don't feel that I should be punished from enjoying the parks with my dog as I am a responsible pet owner. I often volunteer at Milagra with the GGNR and also on my own on a weekly basis I pick up the feces from other dog owners that are not being responsible. I know that the feces is a problem to the environment, but instead of being so incessant about having dogs on lease we should focus on issuing fines to those that are not picking up their dogs waste, which is the real problem at the parks. Being a Geologist (I know some information about environmental issues) there is no reason that the dogs should not be allowed. I understand that dogs trample the vegetation, however, if were talking about the amount of area the dogs trample versus the entire area of the parks their destruction of vegetation is almost negligible. Our government has already ruined the natural vegetation by planting the non-native ice plant and the Pampas grasses thinking it would prevent erosion. The dogs remaining on the trails only leave paw prints if the owners are picking up and not allowing their pets to walk on areas that are being rehabilitated. Maybe we should try fencing in the rehabilitated areas to keep people out of them instead of keeping dogs contained. Despite fencing in dogs you still have a human problem of trampling vegetation. I feel that you should consider leaving all parks open to all toe enjoy. It is getting overly restrictive and not healthy for humans nor their best friends. And we should not all have to be punished for those that do not follow the rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1788    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

The changes made in the 2014 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SIES for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitor as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

Kindly remember that the GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It required a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk with their dogs.

---



This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County!

Best regards,  
Deirdre Swarsen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1789    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 10:25:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I find it really difficult to read your document and find out what the draft report says about unleashed dogs. That's the topic that I was interested in and how I got on your mailing list. What I feel is that Crissy Field and all federal government park areas should require that dogs be on leashes. I've seen unleashed dogs defecate on parkland without their owners even knowing they had done so. I'm not afraid of dogs, but I understand some people's fears; dogs on leashes would feel safer to all the other people on parkland.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1790    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 11:02:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My dog loves running around Crissy Field, its one of the few places he's comfortable enough to cut loose and run at full tilt in SF. Don't take that away from him.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1791    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Jason Stephens and I currently live in San Francisco and have lived in the Bay Area for 15 years. I am one of the many San Franciscans who own a mostly well-behaved dog that I walk on a daily basis in the city. On weekends I often try to take Kora to an off-leash area so she can get more exercise and enjoy a short stint of relative freedom. I've never personally had any problems between my dog, anyone else's dog, or other dog or non-dog-owning people. Although I know problems do occur, my observation is that they are very uncommon and it would be a huge shame to greatly curtail off-leash areas based on anecdotes. Part of living in a dense city environment is having to occasionally put up with people and situations (and yes, dogs) that you might prefer not to.

I did not write the comments below but I have read them and agree with them:

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.

What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describes how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be, not as a national park, which is not something that is appropriate in a crowded urban area.

Sincerely,

Jason Stephens

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1792	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 11:20:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep an offleash area at Fort Funston. Parkl is in your name. Parks are areas for recreation.				

Off lease areas like Funston provide true recreation areas for dogs and their humans. Recreation for dogs truly means off leash. They need to run, and I know that I for one cannot run as fast as my dog can.

Granted, the National Park Service probably has a focus on both humans and the environment, rahter than dogs. However, I would argue that these off leash areas serve humans as much as their pets. Outdoor exercised pets are happier pets, espically in a crowded city like San Francisco. This is important.

I would also guess that off-leash areas in the NPS are a tiny percentage of overall park service lands.

Service is in your name. Please keep the off-leash areas as a service to all of us who live here.

Susan Cunningham

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1793	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 11:35:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Kathryn Weeks. I am writing to express my very strong opposition to the proposed off-leash restrictions in the GGNRA, particularly Fort Funston, a dog mecca. If you live in the Bay Area and own a dog, you go to Fort Funston. On the beach, there is an eyesore of a drainage pipe surrounded by concrete walls. Over the years, the walls have been covered by murals, graffiti, and even frescos in relief - all of which depict dogs.				

---

Our dogs go to Fort Funston about 3 times a week. There is no way we could live in our one bedroom apartment, with 2 people and 2 dogs, if it wasn't for the off-leash privileges in Fort Funston. The vigorous exercise our dogs get is vital to their ability to live in cramped quarters, their ability to relax, and for their humans' peace of mind.

Please do not restrict off-leash privileges in GGNRA. This is not a proposal supported by the public or the citizens of this city. The residents of San Francisco have more dogs than children. We need these off-leash areas to give our dogs the exercise and socialization that they need and deserve. We pay the ridiculous cost of living in the Bay Area to have access to special places, like Fort Funston, and we cannot afford to lose it. Please do not restrict off-leash privileges in the GGNRA. It will have a significant impact on these animals' well-being. It will also hurt the many dog-walking businesses that rely on off-leash areas, like Fort Funston, which provide a safe environment for dogs to roam free and exercise.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1794	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRA,				

The changes made in the 2014 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SIES for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitor as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

Kindly remember that the GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It required a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk with their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County!

Best regards,  
Sonja

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1795	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 12:11:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Madame or Sir:

My name is Kathryn Weeks and I am a proud resident of San Francisco. I am writing to express my very strong opposition to the proposed off-leash restrictions in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, particularly in Fort Funston, a dog mecca.

One of my dogs is one year old and as hyper as they come. Her favorite place in the world is Fort Funston.

If you live in the Bay Area and own a dog, you go to Fort Funston. On the beach, there is an eyesore of a drainage pipe surrounded by concrete walls. Over the years, the walls have been covered by murals, graffiti, and even frescos - all of dogs, which signifies how much of an institution Fort Funston has become for dog owners. Our dogs go to Fort Funston about 3 times a week. There is no way we could live in our one bedroom apartment, with 2 people and 2 dogs, if it wasn't for the off-leash privileges in Fort Funston. The vigorous exercise our dogs get is vital to their ability to live in cramped quarters, their ability to relax, and for their humans' peace of mind.

Last year, our beloved Boxer dog died. We scattered her ashes on the beach at Fort Funston - her favorite place on earth. It was The off-leash laws have great significance to San Franciscans, even sentimental value for some of us, and have a very positive impact on our lives.

Please do not restrict off-leash privileges in GGNRA. This is not a proposal supported by the public or the citizens of this city. The residents of San Francisco have more dogs than children. We need these off-leash areas to give our dogs the exercise and socialization that they need and deserve. We pay the ridiculous costs of living in SF to have access to special places like Fort Funston, and we cannot afford to lose the off-leash privileges that make them so unique. It will have a significant impact on our animals' well-being. It will also hurt the many dog-walking businesses that rely on off-leash areas, like Fort Funston, as they provide a safe, natural environment for dogs to roam and play. This, in turn, improves the quality of life for SF residents. Please do not restrict off-leash privileges in the GGNRA.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1796	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I was born and raised in San Francisco. I have been a veterinarian at the SF/SPCA since 1994. In the Bay Area, many people regard their pets as their family members. Just providing food and shelter for our pets is not enough to ensure good health. Environmental enrichment, training, socialization and daily exercise are essential for our pets to be fit and healthy. Dogs need regular off leash exercise that often can not be provided in our homes, ours small backyards if any, or by simply leash walking in the neighborhood or at local parks. That is why it is so important for us to have close access to off leash dog parks and regional open space. My clients, friends, and my family regularly take our dogs to Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, the Presidio, the Marin Headlands, Fort Mason, and Sweeney Ridge. Restricting available off leash areas in the GGNRA means that many of us will be unable to adequately provide the exercise our dogs and families need and more people with dogs in the Bay Area crowding the limited local off leash dog parks.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

---

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral de la Tierra.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1797	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 12:27:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern:				

Off-leash spaces in the San Francisco Bay Area are extremely important to dogs and dog owners. They increase the happiness and well being of both. When dogs cannot get significant exercise, as they do with fetch (off leash), they are much harder to manage at home and in general. A well exercised dog is a wonderful dog for the whole community.

Please do not limit off-leash dog areas.

Thank you,

Laura

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1798	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** US Citizen, San Francisco Resident Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 13:20:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Limiting the National Recreational areas off leash dog access would be a travesty. Off leash access an important part of my own health and recreation. It is vital to myself and to my dog. I oppose this change as San Francisco agreed to the national parks managing of this area as an URBAN recreational area not as a national park, which is a vital component of San Francisco for its citizens and their enjoyment. I do not support your suggested changes to my national recreational areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1799    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 13:49:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reserve an area for dog walking in all the different parks. As a woman, I always feel safer walking and hiking these areas with my dog. I think professional dog walkers should have a dog limit per each excursion to keep proper control of their dogs. I also favor restricting some areas to preserve wildlife habitat. Erosion causes these areas to shift and barriers are not always clear. I would also favor a rule limiting off leash dogs to two per person. We think parks can be enjoyed by everyone including dogs as long as owners respect that certain areas are off limits and common sense rules enforced to maintain the natural beauty and enjoyment for all visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1800    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 14:08:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am absolutely in favor of tighter leash laws (but they need to be enforced) in addition to removing dog access all together. Dog waste has altogether become a problem everywhere. Streets, trails, beaches, you name it. Not to mention, where leashes are required, many owners do not adhere to the applicable laws. "Under voice control", unfortunately what dog owners deem as adequate voice control is open to interpretation, so much so its laughable and the only alternative is to ban them all together. Overall, my experience of public spaces is never enhanced by others dogs, rather, there is an indifference, or a negative impact. Super negative when I see their excrement left behind. I think dogs have hit critical mass and there needs to be tighter control.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1801    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 14:24:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please consider keeping off-leash areas for dogs in your plans. Thank you!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1802	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Yuba City, CA 95993 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 14:48:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My four dogs and I drive over two hours to Fort Funston on a regular basis, as it is one of the few remaining places where dogs can simply be dogs. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1803	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 15:02:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I wholeheartedly support the "No Action Alternative." As a 27 year Marin County resident, I strongly urge the GGNRA to retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy. Dogs under responsible owner supervision should continue to be allowed off-leash, given the popularity of dogs in Marin. We have taken our dogs to Muir Beach, Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Homestead for over 20 years. We've never experienced any problems and have always been responsible, considerate owners. Attention must be given to number of dog owners in the county. Leaving only Rodeo Beach for dogs to be off-leash is unfair and could also create other problems such as over-crowding. Yes, irresponsible dog owners should be subjected to citations by park rangers and held accountable. The beaches and trails currently open to dogs should stay that way so that people AND dogs can reasonably coexist.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1804	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 15:14:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't ban off leash dogs from our GGNRA parks in SF. how about looking to other cities (sacramento and sonoma) that have created attractive, healthy off leash areas that are fenced in - there are trees, picnic tables, benches, a bike path around the off leash area. It can be nice if it is also maintained.				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1805	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Miwok Trail; Wold Ridge Loop; Tennessee Valley Trails, including Rhubarb and Oakland Valley; and Muir Beach. ONE OF THE MAIN REASONS MY HUSBAND AND I DECIDED TO SPEND A PREMIUM TO LIVE IN MARIN WAS THE DOG FRIENDLY, OFF-LEASH TRAILS!

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1806	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95130 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 15:21:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome				

We make multiple trips a month to visit that beach with our dog. We often eat at nearby restaurants as well. It would be a real shame for those businesses to lose business because of a bad decision.

Eric Rees

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1807	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 15:22:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The dog restrictions proposed in the Draft Dog Management Plan for the GGNRA are far too exclusive of dogs where they have long traditionally been allowed. I believe restrictions are necessary in sensitive areas where wildlife can be disrupted by dog and human activity, but this plan excludes dog activity where it causes no environmental disruption or damage. Indeed, far more destructive human activity is permitted in many areas. As a frequent enjoyer of the GGNRA, I am happy to encounter off-leash dogs and I feel they are a great enhancement to the enjoyment of all. Responsible owners should not be punished for the behavior of irresponsible dog owners, or dog walkers with more than two dogs. Rules are needed, not exclusions, and the dog-owner community is exceptional in its enforcement of responsible behavior among itself.				

---



The freedom and respect for dogs are an integral part of San Francisco, and this attitude is one of my main reasons for living here. The current proposal lacks balance and needlessly assumes typical prejudices against dogs and their owners. I urge a fairer balance, keeping traditional practices- -which have worked well for decades- -while limiting restrictions to areas that suffer from both human and dog activity. Responsible dog owners are, in my experience, the most responsive to environmental preservation of the frequent users of the GGNRA.

I urge you to please re-examine and revise this proposal to strike the proper balance respecting tradition and character of this fantastic resource and national treasure, which we have enjoyed for so long and so harmoniously.

Sincerely,  
Stephen Waxman  
San Francisco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1808	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 15:26:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.				

Please retain the 1979 pet policy.

The GGNRA was created to give us recreation land.

I am a responsible dog owner, leave no trace in our recreation. I often pick up other people's trash and leave the land in better condition than I found it. Walking my dog through the GGNRA lands is one my greatest pleasures and a valuable resource for me. Please don't take that away from me.

Thank you very much!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1809	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Larkspur, CA 94939 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 16:03:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to GGNRA areas, and it a relaxing time for both humans and dogs.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1810    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Greenbrae, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I don't have a dog personally, but absolutely love to watch happy dogs playing out in the open, running full speed to catch a toy and bring it back to their guardian. Being around happy dogs makes me happy. Happy dogs impacts the mental well-being of all the people around them. Off-leash areas are good for the community, and must be continued.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1811    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 16:12:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In sum, the tighter the restrictions on dog walkers, private or commercial, the better.

In particular, commercial dog walkers should be heavily restricted - they have 10 dogs at times and let them off-leash at times. Sometimes there is more than one commercial dog walker at same location. When requested to control animals, they are rude and claim they are not subject to regulations. It is dangerous to walkers nearby - particularly in Presidio and near Mountain Lake.

In Crissy Field, at times there are just too many dogs - they fight with each other and it is dangerous to walkers nearby.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1812    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 16:23:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My comments are specifically related to the Stinson Beach area that is currently a "leash free" area for dogs.

My understanding is that this "leash free" area will not be available to non Stinson Beach residents if the current proposals are enacted.

I strongly urge you NOT to make this change.

I have been to Stinson Beach numerous times, both with a dog and without a dog. I have experienced no problems with any dogs during my visits. My dog has caused no problems. I have observed that the overwhelming majority of dogs are well behaved and responsive to their owners. I have also observed that the overwhelming majority of dog owners pick up after their dogs. (Unfortunately, horse owners are not required to do that; but that's another story.)

There are limited areas within Marin County that are available for leash free dogs. So called dog parks only provide a limited amount of space and room for exercise and only provide limited stimulation both for the dog and the dog owner. Stinson Beach is a wonderful area for both humans and canines. There is no reason that they cannot enjoy them together.

Please do not deprive us of joint access to this area

Thank you.

John

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1813    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** MILL VALLEY, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 16:37:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I own two dogs and live near the GGNRA and Muir Beach in Mill Valley, CA.

I take my dogs with me on hikes and runs in those two places on a regular basis: one or two times per week.

I don't understand why you would limit the presence of dogs in these designated dog approved trails and beaches. There are so many trails where dogs are not allowed, why eliminate the few where they are allowed?

Why not allow the users of the park some say in how the park is used? After all, the public owns the park and we are the public.

This isn't a wilderness area like Yosemite why treat it like it is?

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you for your consideration.

Peter Abel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1814    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco and a dog owner. My dog and I both love to exercise outdoors in nature and in our parks and already feel we are too restricted as to where we can do this. It would be terrible not to be able to take her to walk in Fort Funston or Crissy Field, two parks we visit many times a week. It is incredibly important to both my health and the health of my dog to be able to exercise in our beautiful outdoor parks.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Thanks very much,

Page Bertelsen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1815    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939

United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

This amounts to banning access to many local residents who are the primary local users of the resource for regular exercise and appreciation of this excellent resource.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

This is a policy that is not solving any real problem and which will negatively impact a core of the user base of this resource.

Respectfully,

Eric Miller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1816    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 16:56:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Fort Funston is one of the last places where Humans and Dogs can enjoy nature as it was designed: to be open and free. While it may SEEM as though you are helping conserve the park by restricting dogs, in reality you are ruining that park's experience. In California there are hundreds of miles of beach and woodland area where dogs need to be leashed - this need not be one of them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1817    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 18:13:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I just wanted to express my support of the proposal. National parks are not dog parks. There is no need to for people to have dogs in all areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1818    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 18:45:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the elimination of any off-leash areas. I am a homeowner in San Francisco and have visited Fort Funston to experience seeing dogs and their walkers enjoy the pleasures of the area. I believe that these off leash areas serve both the public and the park by getting people out in the beautiful environment we live in. Our parks are for the public's enjoyment, promoting appreciation of the vistas, flora and fauna. They are not to be roped off or to be policed for people and their pets exercising their pursuit of happiness.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1819    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94605

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 19:16:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

I respectfully request you review your proposal to limit dog use within the Golden Gate Recreational Area. Dogs are an essential part of our lives in America and limiting their movement in our parks and open space limits our human lifestyles as well.

Last year I started a lifestyle change. I had gotten a puppy earlier in the year and had to wait until it was safe for him to be on the streets. As soon as he was able, I started walking him. I walked and walked and walked him and you know happened? I lost 60 lbs! YEP! I went from Obese to 'Normal' and most of that change happened because I WALKED MY DOG!!

My dog and I went to the Marin Headlands last year together to celebrate my birthday as no one was around to share the day with me. We had a GREAT time! As a single female, I don't feel its safe to be on isolated trails alone (and its NOT!), but when I'm with Bubba, I'm all good! It was a birthday to remember! Why would you want to prevent me from being on these trails with my protective Bubba?!

According to the American Humane Society, 37 to 46% ohouseholds in the United States OWN DOGS, thats 87 million domestic dogs in the United States!! THATS A LOT OF DOGS. Honestly, its the people who own dogs that are using the TRAILS! If you own a dog, you absolutely MUST walk them and if your a dedicated dog owner, you actually plan your weekends around taking your dog to an awesome outdoor area- like the Golden Gate Recreation Area.

Dogs are a part of our families. Dogs motivate us to get outside, to visit our parks, to smell the fresh air! PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE, I beg of YOU, please stop descriminating against our furry family members. WE need trails!

If you don't have a dog, PLEASE take 2 minutes to watch this video:

<http://www.godtube.com/watch/?v=WWDPLWNX>

I thank you in advance for your time in reading this email and for your consideration of my request.  
LOVE my NATIONAL PARKS!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1820    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94001

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 20:05:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow dogs to roam off-leash in as many public parks and beaches as possible! Instead of banning ALL dogs, lets put the burden on the owners who fail to either clean up after their dog or allow them to go in places they shouldn't (dunes, for example). Put a VERY hefty fine on dog owners who disobey these things. But please do not make ALL dogs go on leashes. Running free brings them SO much happiness.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1821    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** davis, CA 95618

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 20:28:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi, I want to write to let you know that I do not like the idea of eliminating the limited number of outdoor areas for dogs or dogs off leash. For the first time EVER me and my family were able to enjoy an outing with our family dog this past weekend. Our experience at Muir Beach was phenomenal and worth the drive. I was amazed at how pristine the beach was with dogs, no waste, no dog fights, just dogs frolicking with each other and their owners.

What struck me was the relaxed atmosphere of the beach and its visitors that day and I think that this vibe could be attributed to the dogs being there. They broke down barriers and lead to strangers interacting with each other, chatting and enjoying a lovely afternoon. These interactions would not have happened if not for the dogs, who brought all together.

It has been shown that dogs encourage people to exercise and improve quality of life. So why would you take that away? It makes no sense.

Lastly the reason we chose to visit the beach over the woods was because of the dog friendly policy. Please don't take this resource away from the public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1822    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94611

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 20:29:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express dismay not only about the proposed dog plan about the odd ways in which the information is presented and the autocratic ways in which the National Park Service has acted. I have now stopped my annual donations to the National Park Service because of this issue.

On October 21, 2013, the National Park Service simply did not attend a hearing because they didn't want to hear the perspectives of those that do not agree with them. According to SF Gate, "Howard Levitt,

the park's spokesman. "It made no sense; we saw no productive purpose to be served."

On the website under the Dog Management Plan, you have provided a list of Current Places Where Dogs Can Go Under Voice Control. However to find out what the elements of the dog management plan are, one must go to a complex set of documents. If you can make the current list of available dog friendly sites available in a clear list, why can't you make the new restricted list as available? I can only think that it is in keeping with Mr. Levitt's approach to not engage stakeholders with views that differ from the Park Service.

I am greatly frustrated by the National Park Service's efforts to impose Yosemite-like rules on a Recreation Area. I will continue to be politically and financially active in opposition to these efforts, but I find it terribly unfortunate, when the Park Service is not devoting its resources and time to improving its parks, to outreach services to youth, to fundraising, but instead to reducing the joy and recreation of dog owners and families in the Bay Area.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1823	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 20:52:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** ALL ANIMALS INCLUDING HUMANS DESERVE AND NEED FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT. HUMANS ARE ABLE TO WALK AND EXERCISE FREELY AND ANIMALS NEED TO BE ABLE TO DO THIS AS WELL FOR THEIR HEALTH AND WELL-BEING. IF AN ANIMAL CANNOT MOVE FREELY FROM TIME TO TIME, THEY ARE NOT LIVING A FULL LIFE JUST AS WE WOULD NOT LIVE A GOOD LIFE IF WE WERE TETHERED. DOGS DESERVE HAPPINESS JUST AS WE DO AND MOST DOGS LIKE TO RUN FREE JUST AS OTHER ANIMALS DO. YOU WILL HAVE MORE DOG-BITING ON YOUR HANDS IF YOU REMOVE THEIR RIGHTS . EVEN A ZOO ALLOWS ANIMALS SOME FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT. OTHERWISE, YOU HAVE A FRUSTRATED ANIMAL. I HAVE WALKED MY DOG OFF LEASH ON OCEAN BEACH FOR A LONG TIME AND HAVE NEVER EXPERIENCED ANY TROUBLE THERE WHATSOEVER. INSTEAD, DOGS BRING PLAY AND COOPERATION AND THEIR NEEDS IN LIFE ARE NO LESS THAN YOURS. A DOG ALWAYS ON A LEASH HAS PENT UP ENERGY THAT COULD ESCALATE INTO A TROUBLED DOG THAT WOULD CAUSE TROUBLE. JUST AS HUMANS WOULD. LET THE WORLD PLAY AND REALIZE THAT MANY DOGS ARE PART OF WILDLIFE. WOULD YOU LET US WALK A MOUNTAIN LION OFF LEASH ? YOU WANT TO PRESERVE WILDLIFE? THEN, DO. WHY NOT DO SOMETHING MORE PRODUCTIVE FOR THE PARKS RATHER THAN DREAM UP MORE RESTRICTIONS. WE ARE NOT ROBOTS. NEITHER ARE DOGS. AND HOPEFULLY, NEITHER ARE YOU.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 1824    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 20:57:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please let my dogs run off leach on the beaches in California. I have two ATT dogs that are on leaches in the City. They go to rest homes thru the SPCA program but after their visits with the rest home clients they need to relax with a good run on the beaches of San Francisco. They work great with the clients and know that after a good work day they they will be able to run and play like dogs.

Please do not take these areas away from them. Dog parks are OK but they are overrun by dog walkers and they are dusty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1825    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Jake Davis and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Ft Funston, Baker and Crissy Beaches for the past 7 years. I belong to the Dolphin Club.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for the above mentioned beaches because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Finally, I don't want to have to drive long distances to let my dog run.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1826    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 21:59:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Most of my experience in the GGNRA is at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. I hope to see the preferred alternatives put in place at both sites.

I enjoy dogs but I have witnessed many people and their children getting harassed by enthusiastic off-leash dogs, and even aggressive dogs. I have also witnessed them go after birds (including snowy plovers at Ocean Beach.

Whichever alternative is chosen, please be sure to enforce the laws. It seems as though there is no enforcement at Ocean Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1827    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 22:21:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposed revisions to dogs in park lands are too restrictive. It's important to retain our precious beaches and parks. It's also important to maintain the quality of life that provides a sense of community and positive health benefits for many who otherwise would not take part in the outdoors.

Dogs are an essential ingredient of a healthy life style. Please continue to educate the public about how to be responsible , while at the same time allowing the same open space use of space by owners and dogs as is currently in place . Please do fine those who don't comply to current regulations or who are not responsible pet owners, but please don't implement the new plan as proposed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1828    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 22:31:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

I have been a resident of San Francisco for the past 20 years and currently live in the Glen Park neighborhood with my partner and our two dogs...Poppi the 6 year old Beagle, and Ramsey the 10 month old Greater Swiss Mountain Dog. Both dogs are well socialized and good-natured in part because we believe that daily exercise and socialization with other dogs and people are key to the health and safety of our canine companions. Prior to our current dogs, I lived in the Duboce Triangle neighborhood and had a Rott/Lab mix for 13 years who I walked off-leash in Duboce Park every day.

Since moving to Glen Park, we frequent neighborhood parks (Glen Canyon and McLaren Park) as well as Fort Funston and Crissy Field. The proposed restrictions in GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan are severe, unwarranted, and oppressive to all responsible and law abiding dog owners and their pets. If implemented, these restrictions will severely compromise our ability to provide the necessary care to our pets. Any dog behaviorist will tell you that well socialized dogs are also critical for the safety of other people and animals as positive socialization mitigates fear based reactions. This is a health and safety issue for everyone.

We take great pride and joy in watching our dogs run and play. Spending time at Crissy Field and Fort Funston with them and interacting with other dogs and their people is a pleasure, and reminds me how fortunate we are to live in such a beautiful place! It also gets us out and about and keeps us healthy.

Nothing is more satisfying then taking a nap with our dogs after a romp on the beach....a tired dog is a happy dog! Please do not impose these restrictions that limit our ability to enjoy the recreational areas that we should be entitled to like any other city resident. Don't take equal access RECREATION out of these recreational areas.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Wade Crosson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1829	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 22:44:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** i am a 92 year old woman and i would like to say that what you are proposing is preposterous !  
why are you trying to police people to such an extent ? your rules sound so silly . maybe you don't have dogs or understand their needs. too bad. we do understand our dogs needs and they need to run. our dog is very gentle and would never cause trouble. these are not your parks. they are the parks of the people.  
why punish those who act responsibly? those who are afraid of dogs which seems to include you are probably afraid of a lot of things and dog haters should get some counseling. we are taxpayers and we have rights. you really shouldn't have the right to take away the rights we have enjoyed for a very long time. in all my experiences , i really think this makes no sense whatsoever but seems cruel to me and to my friends who like to enjoy the great outdoors. please have some respect for our rights to make our own decisions because the more rules you make, the more troubles you make. and the more unhappy people become. a dog that doesn't receive proper exercise can become a mean dog and you'll see more problems down the road. when you hear a dog barking non stop at home or being rough in the world is most likely that way because they don't get proper exercise and dogs physically need to run.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1830	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

My name is Thibault Cartier, my dog and I have been living in San Francisco for 2 years now

We enjoy taking walks and playing off leash with other dogs at Ocean Beach, Fort Funston and crissy field.

Walking my dog in these area is just so amazing! My dog is the reason I go out and we would miss going to these area so much.

Where should we go if you ban these area? In the street where the dogs can walk on pieces of glass, eat chicken bones left over by people who don't know where the trashes are?

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Best Regards,  
Thibault Cartier

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1831	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 23:38:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please understand that this is a quality of life issue. Many of us spend several hours with our dogs at the beach, and other off-leash areas. We need the healthy atmosphere and exercise for our happiness and well being. If there were enforcement and public outreach for the areas specifically designated as requiring dogs on leash, everyone would have a choice as to how they want to enjoy our public lands.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1832	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 23:43:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please BAN off-leash dogs from all of Ocean Beach. I surf there every morning and see many dogs attack or harass native birds. Native wildlife should be protected in the limited areas they have to live in near the city.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1833	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Address:</b>	private, Alamed, CA 94501 United States of America						
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual						

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Please hide my identifiable personal information.

The argument that all interests must be accommodated in all parks is ludicrous and an impossible goal. Just as one wouldn't expect to be able to play baseball on a tennis court or bicycle on beach sand, non dog lovers can't expect to have all the beaches to themselves. What is more realistic is to have special parks that include special purposes. There are plenty of parks and beaches that ban dogs altogether. Only a few are available for off leash activity. The needs of the many should not be restricted by the desires of the few.

The best way to accommodate different interests is to take into account the percentage of potential users. According to the latest census, there are more dogs in the City than children. While these groups are not mutually exclusive (many households have both children and dog) as the numbers of dogs increase, accommodations for them should increase, not decrease.

Muir Beach is a good example of a park that is ideally suited to remain designated for off-leash activity. It is out of the way and the majority of users are dog friendly. Impact to the environment near the water's edge is negligible.

To answer some of the objections posed:

1. Dogs are vicious and attack people.

A greater risk exists on the city streets than in parks. People don't take aggressive dogs to the beach, evidenced by the relatively few reported incidents of dog bites (only 9 bites in 17 million visits to the parks last year, according to Parks Services' own report).

2. Dogs trample the flora and chase the fauna.

Mostly, dogs run along the waterline leaving the rest of the beach alone. There is no flora growing at the water's edge on a sandy beach. Sensitive areas on the way to the beach are protected by enforceable dog leash laws. Similarly, the water's edge is not a sensitive wildlife habitat. The footprint of dogs is far smaller than the footprint of humans. There have been few documented incidents of dog damage to the environment.(e.g. I have never seen a dog with a Snowy Plover in its mouth).

3. Dogs leave messes.

Responsible dog owners pick up their dogs feces. That's the enforceable law. What I've experienced on the beaches, on the other hand, is the litter left behind by people, not dogs. If litter were the criterion used to restrict beach use, we would ban people from the beaches. Enforce liter laws.

4. Dog pathogens pose a health danger to humans.

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

5. Dog pathogen pose a health danger to wildlife.

Vaccination against rabies is mandatory as is licensing. Responsible pet owners routinely vaccinate their pets against parvovirus, distemper, influenza and other diseases. If transmission to wildlife ever becomes a real, other than a perceived, threat, then area specific requirements for specific vaccinations could be enforced.

Question: What is the waterside boundary at National Parks' beaches? Mean high-high tideline is the usual property line designator. If that is the case with National Parks, then the land between the low tideline and the mean high-high mark is outside the jurisdiction of the Park Services and would be governed, instead, by any applicable Maritime or National Marine Sanctuary laws.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1834    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 01:52:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I just learned of the planned restrictions to off leash dog walking in SF and surrounding areas. As a owner of two dogs in San Francisco, I am 100% aainst such a move. My two dogs are extremely well adjusted, healthy and happy dogs that live in the middle of the an urban environment. I live across the street from Dolores Park, which affords a nice outlet for dog socialization and exercise. However, on the weekends it's impractical to take them there for exercise because of the crowds.

When looking at alternatives, few good ones exist. The handful of alternatives close in the neighborhood are extremely limiting in terms of actual freedom to have the dogs enjoy safe, free, exhausting (essential for happy active dogs breeds and their temperament) play. Closing access to places outside of the very enclosed dog parks in the area or Dolores Park when there are few people, which is very limited, would limit the access to free play and dog/owner bonding on hikes.

I have no idea what issue would be resolved by doing this. I am near certain of the impact though; less active dogs, with pent up energy in a city with so many dogs = a lot more acting out, overcrowding of the few dog areas in the city and therefor more dog issues between dogs and with people. Restricting off leash areas just because will not be without ramifications; why do it???? Please, please, please, please stop this campaign and leave off lease dog access as is or with even more options.

Sincerely, Alan Brisbon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1835    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Portola Valley, CA 94028  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 08:21:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I urge you to keep off-leash dog walking as a part of the Fort Funston area. Dog truly is man's best friend, and our four-legged companions bring such joy to our lives. Those of you who have the power to make these decisions and also own dogs understand that I'm sure. The Fort Funston area is a key place and one of only a few I know of where dogs can be dogs - off leash. They can run on the beach, interact with other dogs, and feel free for a time. It is truly a sight to see your dog as happy as a dog can be, and currently they can be that at Fort Funston. This also keeps their owners fit and healthy, happy and calm.

With what dogs face these days, so many being euthanized that don't have the luxury of homes and owners that care, let's not take one more thing away from them. They are our friends our companions and depend on us. We have the power to keep them happy while also protecting the environment around them.

Thank you,  
Nathan Hanley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1836	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94605 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 09:05:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Officials at GGNRA,				

Please reconsider the initiative to restrict dogs so that they must be on a leash in designated park areas. Previous to living in Oakland, I lived in San Francisco from 1998-2008. I have enjoyed the beautiful parks in the city as do most dogs. Now that I live in Oakland and have my own dog, it brings me great joy to be able to share the open space at Ocean Beach with my dog. This is an area where there are no ticks and plenty of other friendly dogs for her to socialize with. Also, many people without dogs enjoy the spontaneous energy that is create when dogs are allowed to play in a respectful manner. Not once have I seen a mishap created by a dog, nor have I noticed the dogs seriously destroying the habitat. In fact, over the years having surfed at Ocean Beach, I have see the coastline and dunes drastically change as result of storms or high surf.

It is with great concern and disappointment to know that my small dog must be on a leash along the coastline.

Kind regards,  
Stephen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1837	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 09:14:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	1% o our recreational land is so small an allocation! Our dogs are our family. For people who respect poop rules our dogs should be able to run free. They are the kindest part of our society today. My dog is a service dog and needs his reward of play please.				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1838    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 09:18:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PEPC-

I'm in favor of Alternative A to allow me and my pets to continue to walk off leash through the GGNRA, as well as having some public beach access areas to play. This pet policy adapted in 1979 allows humans and their pets to access a just a small percent of the beauty in this area. As an animal owner and nature lover it would be a huge loss to me and many people in the area to have out rights taken away altogether given the large space in question and leaving a smaller percentage to dog owners to occupy. I sincerely hope there is some percentage of space left for us to enjoy too.

Warmly,

Laura Miller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1839    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 09:44:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please enforce leash laws in the GGNRA! Please protect GGNRA visitors, wildlife and the environment by implementing Alternative D. Our second choice is Alternative B.

While activist dog walkers may have the loudest voice, they are a minority and there are many more visitors who don't own dogs, are dog owners and dog walkers, who do not agree with their views. Protect us from the unreasonable requests of activist dog owners.

As frequent visitors to GGNRA sites, we are alarmed by the number of dog owners who let their uncontrolled dogs run off-leash. Many of them are not under voice control. Those of us who have been attacked and bitten by dogs and/or feel very uncomfortable around unleashed dogs are labeled as unreasonable when we ask that owners to leash their uncontrollable dogs. Dog owners should recognize, in the words of veterinarian, Ben Hart\*, an animal-behavior specialist at UC Davis that "There's no such thing as an absolutely, completely safe dog." Given this from an expert, it is clear that public safety should be a real concern. This is not to detract from the negative effect that dogs have on wildlife and the environment. Our SF neighborhood suffers from a high dog population where dog incidents and dog waste have polarized the residents. We have had to rescue innocent visitors from our neighbor's "friendly" dog. Only a subsequent visit and citation from the SF Animal Control convinced them that they needed to obey city leash law.

This conflict reminds us of those days when smokers freely polluted the air in public spaces, negatively affecting the environment and health of all around them. Not until the no-smoking law restricted their behavior, did the quality of air improve for all of us.



Please see this SF Chronicle article: It would be interesting to note the change in statistics since that date.

\* <http://www.sfgate.com/news/article/Dog-Bites-Are-Big-Problem-Involving-Canines-Big-2949357.php#page-1>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1840    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** ALAMEDA, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 09:50:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I lived on the peninsula 20 years, and tried several times to enjoy the beach when i would take my dog to funston...too many dog fights, too much dog crap all over, lots of aggressive dog owners. This is an area for people, not offleash dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1841    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 10:22:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I totally support the parks efforts to curb the overpopulation of dogs leash free in the parks. If owners respected the rules this would not be necessary. Too many dogs are destructive for our parks, it's fauna and flora.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1842    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 10:38:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support the new dog management plan. Priority needs to be given to the protection of the park, its natural features and wildlife, which - esp. in an urban area - - is already subject to massive stress. The damage done by dogs, and esp off-leash dogs - - is very obvious at Fort Funston, which looks like a devastated area. I no longer want to walk there. It is depressing to look at.

Keep GGNRA as a park for everybody to enjoy - - that means also, protect what is there from being exploited and destroyed by the vocal few. Think of the countless hours of volunteer work people have put into the park maintaining and restoring it. All of that can be easily ruined by careless and thoughtless use, such as proposed by the dog owner lobby.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1843    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:15:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Thank you for finally establishing some controls and limits around dogs running wild in our parks. I have a small child and he has been knocked down and traumatized by dogs that roam without leashes or any control by their owners. When it's gotten to the point where it's not safe for children to play in parks because of fear of being attacked, a change has to be made.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1844    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:37:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This plan should be rejected because it reduces available dog-walking areas and eliminates it altogether in others [such as Ocean Beach between Sloat Blvd. and Lincoln Way]. It is a fundamentally flawed plan that unnaturally transposes to this unique urban park setting the goals and practices of non-urban parks.

Our dogs are our family. They emotionally nourish, sustain and "give back" to us daily in a way other animals [including wild birds] don't and can't. They deserve and need free-exercise areas in a densely populated city like San Francisco. San Francisco is not Yosemite or the Grand Canyon, for crying out loud. GGNRA bureaucrats obviously are unable or unwilling to acknowledge and protect that pivotal difference.

Bicyclists and uncontrolled young children are a far worse safety risk in the GGNRA than dogs - particularly at Crissy Field. Bicyclists and unsupervised children routinely run uncomfortably close to pedestrians, cause collisions and ignore basic courtesy. If the GGNRA wants to increase safety at Crissy Field, it should: (1) either ban bicycles or begin strict ticketing of bicyclists who ride too fast and too close to pedestrians.

Bird-watchers have plenty of non-urban parks and open space in the San Francisco Bay Area to go to. There is no need or reason to grossly reduce dog walking areas in San Francisco; to the contrary, they should be INCREASED!

Moreover, the Audubon Society grossly distorts this discussion by claiming [as their representative did on January 30 in San Francisco at Stern Grove] that dogs are to blame for the reduction in numbers of certain birds. No empirical data supports that false claim - the Audubon representative couldn't cite any when asked to do so on January 30. Feral cats, coyotes and other natural predators ignored by this plan are more of a risk to birds than dogs. And they all have been such a risk since time immemorial and before there ever was a national park system. It is the bird watchers, not dog owners, who are trying to alter the natural order.

Dog-walking areas in the GGNRA should be increased, not reduced as this draft plan would have it. Too much staff time and too many taxpayer dollars have been squandered already on this draft plan, which succeeds only in bolstering San Francisco's growing reputation as a bureaucrat's paradise. Enough is enough. The draft plan should be rejected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1845    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** J Rudman & Associates Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member

---

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:43:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The changes made in 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns in filed in 2011 and comments in 2011 ran against the plan. I support the no action alternative entirely for each area. Please, retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy as it is one of the things that makes living in Marin so very special.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1846    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 11:46:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs, by their nature, will sniff, chase, and dig. They are curious and unpredictable. They greatly harm birds, rodents, insects and other wildlife, either directly or by disturbing their habitat or food sources. Domestic dogs should not be allowed to destroy what little is left.

The GGNRA is not a synthetic urban dog park. It is part of our National Park System, and a protected area for endangered and threatened species. People have a right to use it, but not abuse it.

Please consider this: the folks that have dogs also typically have extra money to care for them- -their food and vet care; and often their toys, grooming, and walking service. Folks that have dogs also usually own a house or condo, as the majority of apartments or rental units do not permit dogs. Therefore, these dog guardians already have a disproportionate amount of power in the city. They do not represent the majority of San Franciscans, and they certainly don't represent the wildlife, which has no voice, no "owners" to speak for them.

So I must speak for the wildlife. I am asking you to please not give in to the loudest fraction of San Franciscans who feel entitled to force their choices on nature and the rest of the city. I love dogs; they have been a part of my home and my life. But dogs need their own fenced-off space to be dogs, and their guardians must be responsible and follow the law- -with consequences if they don't. There must be justice for nature. Please protect those who have no political power, even while the most privileged are shouting for more.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1847    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 12:01:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Crissy field.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-

specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1848	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 12:09:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi:				

I strongly agree with the idea of this plan. However, from what I can see, there is no mention of Stern Grove Park anywhere. I live in the area, and I cannot take my kid to Stern Grove, because, despite the fact that this park has its own dog play area, the off-leash dogs are everywhere - kids playground included. This is not safe.

My concern is that after the other city parks become more restricted towards the off-leash dogs, there would be even more off-leash dogs in Stern Grove, which would basically turn it into one huge dog park, neighborhood children be damned. So my suggestion is to try to make off-leash/on-leash restrictions and clear markings a citywide project, to save other parks, and especially Stern Grove, from becoming exclusively dogs playgrounds.

Thanks.

Best regards,  
Maria Belilovskaya

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1849	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	retired Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 12:32:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I was raised with a family dog and have had my own dogs as an adult. They were always a very positive addition to my life and I wouldn't have had that any differently than I did. Dogs are not, or shouldn't be considered, wild animals. We have them and raise them to be members of our family. Raised in a suburb we always had a rear yard that provided for our dogs' exercise. We never took them to parks and let them off leash.

Dogs should NOT be allowed on city streets or in urban parks off leash. Dog owners seem to be oblivious to us who do not currently co-habitate with Rover. The owners feel they have the right to have their tamed animals utilize public and private spaces with the same sensitivity as we would ask of another human being. This is not possible. Even the best trained animal, when not controlled by a leash, will gather with

their kin to form packs that lose their training to follow the dominant animal in that pack. This well recognized in rural areas where dogs off leash in areas of animal grazing can be legally shot by the rancher or farmer whose animals will be threatened by the off the leash dogs.

Why should we as urban citizens, who love our parks just as much or more than the dog owners, have to put up with marauding packs of animals, dodging both them and their ubiquitous feces and fearing to lie in grass that has been fouled by preceding droves of dogs?

Sure, dogs and owners love to have them run and enjoy what we the people have made available. But why should such a small percentage of citizens, dog owners, control such a large percentage of what is there for us all?

I might add that I'm tired and disgusted by having to replace so many of my front yard plants, many, many, due to the irresponsibility of so many animal owners!!!! Ron and Pamela Harrison

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1850	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 13:00:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Don't do this. San Francisco has become such a dog friendly city which is a long time coming. Animal lovers need a vast stretch to take their beloved pets.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1851	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am appalled at the new dog management plan. this limits the freedom i have with my companion, seeing as i take him to the east beach near crissy field almost daily and many others are there to greet us, it is an iconic land mark for some, and those who come to visit are pleasantly surprised at the immense fun everyone is having. we are not causing any harm and it has become rooted in our way of life. please dont tear that away from us				

---

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1852	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** we oppose the new dog management plan. as the citizens of San Francisco, you represent the will of the people, and the people have spoken, this plan should not be submitted. I am appalled at the new dog management plan. this limits the freedom i have with my companion, seeing as i take him to the east beach near crissy field almost daily and many others are there to greet us, it is an iconic land mark for some, and those who come to visit are pleasantly surprised at the immense fun everyone is having. we are not causing any harm and it has become rooted in our way of life. please dont tear that away from us

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1853 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 13:26:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am pleased to see this new expansion to keep dogs out of the park. I go to Crissy Field frequently with my child. We have been jumped on by off-leash dogs, a dog once peed on our beach bad, and there is always dog poop on the ground.

Dog owners always apologize and say "my dog is friendly." They seem to not care that not everyone likes dogs and many of us do not want to pet their dogs not be tackled by them. They don't care that children might be afraid of a dog bounding up to them and knocking them off their feet.

Dogs should not be given complete freedom, they are dogs, not people. Keep them on leashes, keep them off people, pick up their poop. Dog owners are not respectful of others rights.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1854 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Dog Management Plan. - The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan.

---

- I support the No Action Alternative in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

- The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

- The GGNRA should retain the longstanding 1979 pet policy.

- The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone and Yosemite.

- The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs freely. More time in car = bad for the environment, and bad for Marin County.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1855	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Los Angeles, CA 90069 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I disagree with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Dog Management Plan.
------------------------	---

- The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan.

- I support the No Action Alternative in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

- The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

- The GGNRA should retain the longstanding 1979 pet policy.

- The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone and Yosemite.

- The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs freely. More time in car = bad for the environment, and bad for Marin County.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1856	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 14:05:19
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a neighbor and volunteer at the Presidio, I frequently encounter dog walkers with dogs off leash. Many times the dogs are running in areas that are clearly marked as sensitive habitat.
------------------------	---

---

Professional dog walkers often have as many as 9-10 dogs. The worst offenders are those that do not keep them on leash. But even on leash, no one can effectively manage that many dogs.

Although I am a dog lover, I still believe that there must be strict rules to manage dogs in the Presidio. No dog should be off leash in sensitive areas.

Professional dog watchers should be limited to a maximum of 4 dogs and only permitted in certain, non sensitive areas. Professional dog walkers should also be charged fees for their use of the park and required to have permits as other vendors in the Park are required.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1857	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94134-3176 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 14:19:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a disabled dog owner, places where I can exercise my dog are limited. My daily visits to Fort Funston are an important part of my life and that of my companions.				

This attempt to limit dog walking in the face of massive utilization by San Francisco residents and now massive protest is despicable. If it succeeds, the quality of my life will be lowered, as will that of the hundreds of dog walkers I see every day at Fort Funston.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1858	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 14:31:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I regularly visit Ocean Beach and Fort Funston with my dog.				

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred



alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1859	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	La Jolla, CA 92037				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Dog Management Plan.  
- The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan.

- I support the No Action Alternative in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

- The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

- The GGNRA should retain the longstanding 1979 pet policy.

- The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to

---

people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone and Yosemite.

- The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs freely. More time in car = bad for the environment, and bad for Marin County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1860    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Cupertino, CA 95014  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:40:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is understood that the heavy use of these parks needs to be taken into consideration, but dogs should not be held accountable or punished. Good dogs and good owners seem to constantly be punished for the bad dog owners. I own and have owned dogs throughout my life. Being able to take them out and spend the day with them in the San Francisco parks and other nearby state parks is what makes living in the Bay Area so wonderful. Once a month bulldog owners, including myself meet at Chrissy field - at East beach in particular, and let our dogs romp around together for a few hours. Like small children, this teaches our dogs how to behave around others and "other social norms." I have seen people who are afraid of dogs learn that dogs are not so scary by watching our dogs. My dog is just as scared of people as people are of him. Removing off leash areas like this or restricting them will prevent many people from learning how to manage their dogs, and from their dogs to learn from each other. At the same time, why don't they just remove playgrounds?

In our family, our dogs have traveled all over California with us. They have gone camping, hiking, day trips, car trips, weddings, everywhere. It is understood that perhaps sometimes, areas may be closed or trails should be allowed to "rest," while wildlife regrows, etc. But to remove or limit off leash areas completely seems a bit much. Dog owners should understand their dog's needs. If their dog cannot be controlled, their dog should be left at home or put on a leash. This is much like if a child cannot be controlled - it is up to the parent to do the discipline.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1861    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:42:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have always been a dog owner in San Francisco it would be a shame that Parks did not have areas where it was off leash. My dog loves the freedom to run around and fetch a ball and socialize with other dogs. I hope this law does not go through dogs are allowed to feel the freedom to run play with other dogs I do not agree with theno off leash. I'm for off leash as a dog owner please do not ban off leash.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1862    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I disagree with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Dog Management Plan.  
- The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan.

- I support the No Action Alternative in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

- The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

- The GGNRA should retain the longstanding 1979 pet policy.

- The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone and Yosemite.

- The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs freely. More time in car = bad for the environment, and bad for Marin County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1863 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94108

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 14:53:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the stronger dog leash and dog ban on GGNRA property. I have had seen several dog owners unable to voice control their dogs. This has endangered surrounding habitat, other dogs, dog owners and people alike.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1864 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 15:14:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a lifelong resident of San Francisco and vocal advocate and financial supporter for restoration of Crissy Field, surfer and frequent user of the GGNRA, I must loudly and vehemently disagree with any plan to require dogs to be leashed. There are, of course, fragile ecosystems that require a no dog policy at specific times - to protect breeding grounds and endangered species. Most of the GGNRA is not, and certainly Crissy Field is a family and dog friendly area in which dogs have been allowed to play Frisbee, fetch, chase kites and run free for ever. There does not seem to be any valid reason to change this policy. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1865 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pleasanton, CA 94566

United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Diablo Rhodesian Ridgebacks Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 15:20:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Nancy Faville. I am a hobby breeder and Rhodesian Ridgeback enthusiast. All but a few of our 100 puppies live in the San Francisco Bay Area. Together, we are a family of dog owners who email often and meet at least twice a year to maintain a support network, share dog-related recreational information, rehome dogs as needed, share health information and donate to a fund to provide financial assistance for Ridgebacks with medical needs. Members of our Ridgeback family organize and participate in Ridgeback "meet-ups" at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, and Muir Beach. These off leash meet-ups encourage the dog socialization which is necessary in high density urban areas.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. The right action to take is to formalize the 1979 Pet Policy for dog management. I support expanding off leash access in San Mateo and newly acquired land by GGNRA.

Park land preservation is important, but so is the enjoyment of that park land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1866    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Me Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 15:46:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** According to the SF Examiner, the "stakeholders" include a dog group, a bird organization and a park conservation association. Sounds more like "interest" groups to me. How about someone from the general public or a family, or children's organization? Are we getting to the point that we are battling between those who want playgrounds and those who want dog parks?  
Jackie Speier is wrong about not having two sets of rules for two jurisdictions. By her logic, the entire GGNRA could be open, or closed, to dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1867    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 16:20:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We support wholeheartedly the Park Service dog management plan. Most areas of the park is now a dog park unwelcoming to us a dog owner. The unmanaged conditions sicken us so we do not go to heavily dog-impacted areas. Even areas off limited to dogs have dogs on and off leash. This is entirely unacceptable and the result of systemic corruption known also as endemic corruption, which is corruption primarily due to the weaknesses of an organization or process - in this case the unwillingness of Park Service staff to uphold the current law and to protect the interest of living plants and animals that living in the parks and other responsible park users.

"The worst form of corruption is acceptance of corruption."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1868    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 16:27:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am submitting my comments as a concerned long-term resident of San Francisco. My primary concern is that the Snowy Plover Protection Area at Ocean Beach has become an off-leash dog play area during the restricted seasons, with no enforcement of park policies for the Protected Area. This has resulted in increased harassment of the Snowy Plover populations in the Protected Area.

I would like to recommend strict enforcement of dogs on leash requirements in the Snowy Plover Protection Area at Ocean Beach, regardless of what Alternative Dog Management Plan is adopted. I am a regular visitor to Ocean Beach and particularly the Snowy Plover Protection Area and I have yet to see any enforcement actions in all the years I have been visiting the area. Dog owners rarely have their dogs on leashes in the Protected Area and I have witnessed increasing numbers of dogs harassing the Snowy Plovers and other birds. In some instances, I have also witnessed dog owners encourage their dogs to chase birds in the Protection Area as a play thing for enjoyment. Dog owners usually become confrontational when made aware of the Protected Area's on-leash and no-harassment policies, and they usually do not seem to be aware of the Park's policies in the Protected Area or do not seem to be concerned, especially given the lack of enforcement. I also think allowing off-leash dogs during a short window between May through July increases confusion in the general public with regards to dog handling policies in the Protected Area, and promotes the lack of concern and compliance during the protected seasons when dogs are required to be on-leash.

It is important to note that the number of off-leash dogs in the Snowy Plover Protection Area increase during the dawn and dusk periods, which coincides with the feeding times of the Snowy Plovers, significantly increasing harassment impacts on the Plovers. I have also noticed a shift in the feeding time patterns of the Snowy Plovers in the Protected Area, where they now come out to feed later in the twilight hours when there is less harassment as there are less people and dogs around then. This however reduces their feeding time window and their ability to find food, which likely impacts their overall wellbeing and population numbers.

I have also witnessed Park Law Enforcement personnel drive their vehicles in the Snowy Plover Protection Area and in most occasions at night, particularly in the zones where the Snowy Plovers nest/rest. This seems to be in complete violation of the Parks policies in the Protected Area and have direct negative impacts to the Snowy Plover nesting populations. Would like to recommend the Parks Service take action to restrict vehicle use in the Protected Area, particularly during the restricted seasons.

Would like to note that I am a dog lover and have a dog in the family. Like other responsible dog owners, we are respectful of the Protected Area's on-leash policies and the need to find balance in protecting natural habitats and wildlife, and in particular the threatened Snowy Plovers. I and others are supportive of strengthening protections afforded to natural resources, wildlife and habitats within Park boundaries and believe that should be prioritized. I think it would be helpful for the Park Service to expand its public awareness and education efforts to inform dog owners of the on-leash and no harassment policies in the Protected Area at Ocean Beach and other similar designated protective areas on Park lands. Critically, this needs to be followed up with strict enforcement for it to have meaningful impact.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1869    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 16:29:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are not dog owners, but we really enjoy watching the dogs, off lease, play and swim at Crissy Field sandy beach areas.  
The owners, especially the dog walkers, are so responsible and friendly.....just great . Hope for no one, no document, no restrictions to this pleasure.

But on the dirt walkway, which runs parallel to the beach, we think dogs should be on leash and there should be NO BIKING allowed (only walkers).....there. Allowing bikers to intermingle so close to walkers is an accident waiting to happen.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1870    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 16:38:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My name is Mark Rubnitz. I have been & am a resident of San Francisco for over 20 years. I currently have 2 small dogs & had 2 medium sized dogs before these. SF has always been an extremely dog-friendly and dog-proud city. It is estimated that there are significantly more dogs living in SF than children. It is absurd to me that the off-leash dog areas even need to be defended. Dogs, like people, are social animals even & especially in domestic urban circumstances, and they require, NEED adequate play/exercise, energy & interaction outlets with their owners & other dogs. This is NOT something new! Humans have had close personal domestic relationships with dogs for thousands of years. Dogs are animals and need to be able to express their energies & instincts as such and this cannot be achieved by denying them & their guardians reasonable access to areas where the limitations & restrictions of leashes & leashed activity are not required. All one has to do is compare dogs walking on leash anywhere to dogs running & playing off leash at the beach or in a park to see & understand the difference. SF is a growing city & its population of dogs is growing as well. To take away so much already established & relied upon off-leash exercise areas would be a huge mistake as well as set the stage for financially & time consuming civic battles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1871    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello.  
I take my young dog, Baxter, a Border Collie mix, out to the GGNRA about four days each week. We often visit Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field in the Presidio. Our visits are a mix of on- and off-leash walks, runs and play times. While the sights and sounds of these beautiful outdoor recreational areas are enjoyable, it is most often the times when Baxter is wandering, running and playing off-leash that makes the experience truly satisfying and restorative for us both.

---

Having reviewed and considered the draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement, my additional comments are as follows:

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

In closing, I monitor Baxter's activities both on- and off-leash and am opposed to further off-leash restrictions in our use and experience of the GGNRA.

Sincerely,

Michael Harrington

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1872	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114
-----------------	-------------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 16:43:43
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I am very much in favor of restricting access of off leash dogs where preservation of wildlife, i.e. snowy plover, is indicated. I am also in favor of restricting access at Crissy Field and Ocean Beach. From direct observations, my experiences at these locations has ranged from annoyance to intimidation. Having had dogs run up to me and my child while the dog is unleashed is anything but pleasant. Our outdoor experience is negated further by the ubiquitous comment, "don't worry, she's friendly." Additionally when I do see dogs leashed and unleashed on grassy areas of the park, that area becomes off limits to me because of the animals crapping on the grass. It has been my experience that I always pick one of those spots, the result being is that my family avoids playing on the grass rather than risking an encounter with dog "skid marks." There has not been a time when I have not witnessed off leash dogs either rummaging through personal items, urinating or becoming uninvited guess with my experience at the GGNRA.

I do understand and enjoy seeing dogs unleashed and enjoying the out of doors but only in site restricted areas. I respectfully request that off leash dog regulations remain restricted in order to preserve wildlife and everybodys experience.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1873	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941
-----------------	-----------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 16:43:52
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to many of the trails in Marin and I'm highly respectful of others and the natural surroundings.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling

reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thanks

Chris Neal  
Dog Owner - Marin Resident

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1874	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san Francisco , CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 16:46:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly walk along these trails and beaches and seeing dogs and there owners is a joy.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% othe Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1875	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 16:59:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

As a long-time SF resident and former dog-owner, I believe it is imperative that off-leash dogs should be restricted and enforced. I think the most recent draft to GGNRA areas regarding areas for off-leash dogs



was more than generous given what a truly small percentage of dog owners there are actually in these represented areas. The survey research done by GGNRA shows this clearly. The damage, danger and nuisance that even one off-leash dog presents to people, wildlife and children, is enough reason to carve out designated areas for their activity. Just today, I returned to Crissy Beach East with my two young children (2 and 4 years old) and was again, bombarded by at least 4 off-leash dogs whose owners had no voice control over their behavior; these dogs' behavior included urinating on my children's toys, digging through our backpacks and picnic basket for food and growling and threatening myself and my children when I attempted to shoo them away. And these same self-righteous dog owners threatened to call animal protective services on me for trying to protect my property and my children from their dogs. I told them that if they did not have control over their dogs, they need to be leashed. They only finally left with their dogs when I said that I would be happy to call the authorities for them regarding their dogs' behavior. It is extremely frustrating to experience this each and everytime we go to Crissy Beach East with our children. These incidences happen several times per visit, and is exacerbated on weekends and sunny days - where even a greater proportion of off-leash dogs are out. Sadly, it takes just one thoughtless dog-owner to take away the privileges of other dog-owners (who do have voice command control over their animals). We should preserve the beauty of GGNRA as much as possible - in its natural habitat and for the wildlife - so that generations thereafter can appreciate it. I take my children to enjoy the beauty of the landscape and oceans - so that they can grow up to be conscientious of their carbon footprint on this planet. I am saddened by how even a handful of dog-owners can ruin this for so many people, because they feel their dog has not only a right to trample over children, picnics and wildlife, but that somehow our need to restrict and regulate this is unfair. If they even lived in other countries - they would see how highly privileged their dogs already are. In France, dogs are prohibited from beaches completely. Please help preserve as much of our wildlife as possible for generations to come - not just the generation of "me and now".

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1876	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 17:04:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Our precious dogs need space to play and walk! With so many places for non-dog owners to be, with the high percentages of dog owners in the Bay Area, and lastly with kids in school m-f there must be some solution other than to ban the dogs or significantly reduce the dogs from these fine places. Our dog walkers are well trained on doggie manners and know how to keep dog well behaved within the rules. I as a dog owner want the enjoyment of walking my dog in these areas as it is also pleasurable to me, a dedicated tax player.				

I could not attend on Thursday but I want to support the cause!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1877	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	San Francisco Resident Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 17:09:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been going to Fort Funston with my dogs for over 20 years and support the off leash law there. It has always been clean with people picking up their dog excrement and very safe.				

---

The dog owners are very social and friendly. We all can communicate with each other about how good Fort Funston is for families with their children and dogs. This place must be preserved as a off leash dog park so that we can all enjoy the nice people with their dogs. Make this site a SF city park that is the greatest for walking, seeing the view, enjoying the history and meeting nice dog people.

Ronald Smialowicz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1878    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 17:11:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am strongly opposed to the the "dog management" Alternative F plan. Very little of the parks are available for dogs as it is. We frequently walk our dogs on the trails of Mill Valley and I have never encountered a dog which was destructive or out of control. Closing off trails to dogs essentially means that the people can't enjoy them either. I don't believe you have presented any solid evidence that dogs are threatening the parks or the trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1879    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern,  
I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative to the GGNRA plan because it is too restrictive. I have enjoyed use of GGNRA land for multiple uses since I moved to the Bay Area more than 15 years ago. I cycle, hike, have children and have dogs. I benefit greatly from open space area and could not enjoy it nearly as much if the proposed changes take place.  
There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. I was upset in 2011 by the threats of tickets and tickets that were issued to people enjoying places like Crissy Field with their pets in areas that have historically been off leash areas. There is no explanation why the numerous comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. Parks are already overcrowded and do not provide the same type of experience as open space areas like Crissy Field

---

and Muir Beach. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. This is not the case.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. I find that most owners are very responsible and that the impact dogs have is less than the impact some hikers, mountain bikers and horseback riders have on the same areas. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral de Tierra. As someone who works in San Francisco and lives in Marin this issue is very important to me. My dogs go with me to work and are in open space every day. Living with large dogs in an urban area necessitates having space to exercise them. Please help to make our voices and opinions heard.

Best Regards,

Betsy Joyce

(Elizabeth Drobish Joyce)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1880	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Yorkville, CA 95494 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 17:16:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** While I don't live in San Francisco at this time I am a member of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area & feel I would like to comment on this issue.

I strongly believe dogs and any other domestic animal should be kept out of the area. There are many wild creatures who live in this area and they need their space. While dogs may not be eating or chasing these animals, their very presence affects their lives. I live in a very remote part of Mendocino County. I have no domestic animals because they would eat my blue belly lizards, & scare my deer and possibly kill my birds. Domestic animals should be kept away from the homes of the wild animals.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1881	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 17:28:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of the draft GGNRA dog management plan. I believe it strikes a reasonable balance between dog walkers and other competing values and benefits. As you consider possible revisions I urge you to continue to protect wildlife and the visitor experience from the impacts of dog use on trails and beaches. On the Sweeny Ridge trail from Fassler Road please do not open up the trail to dog use beyond the cattle hill spur trail. My experience at Mori points is that about 40% of all dogs are off-leash even in dogs-on-leash areas. When evaluating dog impacts, given the lack of enforcement, it should be assumed that allowing on-leash use will lead to significant off-leash use also, especially in more remote areas.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1882    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 17:30:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is damned difficult to believe the NPS is overstepping its bounds and thwarting the people of the city whose dog population practically outnumbers its citizens. The city should never have turned so much territory over to the government in the first place. Dogs are part of nature and provide pleasure to the vast majority of the city's population.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1883    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Brandy Wince and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on at Ft Funston and Chrissy field.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Ft Funston and Chrissy field because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, the restrictions will negatively impact mine and my dogs life.

Sincerely,

Brandy Wince

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1884    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 17:57:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello!

I am writing to voice my opinion to oppose the GGNRA's revised dog plan. I fear that by placing restrictions on what have traditionally been dog-friendly spaces, smaller spaces such as city parks will now have to accommodate an influx of dogs and may lead to more conflict between dog owners and non-dog owners. As San Francisco is a city with a robust dog population, it seems unwise to greatly reduce the amount of available recreation space, especially as it construes such a small amount of the overall GGNRA land holdings. As Bay Area residents become increasingly absorbed by computers and technology, it is extremely heart-warming to see entire families going for a walk together at Fort Funston. The family dog is the catalyst for these group walks, and, if restricted from these open spaces near urban centers, people are going to be even less likely to disengage from technology and enjoy the out-of-doors. Dog owners have traditionally been very staunch supporters of open spaces and the GGNRA and it would be a shame to alienate this group.

I am grateful to have such wonderful open spaces so close to my home in the City and applaud all that you do to maintain these amazing retreats. Please don't make it harder for city folk to get fresh air and exercise with their dog!

Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1885    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 18:00:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the option of having dogs off leash throughout the GGNRA. I oppose the GGNRA's Restrictive Dog Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1886    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 18:30:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a resident of the Bay Area since 1967 I have explored much of the area of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I respect the title since the Recreation Area is for the well being

---

of over 4.5 million people who live in the inner Bay Area. Alternative E provides the most well balanced approach of all interested parties and I recommend that plan be adopted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1887    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 18:34:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For some context, my family owns a dog, a lovely little Jack Russell. My family is also are strong supporters of Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I don't claim to speak for all dog owners, but I can say that not all dog owners feel the same about this plan. I feel that GGNRA's has balanced the "need" for off-leash dog walking well by including the Crissy Airfield and the northernmost half mile of Ocean Beach (to name two spots we take our dog for off-leash activity.

The park's main mission- -the protection of natural and cultural resources- -is well served by the current plan, and I support the plan.

Thank you for the long years you have spent listening to the broader public, including dog owners like myself and other people who respect your mission.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1888    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 18:47:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a longtime bay area resident, hiker, and 14 year GGNRA volunteer, I fully support strong regulation of dogs in the GGNRA. Your Dog Management Plan is fair and appropriate. The park is many things to many people, and if we are to ensure that no one group displaces the rest of park visitors, then dogs need to be considered second to the natural resources, wildlife, and visitors who are not comfortable with dogs. I support the par service's efforts to regulate recreational dog walking, and to adopt a Dog management plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices.

Further, I do NOT believe that commercial dog walking should be allowed at the GGNRA. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public. Also, I have personal experience with seeing commercial dog walkers lack full control over their dogs and dog waste, etc.

Thank you for your diligence in taking good care of our parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1889    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I am not a dog owner at present, but I often walk with friends and their dogs. It is so wonderful to watch how joyous they are, enjoying nature with us.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Abbey Levine

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1890	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 19:05:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Mat Gilbert and I live in San Francisco. I have been visiting GGNRA lands for 10 years, especially Fort Funston and others in the immediate San Francisco area.

I strongly oppose the "preferred alternative" for it is far too restrictive. San Francisco sets a very strong example for the rest of the nation with our achievements in terms of humane animal welfare. Animal Shelters from around the country have commended our city and county for having the highest adoption to dog birth ratio in the country where elsewhere dog overpopulation is a problem. The citizens of the city depend on open space to exercise along with their pets.

In addition to the detriment to our lifestyles, there are a number of reasons that this dog management plan is a problem. For example, there have been no peer review or site-specific studies, as required by law.

Matthew Gilbert  
San Francisco, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1891	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 19:10:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please ban all dogs and cats from national and state parks. They are destroying the ecosystem and disturbing the wildlife

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1892    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 91010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 19:52:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge the GGNRA to restrict off leach dogs to designated fenced in areas only. I look forward to someday being able to sit in the grass again and I'm sure our shore birds would like to nest on our beaches again. There are simply too many dogs in the city now and our parks and open spaces have become predominantly dog exercising zones. The balance we need will require greater restrictions on dogs and their owners than we currently have. The status quo seems to be off leash dogs everywhere. It horrifies me to see dog owners knowingly let their dogs harass wildlife, especially young, and vulnerable birds. It is very stressful for them and probably ends up in premature death. Our wildlife needs to be protected!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1893    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 19:54:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the newly proposed Preferred Alternative use for the GGNRA because it is too restrictive for off leash dogs. As a professional dog behaviorist and trainer who's lived and worked in San Francisco for over 15 years, I know from experience how important these areas are for our dogs' and people's health and well being. Dogs need to be able to run and play in large spaces and even trained in these spaces. Without proper exercise and training, almost all dogs will exhibit behavior issues. These behavior problems can be as minor as destruction of household items and mild separation anxiety to dangerous aggression towards other dogs and humans.

I also fear how crowded our dog parks will become. Our local parks are too small for proper exercise and, with more dogs pushed into them, may also cause further aggression due to crowded conditions. It will also undoubtedly lead to more spread of contagious diseases, such as giardia and parvo, which are already all too prevalent in San Francisco.

Please allow our dogs and their people the ability to roam freely and safely and obtain the healthy exercise they require.

Thank you,  
Beverly Ulbrich  
Owner, The Pooch Coach Dog Training  
APDT # 64606 IACP # 2551 AKC/CGC # 8362  
Any Dog. Any Problem.  
www.poochcoach.com  
415-643-3333



---

**Correspondence ID:** 1894    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 19:56:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that for the good of the park there must be areas for the people and wildlife to be without off leash dogs chasing animals, digging and activities that hinder the well being of the wildlife and enjoyment of park visitors.  
thank you for your time

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1895    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 20:03:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is another act by the GGNRA people to not listen to the people of SF. Where are we supposed to take our dog???you have all the answers. This approiation of area is quite unfair and who is going to police the dog owners. Sometime they don't even empty garbage cans. Disgusting that a FAIR AGGEMENT can not happen.  
Guess like most people I spoke with- -will just take our chances. Dogs need to runned and people need to be responsible. How about monitoring the people that are NOT RESPONSIBLE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1896    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is (first and last) and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Chrissy Field, Marina Green, Baker Beach, and Presidio for the past 5 years.

These new proposed laws are too restrictive in a city that is known for being dog friendly and progressive. There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, this will impact not only my dogs quality of life but mine as well. With less places to walk my dog, I will have to drive farther which impacts emissions. More fuel burned, more cars on the roads

---

per dog owner. Consider the number of people with dogs, how many added cars that is to the streets because we have to drive daily to give our dogs exercise. Consider how dogs bring smiles to most people faces. You are stealing that from them. Consider the impact it will have on the few areas that you are allowing dogs. How will those areas be effected when all of the dogs in the city have to migrate there. For a progressive city, this is taking us back in time to segregation! San Francisco should be an example to other cities across the country. Instead, capitalism is ruling and taking over the soul of our city. Shame on you for your part in this! Please keep the rules as they are so we can walk to our destinations, keep smiles on strangers faces, keep fuel emissions down, keep dogs spread across the city thus lowering the environmental impact.

Sincerely,  
Amanda Whichard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1897    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 20:23:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe the restrictions outlined in the plan are prudent, striking a balance between the needs of nature, the needs of people without dogs and the needs of people with dogs. My experience in various parks in San Francisco and beyond is that dog owners show a willful disregard for regulations, ignoring both use restrictions and leash requirements. As a result, I think clear, unequivocal regulations on where dogs can and cannot be, and where dogs must be leashed, combined with FIRM enforcement, is best for all who use the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1898    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94705  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 20:59:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please increase protection throughout the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for wildlife, children, and sensitive adults from dogs and their guardians. Please further restrict dog access and increase monitoring, enforcement, and fines for violations. Please resist pressure from the dog-owning minority to unfairly impose costs on the rest of society. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1899    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach as well as many of the fire roads that would be off limits under the proposed plan, where she looks forward each day to being able to run, chase a frisbee and play freely with

other dogs. This type of activity is a vital part of my dog's life and physical health.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,  
Michelle Dodd and Sydney the Labradoodle

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1900	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Airline Pilots Association International Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 21:11:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1901	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 21:14:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe many people misunderstand the situation with off-leash dogs in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Just because dog owners are well organized and are loud doesn't mean they have a right to trample the rights of non dog-owners to enjoy these areas and in particular to enjoy the wildlife values of these places.				

---

I fully support the National Park Service policy on off-leash dogs. The big problem continues to be lax enforcement of existing regulations. I cannot tell you how many times I have been trying to photograph rare and/or sensitive birds or animals and have had inconsiderate dog owners allow their dogs to terrorize the birds and animals right in front of me. And when I point out that the area is posted that dogs must be on leash they just laugh.

Please do not let the loud, organized protests from the dog owners association drown out the disorganized but heartfelt opinions of those of us who find that we no longer want to visit our public parks because they are no longer suitable for wildlife study or quiet contemplation.

Any multiple-use plan must take into account the values all of us, not just dog owners. I hope you will consider my comments before pushing a pro off-leash dog position any further.

Thanks for listening.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1902	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 21:49:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This plan by the GGNRA is the worst idea I've seen in a long time. Judging by the lack of response to an overwhelming amount of resistance to this plan, you at GGNRA are likely to ignore all reason and will proceed with this hateful plan, no matter what the general public says. If you are trying to stir up civil disobedience and a general revulsion for the GGNRA, you are succeeding. Dog owners have a long memory, and we don't forgive or forget.				

Before you do something that you and your future victims will regret, try for once to do the right thing.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1903	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Samantha Tattan and I live in San Francisco. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Panhandle, Alamo Square, the dog run by 7th Ave and Ocean Beach for the past four of years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I oppose the preferred alternatives because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for

major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.

I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

And finally, (please state in your own words how the restrictions will impact your life- examples may be having to get into your car and drive long distances to walk your dog or not going out on walks with your family because you can't take your four-legged friend etc.)

Sincerely,  
Samantha Tattan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1904	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Timothy Tattan and I live in San Francisco. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Panhandle, Alamo Square, the dog run by 7th Ave and Ocean Beach for the past four of years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I oppose the preferred alternatives because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.

I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

And finally, (please state in your own words how the restrictions will impact your life- examples may be having to get into your car and drive long distances to walk your dog or not going out on walks with your family because you can't take your four-legged friend etc.)

Sincerely,  
Timothy Tattan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1905    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94609  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 22:47:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Places where people can enjoy their dogs off-leash attract like-minded individuals with dogs, particularly if they're refreshing to the soul and body. So, envision a place where there are lots of people, children, dogs, strollers, most in motion, active, even noisy. Any wildlife that could be harmed isn't likely to be revealing itself, wouldn't you think? I used to take my dog to Fort Cronkite beach on New Year's Day. It was always busy with people. The last time I did this, a ranger literally chased me and scolded me with a wagging finger ... I didn't know they'd made a new rule about "no dogs except on leashes". Who tortures a dog by leashing it on the beach?? I looked around; there were a couple hundred people and kids, walking, sitting, running, playing, boogie-boarding. I thought about what was being protected by leashing dogs, and to this day I fail utterly to see it. I would otherwise describe myself as generally pro-conservation. Oh, and if this is about dog poop, let's all get a grip. Just about every critter defecates. Somehow the planet continues to revolve. Most humans learn not to step in it, and if by chance they do, most manage to cope. I passionately agree that dog owners ought to and truly must pick up after their dogs. Let's make sure there are bags available at all times, because even well-intended and experienced owners once in a while fail to have a bag with them. Or maybe they've used their bag for their own dog, and now they need one to pick up after some bozo who didn't. Let's have a public information campaign to make it a big social no-no not to pick up after your dog. Like texting during the movie or lighting up in restaurant. We can change people's behavior if we really want to.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1906    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**    I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

â€ Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1907    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Palo Alto, CA 94306  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 23:01:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley, and the Marin Headlands. These are some of the very few places left where dogs can run, and it would be sinful (and unCalifornian) to discontinue this practice. We bring our dog up from the South Bay to enjoy this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1908    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 23:31:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm skipping all the cut-and-paste talking points to get right to the point: the proposed changes are asinine and will cause more problems than they solve. Dogs will not go away because of your "rules." They will simply go elsewhere. And instead of bothering the local "wildlife", they will start bothering people. Who vote. And write letters. And are very good at being pains in the ass. So go back to whatever you're supposed to be doing, and stop making up solutions in search of a problem.,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1909    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There is no place for dogs in our parks, except guide dogs. I can no longer use the GGNRA or even the city parks, due to my countless frightening episodes with out of control dogs and their often rude walkers. Commercial dog walkers usually cannot control the dogs, nor do they even try, even though these people present themselves as professional. Dogs are destructive to the very things that so many of us come to the national parks to experience: wildlife and the peace that only nature can provide; a respite from city life.

I want the National Park Service to adopt a robust Dog Management Plan; one that conforms to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources; one that provides the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors, not just those with dogs.

Commercial dog walking does not belong in National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking doesn't provide any service or benefit to any park users, destroys park resources

---

and is in total contradiction to NPS values. It only serves private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1910    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 08:30:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
The NPS say they are open for comments and suggestions - - but I'm not so sure. The Open House held on Jan 30th 2014 was supposed to run until 12:30 pm. But by 11:45 am it was all packed-up and in boxes!

Another example of the NPS pay lip-service to listening to comments, but really just pushing through their preferred plans at the expense of all dog owners and dog lovers.

The revised plans are still strongly anti-dog, anti-dog owners. The NPS is blocking the vast majority of access to this huge group of law-abiding tax-paying citizens with no good explanation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1911    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:15:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Not all dogs are docile. Not every adult and child is comfortable around off-leash dogs. Parks are open for all users with different levels of tolerance and experiences with dogs. In public places, dogs best kept on the leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1912    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:15:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner living in San Francisco, I have felt so lucky to have the open space at Fort Funston, part of the GGNRA, to visit with my dog. Fort Funston is a unique space to go with your dog in that you can walk along the beach and ocean or hike along the hillside cliffs. I can see the joy and excitement in my dog, and all other dogs we meet along our way, from being able to run, play and frolic in this amazing space. It would be a true loss to change Fort Funston.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1913    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---



**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,01,2014 10:23:40**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've lived on the peninsula for almost 60 years. Having open areas to hike and hiking with dogs has always been a part of the local culture. San Mateo County has beautiful open spaces that should be enjoyed by everyone.

Dog owners are a responsible lot - picking up after and taking care of the surroundings. Dogs really can't get enough exercise at the end of a leash - it's a physiological fact. Dog owners also add to the safety of the region - especially for women who walk alone. Dog owners are a cordial bunch - we know each other and these walks and talks are vital part of our daily routine.

It's rare to meet other hikers who oppose dogs - quite often the response is welcoming. I can only imagine that superintendent Frank Dean and the others who back this plan do not hike these trails and have formed their opinions about the needs of our parks and open spaces from the comfort of an armchair.

Please! This trend is counter to that of other areas. The East Bay makes walking dogs a joy. Let's move our thinking forward and not backwards. If the real concerns are dog droppings then let's impose steeper fines. If the objection is damage to nature - let's study it and find a solution.

Thank you Jackie Spier for listening to your constituents, for hearing the voice of reason, and for thinking forward to what it means to recreate in the lovely county of San Mateo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1914	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 10:48:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

Let me first say I appreciate the opportunity for the public to submit a comment on the GGNRA's proposal. I am a San Francisco resident and Bay Area native with a very high energy young dog. One of the things we love most about San Francisco is how dog friendly our neighborhood is; we have off leash dog parks in walking distance from our apartment which we frequent daily. While having the opportunity to play outdoors with my dog daily is a great way for both of us to get some fresh air and exercise, it can't compare to the stress relief of letting my pup run free and socialize with other dogs at Fort Funston or spending the day with her hiking in the Marin Headlands as we escape the hustle and bustle of city life and enjoy the natural beauty of California. While I realize there exist some irresponsible dog owners (there are irresponsible people, some of whom happen to own dogs) I have to say San Franciscan's have some of the happiest and best behaved dogs - just check out a dog park in the suburbs of San Jose and you can easily see how much better socialized and well-adjusted city dogs are in comparison. What makes the difference is giving pups some freedom to explore and meet other dogs on neutral turf rather than holing them up in their own back yard and closing them off from interaction with other dogs and humans.

From what I understand, the GGNRA's purpose is (or should be) to maintain urban recreational areas for Bay Area residents, and while, as an avid outdoorsperson, I am certainly concerned for the preservation of my natural surroundings, I am not at all convinced that my dog could cause a more detrimental environmental impact than humans. Now, if we are talking about improving the park-going experience of those without dogs, there are certainly better ways to go about the issue than effectively blocking access

to and decreasing the possibility for enjoyment of local recreational areas for the enormous population of dog owners in the area. As this is a huge population, I sincerely hope the comments from those in support of dog walking will be taken into account in this phase of the process as I know they were largely ignored in the second iteration of this plan. I urge you to consider more reasonable and realistic solutions that target the real issues at hand such as stricter regulations on pet waste cleanup and the number of dogs that one person can realistically have under voice control. Blocking access to beloved local recreation areas will put a damper on San Francisco and the Bay Area's beautiful, unique and open-minded persona, as well as overcrowding our local parks and restricting (in the most claustrophobic sense) so many of us who value the natural beauty of our home and want to share it with our best friends. Thank you for your time. I am looking forward to further conversation on this issue as we collectively inspect and solve the problems facing us.

Sincerely,

Nicole Turnipseed

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1915	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 10:53:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not close or reduce dog play areas in the city! We really need designated areas at the local parks and beaches for the dogs and their owners. Dogs, big and small, need ways to let their energy out and they also need regular exercise and socialization to have a healthy balance of lifestyles. And there are also many dog owners, especially the elderly and physically challenged people in the city, who don't have cars or easy access to go to parks outside of the city. Please take serious consideration of keeping the dog parks available.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1916	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Granada, CA 94018 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 11:14:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have lived on the Coast, in El Granada and Montara for the past 5 years. I also happen to be a former military working dog handler and retired police/search and rescue dog handler. I currently own a retired Bloodhound along with a non-working and very energetic mutt. I walk both every day, or face the consequences of frustrated dogs for failing to do so. The bloodhound remains on a leash during walks because they are runaways by their nature...the mutt, however, NEEDS to be off-leash to run. She comes from Alaskan sled dog stock and HER nature is to run. But she has also been thoughtfully trained and is very sweet natured, staying within voice control while out and about. We don't allow her to chase wildlife or jump on other people enjoying the trails. NO DOG OWNERS SHOULD ALLOW THAT BEHAVIOR. And if reported doing so or caught doing so, they should be issued citations. Should we ban driving cars because some car owners are negligent in their operation and maintenance of their cars? NO, we issue them a citation when caught acting in an unlawful or negligent manner. Dogs need to socialize. Dogs need to release energy. Failure to have the ability to do so results in behavior issues. Walking on a 6 foot leash doesn't always work to take care of exercise. Dog parks aren't always the answer either. So I can't enjoy my neighborhood parks and natural settings because of negligent dog				

---

owners who would attract attention of law enforcement wherever they are, on or off leash? How about signs at the trails with a number to call and report bad behavior? How about rangers doing spot checks for bad behavior? Rather than poop on the hundreds of responsible park users and their dogs, how about rangers and deputies investigate and respond to calls and reports on a case by case basis of bad behavior rather than spend their time scouting for random violations of leash law that weren't reported by a complainant? I'd rather rangers spend their time down at the naked beach on-viewing the public sex acts and masturbating pervs 20 feet away from picnicing families rather than hide behind bushes looking for a well-behaved but off-leash dog...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1917    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94801  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Contra Costa County Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 11:20:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please severely limit dogs in GGNRA, or ban them. They scare away natural wildlife such as birds, and seriously detract from the natural experience. Let dog owners take their dogs to dog parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1918    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 11:33:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Miwok Trail, Oakwood Valley, Wolf Ridge, and Coastal Trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1919    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Washington, DC 20009  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 11:48:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** The report and proposed actions are clearly based on the concerns of a small and vocal minority (and remote bureaucrats) against the interests of a much-larger and more economically varied population (relatively speaking given the location). While this may be fine, or at least acceptable for more remote parks, it makes no sense for an urban park. Rule changes that affect the daily lives of numerous people should not be made without evidence of actual and genuine public support. While the land may be managed remotely it nonetheless is public land and the managers of such land should see some responsibility to manage it in the interests of the actual living-breathing public.

As I'm sure others have noted there are a number of problems with the report. It lists completely arbitrary levels of damage associated with the various alternatives. Some of these are silly in addition to arbitrary - the effects of the policies on a dog owner who no longer can use his favorite or nearby-trail are clearly of a much higher order than the walker who is annoyed by having dogs on the trail. None of the observed environmental degradation is actually linked to dogs. Saying that damage has occurred in dog areas is clearly not the same as dogs have caused damage.

The specific things that I wanted to comment on, however, are:

1) There's no proposal for truly expanded dog use. If one is concerned about the effects of dogs on trails - then it should at least be considered that providing more acceptable trails would spread out the use and mitigate more severe effects on the currently acceptable areas. A rotation could also be considered. Limiting dogs on a small trail corridor (or a handful of trails of any mileage as proposed) will naturally increase the number of dogs on those trails and magnify the real or imagined damage.

2) The report seems to conflate off-leash areas with leashed-walking on trails. Personally I would be fine with limiting off-leash areas to beaches/fields while allowing dogs on more trails (and certainly the existing ones). Leashed dogs generally stay on trails - probably as well as most unleashed children (like the authors of the report I don't feel compelled to defend this point - but i'd say the risk is only mild to moderate). This is especially true on trails that are/were fire roads which make up a fair portion of the trails in the park.

3) Limiting dogs on trails does not magically protect the environment from risk or change the inherent nature of the area. Much of the park abuts recreational lands or is former military land. It's not pristine. It's also close to multiple really big cities that provide a lot of users that do a lot of damage to trails. Reducing dog use will not keep it safe from human-caused erosion, litter, air/water/noise pollution. The notion that dog use is the thing that imperils this land for future generations is absurd. Aren't there horse trails (in general - why doesn't the NPS get around to keeping horses away - as a backpacker I hate horses)?

4) The notion that increasing regulations won't lead to increased enforcement costs is obviously flawed. Restrictions are meaningless if not enforced and that takes ranger hours and money. I imagine it would take a lot of money to keep a resident of muir beach from taking their dog onto the beach or the coastal trail.

5) There are very few on-leash hiking trails as is. very, very few.

6) It's just plain contrary to the nature of the land. These are public lands near a lot of people. They should be left as much as possible for the public to enjoy as they see fit. Areas of particular value (muir woods) can be exempted - but prohibiting a very common public activity from accessible public lands is essentially confiscating a great public resource. There's clearly no compelling reason to do this, especially without a greater effort to determine actual damage.

**Correspondence ID:** 1920    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:12:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a lover of nature and the environment and of dogs, but I think dogs should be controlled, kept on leash when near any wildlife, and have a place to gather. They do NOT need access everywhere! They simply need exercise and they don't care if it's pristine, a gorgeous beach or an of land. Having had a dog for 15 years, I believe dog-owners who don't want any restraints on their dogs are simply selfish. they want to come to the beautiful places, but they don't want to exercise any dog-discipline to preserve those places.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1921    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Ashland, UN 97520

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Hall House Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:15:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have had laws restricting access to our park here in Ashland for many years with no real harm coming to people or dogs. Since our park and yours were both designed by the same person, I feel confident that a rule regulating canine access to the park will only make your park more human friendly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1922    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:17:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Leashed nature walking and off-leash play provide essential exercise for dogs, which is particularly important with the rise of canine obesity. Restricting access will keep responsible owners away, but irresponsible ones (the ones who are currently causing problems) will continue to do as they please, because that's what irresponsible people do.

Please do not pass the new restrictions without further study and evidence that the restrictions would actually solve the perceived problems.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1923    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:22:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are very few areas in the city and surrounding bay area where dogs can run freely with their families. The loss of this space results in anxious dogs that aren't well exercised and therefore bark and cause complaints with neighbors.

It's healthier for all involved if dogs and their families have a lot of outdoor space to run and play. Especially places like Fort Funston which is well kept and specific to dogs. Families without dogs have endless options for outdoor area, but unfortunately those with dogs do not.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1924    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san jose, CA 95125

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions

So many dogs are EUTHANIZED annually for BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS. dogs need to run & have energy burned off to be good dogs not ripping up the furniture at home. I HAVE A 3 YEAR OLD LABRADOR THAT NEEDS OFF LEASH EXERCISE.

PLEASE DON'T CONDEMN DOGS TO DEATH BY LEASHING THEM UP!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1925    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94804

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:35:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've been following the reports of the GGNRA and hope that my input will be of some use. The point I'd like to make is that the off-leash land options should be widespread enough in the bay area that everyone, including people with and without dogs, can enjoy the coastline.

Over the last 18 years since moving to the bay area, I've enjoyed Stinson Beach, Baker Beach, Crissy Field, Muir Beach, and Rodeo Beach with my dog. In the last year, I've made a point of getting Muir or Rodeo twice a month. Being from the land-locked midwest, the beauty of the bay hits me every time I see it; I've come to believe that it's essential for everyone, including the dogs, in our densely populated cities to get away from the traffic, noise, congestion, and air pollution. Access to the bay is vital for our mental and physical health.

Some of the best off-leash training work I've done with my dog has been at the beaches, where there are canine distractions, no fences, and new stimuli (sand, sea smells, birds) that compete with her attention. The training successes translate into a dog who is confident, calm, and able to listen to commands in spite of distractions around the busy streets of Richmond, Berkeley, and El Cerrito where we walk. The benefit is not only for me and my dog, but for everyone who she comes into contact with.

Admittedly, we spend more time at Pt. Isabel, which is a 15-20 minute walk from where we live (or 5 min. drive). I would hate to think of all of the dogs in SF squeezing into fewer places (just Rodeo for an off-leash option) instead of being able to spread out into the parks and beaches we currently enjoy for off-

leash options. Up and down the coast, there are so many beaches and parks that only allow leashed dogs (or don't allow them at all) that I can't imagine further restrictions helping anyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1926    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94707  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 12:38:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm a former dog owner and still a dog lover. But I support the GGNRA dog management plan as drafted. There can and should be a balance between use of GGNRA for wildlife and people who enjoy wildlife and the associated calm, quiet environment on the one hand, and dog owners and dog exercisers on the other. Prohibiting dogs for certain areas, as currently proposed by GGRNA, strikes me as the appropriate way to achieve this balance. Thanks you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1927    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94703  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:04:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a wildlife biologist, I support the specific changes in this Draft dog management plan; specifically the changes that protect wildlife in specific areas from the disruptions caused by dogs. Dogs and people are great but neither species belongs everywhere.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1928    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:05:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If dogs cannot be kept on leashes in the Crissey Field, GGNRA area, then ban them completely.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1929    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:17:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Bottom line: there are only a few places within the GGNRA where dogs are permitted. The rest of the park is effectively off limits. Yes people complain but they are probably in the minority. Should dog owners be encouraged to be more responsible vis-a-vis their pets, certainly. But, greatly restricting their access and/or concentrating their use to an ever shrinking area will only concentrate the problems. A policy similar to what the Marin municipal water district allows- which is that dogs are permitted everywhere in the MMWD, but they are required to be on leash. That policy has appeared to work pretty well for the decades that it has been in force. If anything - increasing the areas

---

where dogs are permitted on or off leash will probably alleviate some of the congestion and overuse issues that are generating problems.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1930    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94108  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:33:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a frequent user of the GGNRA and off-leash dogs severely detract from my experience of the parks. It is quite appropriate to limit off-leash dogs in certain areas for the protection of wildlife and the fuller enjoyment of visitors who want to avoid dog disturbance.  
Thank you,  
Richard Horrigan, MD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1931    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:40:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The audubon society is short sightedly tring to force its exclusive agenda on county residents. We do support the limits now in place and oppose restrictions to off leash dog recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1932    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:42:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands.

Tax paying dog Owners and their pets have the right to access designated beaches for unrestricted enjoyment so please retain the 1979 Pet Policy.

I strongly believe that the 2013 SEIS does not adequately address the criticism and concerns in the comments filed in 2011 which was 3:1 against the plan. It's time to listen to the tax payers!

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1933    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 13:43:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco and a dog owner. We live across the street from Golden Gate Park and the Panhandle. We regularly enjoy recreation in these parks with the dog. As a lover of all animals i support the GGNRA proposal of controlling dog access in the parks. With the decline of bird populations (for a multitude of reasons) and to support their prosperity (they serve as Agents of Dispersal, Biological Controls, Bio Indicators, etc.) i think the GGNRA's attempt to conserve their natural habitat by limiting the dog free-for-all that exists in this City, is a noble attempt to protect wildlife. i am a proponent of creating more designated, fenced in areas for dogs to play and run free. i just don't believe that dogs off leash does not disturb birds livelihood. It's a unique situation to have such amazing parks in an urban environment and it is up to us to protect the creatures that serve as their essence. I failed to mention the birds' beauty and song but if you've ever been in the parks at Dawn you would know...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1934    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 14:15:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the parks dog friendly as they've become an essential space where my dog, Thor, & I enjoy the outdoors and physical activity every weekend. Closing the parks to dog owners would negatively impact many of us at a tremendous level. I give annually for the privilege and would rarely use the parks if unable to do so w/ my gentle canine companion.

I completely understand if the need is to impose leash further requirements for all spaces in question since I know a number of people have approached me thanking me for respecting their space as well. Despite my dog being very gentle to all, I know his size can intimidate people and always have him on a leash to ensure all feel comfortable that he's close to me at all times.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1935    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 14:22:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There seems to be little scientific data that demonstrably proves that off-leash dogs, when under the responsible control of their owners, do significant harm to floral, fauna or other environmental considerations in the types of areas addressed by the EIS (I.e., not high sensitivity areas). It seems like policy is being formulated based upon speculation, not facts.

The focus of the management plan should be to responsibly ensure the broadest access to and usage of these areas, including for responsible dog owners who want to maximize the exercise that they and their dogs get when using these areas. Please don't penalize us for the poor behavior of a small number of dog owners and their dogs or for possible bias that non-dog owners might bring to this deliberation.

Thank you,  
Bill Pace

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1936    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 14:25:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello, I strongly support protecting wildlife by limiting dogs (especially off-leash dogs) in the GGNRA. I have had to greatly limit where I go hiking and bird-watching. Time and time again, even in on-leash only areas, I have seen dogs chasing wildlife while the owners ignored this behavior or, in some cases, encouraged it.

Wild animals have so few refuges, their habitat has been reduced - these few places need to be protected for these animals. Please, do the right thing, and protect our wild places.

Thank you so much.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1937	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Ann Gregory and I have lived in San Francisco for 55 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for GGNRA because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes. I have never seen a dog fight or a dog causing harm to the wildlife in the 8 years I have been walking my dog at Crissy Field and Baker Beach.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1938	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94611 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 14:39:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am an animal lover, animals of all varieties. However, when it comes to the enjoyment of our National Park spaces, I will advocate for the wild life and not the domestic varieties. Keep our wild places for wildlife, and keep dogs away from the wildlife. It may be possible for a few				

---

small spaces to be available for leashed animals, but not on trails where people may wish for a quiet walk in the park, unbothered by dogs, even if they are leashed. Some areas may have families with young children who are not used to dogs, or picnic areas where people want a quiet moment. If people want to take a long walk with their dog, or take it for a run, there are other places to do that. Our National Parks belong to all of us, not just dog owners, and too often dogs take over the environment they are in because of their enthusiasm and high energy. I'd prefer NOT to have them in the public spaces in our national parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1939    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:43:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach and the Marin Headlands.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1940    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 15:51:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do so much training with my dog and I feel that is very important!! I also feel it is VERY important for RUBY to have some freedom and joy to run around and socialize.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1941    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 16:23:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't want those dogs running unleashed. They scare the birds and they scare me. Please make MORE rules controlling dogs and their careless owners. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1942    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Ruben Garcia and I live in San Francisco. I have been walking my dog at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and Crissy Field for the past 10 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative because it is too restrictive. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. I expect that if your proposed changes are implemented at Fort Funston, we will see Stern Grove flooded with dogs.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ruben Garcia

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1943    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Newark, CA 94560  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 16:51:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** why does california HATE dogs?????

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1944    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 16:59:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the hard work dedicated to studying the issue of dogs in our parks. In all cases, I oppose allowing dogs off-leash. A recent visit to Crissy Field (December 2013), for example, was made much less pleasant by the sheer number of dogs darting about, some fighting with each other, others coming up to me and my family, which made us quite uncomfortable. In fact, I am much, much less likely to visit Crissy Field again due to the sheer number of dogs off leash.

---

It is quite unnerving to be on a hike or a simple stroll and have a strange dog- -off leash- -rushing at you.

My family and I had gone to Crissy Field specifically to look at birds. Allowing dogs off leash is incompatible with a nature experience, such as bird watching. I often walk along the bluffs in Half Moon Bay, and many times have seen off-leash dogs chase blue herons, egrets and other birds along the bluffs. Our bird populations, native plants, etc. are under severe strain, and allowing dogs to roam freely in these sensitive habitat areas is, to me, completely incompatible with nature preservation/restoration.

On lands designated as national parks, I very much want to see the 'no dogs allowed' policy enforced. I'd also like to see a 'no dogs allowed' policy in all ecologically sensitive areas covered by this report.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1945	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94707 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 17:36:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs can be happily walked on leash, and play in designated dog fenced in play areas. We have some in Berkeley. They do NOT have to have the run of park areas enjoyed by humans and wildlife.				
Please protect the National Parks from small minded dog owners,					
Carolyn Reese					

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1946	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 17:44:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1947	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support the provisions in the NPS Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that restrict dog walking to designated areas, periodic closures to allow for re-growth of vegetation, in county licenses, limitations per walker, restriction of off trail walking, and strong monitoring to see that the policy is actually effective. In that spirit I offer the following comments.

In the past my family and I have greatly enjoyed visiting the Presidio of San Francisco as well as other areas in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. But recently we have chosen to visit much less often as our experience when we do, has been greatly affected by the number of dogs we have encountered.

The number of dog walkers with large numbers of dogs seems to have greatly increased in recent years. We realize that in an urban park, accommodation of people with a variety of recreational interests is important, but it seems that currently the interests of walkers, hikers, and runners has been sacrificed for the convenience of dog owners. The levels of noise, effects on crowding of paths, and obvious effects on vegetation, severely impacts the experience in the Presidio which is presumably meant to have some of the characteristics of a natural area.

In addition to problems encountering the large numbers of dogs brought to the Presidio by dog walkers, an even more disturbing problem is the huge number of off leash dogs encountered in all parts of the Presidio. While we realize that a majority of dog owners are responsible, given the population in San Francisco even a small percentage of irresponsible owners can severely impact the experience of walking in the Presidio. I was actually bitten while walking around Mountain Lake Park (it didn't break the skin so I chose not to do anything about it). Being accosted by dogs approaching from off trail areas, the stench of urine and feces, bags with feces deposited on the ground, and frightening my grandchildren so they no longer want to visit the Presidio, are just a few of the additional problems we've experienced.

So as stated previously I strongly support the provisions that restrict dog walking to designated areas, periodic closures to allow for re-growth of vegetation, in county licenses, limitations per walker, restriction of off trail walking, and strong monitoring to see that the policy is actually effective.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1948    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94108

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 17:47:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support the Park Service plan to severely curtail where dogs can go along the San Francisco coast, both on and off leash. I strongly support the proposed ban of all dogs from three-quarters of Ocean Beach year-round. I strongly support efforts to maintain and enhance the habitat in these areas for indigenous animals, vegetation, soil, and water resources. Although I like dogs very much, I strongly support the option that would be most protective of resources and visitor safety. At the very least, I support bringing the park into alignment with the NPS-wide leash regulation (on-leash dog walking only). Please enact Alternative D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1949    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 17:51:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support the provisions in the NPS Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that restrict dog walking to designated areas, periodic closures to allow for re-growth of vegetation, in county licenses, limitations per walker, restriction of off trail walking, and strong monitoring to see that the policy is actually effective.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1950    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I strongly support the provisions in the NPS Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that restrict dog walking to designated areas, periodic closures to allow for re-growth of vegetation, in county licenses, limitations per walker, restriction of off trail walking, and strong monitoring to see that the policy is actually effective. In that spirit I offer the following comments.

In the past my family and I have greatly enjoyed visiting the Presidio of San Francisco as well as other areas in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. But recently we have chosen to visit much less often as our experience when we do, has been greatly affected by the number of dogs we have encountered.

The number of dog walkers with large numbers of dogs seems to have greatly increased in recent years. We realize that in an urban park, accommodation of people with a variety of recreational interests is important, but it seems that currently the interests of walkers, hikers, and runners has been sacrificed for the convenience of dog owners. The levels of noise, effects on crowding of paths, and obvious effects on vegetation, severely impacts the experience in the Presidio, which is presumably meant to have some of the characteristics of a natural area.

In addition to problems encountering the large numbers of dogs brought to the Presidio by dog walkers, an even more disturbing problem is the huge number of off leash dogs encountered in all parts of the Presidio. While we realize that a majority of dog owners are responsible, given the population in San Francisco even a small percentage of irresponsible owners can severely impact the experience of walking in the Presidio. Being accosted by dogs approaching from off trail areas, the stench of urine and feces, bags with feces deposited on the ground, and frightening my grandchildren so they no longer want to visit the Presidio, are just a few of the additional problems we've experienced.

So as stated previously I strongly support the provisions that restrict dog walking to designated areas, periodic closures to allow for re-growth of vegetation, in county licenses, limitations per walker, restriction of off trail walking, and strong monitoring to see that the policy is actually effective.  
sue friedland

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1951    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 18:04:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I take my dog to crissy field every day. On weekdays we go at 4pm. Most other people we encounter are also with their dogs. On the weekends we go at 730 in the morning and stay for a few hours. Not only is this great socialization and exercise for the dogs it is for the guardians as well.

I don't understand why there cannot be some sort of compromise made to continue to allow these wonderful animals who provide so much joy to have a place to run free and play.

The dog guardians I encounter and their dogs are responsible and respectful.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1952    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

My name is Anne Schnobrich. I live in the Cow Hollow neighborhood, and frequent Chrissy Field, Fort Funston, Rodeo Beach, and many other wonderful off-leash areas in the Bay Area. We go to at least one of these places daily, and our Rhodesian Ridgeback loves to run and play with other dogs in these friendly, beautiful park areas. Because we live in the city, off-leash areas are critical to the happiness & health (emotional & physical) of both my dog and all the dogs in the area.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most



people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

Again, we chose to live in San Francisco in part because it was extremely dog-friendly. We pay exceptionally high rent & taxes to live in the city, and the rationale for living here is in part due to the off-leash accessibility. Limiting the off-leash areas would result in unhappy dogs. It is critical to the health of our canine population to leave these areas intact.

Thank you,  
Anne Schnobrich

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1953	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I'm a native of San Francisco. I walk all over the City and particularly enjoy GGNRA and have donated to the Golden Gate Parks Conservancy. I have a dog who accompanies on many walks. The proposed changes (Preferred Alternative) to dog use in the GGNRA are too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. These are open space areas - - fences do not belong there.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Finally, the plan doesn't allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA isn't considering off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This restricts off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1954	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117-1149 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 18:42:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

â€ Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private

---

financial gain.

â€ Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Sincerely,

Bob Hall

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1955	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,01,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Brian Kenney and I live in San Francisco. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Fort Funston, for the past three years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I oppose the preferred alternative for all of the affected areas in San Francisco because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.

I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer-reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

And finally, one of my favorite things about living in San Francisco is that I can enjoy beautiful parks with my dog, without a leash. He is well mannered and respectful. Losing the right to go play fetch at the beach would be terrible for us both. Even the idea that we would be in a fenced off area is unsettling. It brings me a sense of peace to be able to walk a long stretch of beach with my dog at my side. He is the closest thing I will ever have to a child and his freedom means everything to me.

Sincerely,  
Brian Kenney

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1956	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 19:00:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm clearly against stricter rules for dog owners in the NP!

While I absolutely support the NP (I'm a member and regularly volunteer there) and nature protection I still think it should mainly be a park for the people who live here. It's in an urban area and people should be able to enjoy it. As many people here own dogs (many rescue dogs from all over California, by the way, who should have the same importance as any bird in the NP) I think they should definitely be allowed to take them with them. Also dogs need space to run off-leash.

I definitely see a problem with irresponsible dog-owners who don't have their dogs under control or don't clean up after them. For them there should be fines. But you can't punish all others for a few black sheep!

Please leave the rules as they are!

Best regards,  
Marion

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1957    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 20:15:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I enthusiastically support the Draft Dog Management Plan in its current form. Please note that I am an equally enthusiastic dog owner, but the irresponsible behavior of a small minority of dog owners makes the contents of the draft essential in order to protect the local wildlife.  
-P

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1958    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 20:17:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** RE: Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

To whom it may concern:

I'm writing to express my support for the proposed Draft Dog Management Plan that outlines new rules for on- and off-leash dog-walking in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I realize that the plan is contentious, and I'm disappointed that so many, on both sides of the debate, have vilified those they disagree with. The fact is, thoughtful long-term management demands a balance of consideration for human recreational use (and that of their domesticated animals/pets) as well as wildlife population success and habitat/ecosystem integrity. I am a dog lover (and soon to be dog owner) myself, but I fully support the restrictions. The National Park Service is not responsible to create open space for dogs to run, and it is incumbent on those of us who live in or near the GGNRA to accept this fact.

Sincerely,  
Christopher Reiger

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1959    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 20:18:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a preservationist and I generally support plans for preservation or restoration of community land (e.g. national park land) and the ecosystems and natural plant/animal life in that land. However, I strongly oppose the Alternatives in the DEIS (especially the Preferred Alternative) that would restrict off-leash dog access in local national recreation areas that are important to me and my community. I am not a dog owner, but it doesn't take a dog owner to see that the relationship between humans and dogs is important for human happiness and that it is akin to the human family ties in many if not most households in the Bay Area. Human/dog families need public places to be outside, be in the community, and be free to run and play (like human children need to be free to run and play). The GGNRA park spaces that currently allow dogs (such as Ocean Beach, Muir Beach, Crissy field, etc) already represent only a small percentage of Bay Area park land, and dog-owning families consider these places invaluable to their quality of life.

The benefit to the Bay Area's natural plant/animal life by restricting dogs to leashes in these spaces seems very suspect to me considering the fact that these spaces represent a small percentage of the natural land of the Bay area, and that they are spaces already altered by the humans and human infrastructure that surround them. The detriment that these Alternatives would have on my friends' and neighbors' recreation opportunities and happiness, on the other hand, seems severe.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1960    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 20:35:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1961    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Muir beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 20:37:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1962    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 20:53:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have had dogs for many years and frequently walk in the GGNRA. I'm also a photographer and a birder. One of my dogs is quite prey-driven and would chase wildlife if given a chance. There are places where it is safe for her and for wildlife if she runs off leash; there are places where it is not. Dogs that are not as prey-driven as my dog are also a disturbance even if they do not actively chase wildlife. A bird is not able to distinguish between a dog that will chase it and a dog that will not, and is under stress in either case.

I've watched dogs chase shorebirds from their safe wintering areas along our shorelines. Yes, the birds return when the chase is over but that doesn't mean it hasn't been stressful or dangerous to them. It takes energy that is better used for foraging for food or keeping warm or resting, when forced to fly away from a dog. The GGNRA is a wintering area to many birds that nest in other areas. If their wintering area is not safe because of off-leash dogs, they will not survive to return to their nesting areas.

Living in an urban area is a challenge for active dogs but there are many places where it is appropriate for dogs to exercise and to enjoy a run or walk.

It is possible to set aside restricted areas where dogs are allowed on-leash, restricted areas where people and dogs are not permitted at all, and areas where dogs can run free. Let's give it a little more thought and do what's right for wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1963    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am very concerned about this new plan. I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. We haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. It's my understanding this is required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of our public lands.

I believe compromise is a good thing, and people should be able to enjoy portions of the recreation area dog-free. But they already have 99% dog-free! The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Please don't take away the tiny area dog owners still have to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1964    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Roseville, CA 95678  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,01,2014 21:42:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The GGNRA is a National Park and belongs to the citizens of the U.S.A., not just the people of San Francisco. I realize many people in SF have dogs, but a National Park with sensitive resources should not be used as a dog park. I'd like to come visit and not have to worry about being harassed by a dog, stepping in dog feces, or seeing dogs chase birds. Even if it wasn't a National Park I would like to come visit and not have to go through all that.

Please institute the preferred alternatives and please enforce them. I believe the current laws at Ocean Beach are sufficient, but it seems to me like it is never enforced and all the dog owners know this. If the preferred alternative allows for better enforcement, then please go forward with that plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1965    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Washington, DC 20009  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 22:18:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think that I was a bit too hasty in my first response - while there are many aspects of the plan and the government/special interest group combination that created it that are troubling - I'd like to focus more directly on the trail system for the Marin headlands.

Looking at the current map, it is clear that areas where dogs are allowed are limited - the crown jewel of these being the coastal trail section from rodeo to muir beach. While it seems that most of the attention with regards to the plan has focused on the off-leash areas - it's also true that the plan strips on-leash walking areas here in addition to converting off-leash areas to on-leash areas. The plan states a preference for on-leash areas, and I have no problem with the conversion of off-leash areas to on-leash. The justification for banning dogs from the trails altogether seems rather weak however.

As far as I can tell the reasons given are the butterfly habitat, the "integrity" of the interior section of the park (which oddly enough contains the coastal trail) and creating a mix of user experiences.

As for the first two points - while I'm sure dogs may have a negative impact on the area I also imagine that if the habitat were particularly vulnerable that people, horses, and bikes wouldn't be allowed on it. Likewise, the "integrity" mentioned is not some sort of wilderness area - but one crisscrossed by roads, people, horses, and bikes and a campsite.

As for the mix of user experiences - this is one of the few particularly scenic areas where on-leash walking is permitted. It is not at Pt. Reyes or Muir Woods/Mt. Tamalpais - or on the trails in the Stinson beach area. While there are numerous open space areas where it is - they aren't coastal or as generally unique as the section of coastal trail. In light of this it seems that a better mix is kept by allowing dogs on the existing trails - those wanting a dog free experience can take any of the other trails in the area or go to any of those other general areas.

It is also unclear why a dog-free experience is something that should be weighed so heavily in an area where many trails allow horses and bikes. Perhaps the changes would be understandable in light of a general plan to reduce human impact in the area - but this does not seem to be the case.

Lastly with regards to this area, the alternative E map shows a significant reduction in dog-available land vs. the status quo. The document states that maps labeled E are supposed to provide for the maximum of dog access. In this case the maximum access would be access to all trails - and not a substantially reduced area.

It is hard to believe that the park service considered all interests if the supposedly dog-friendly plan was itself a strict limitation. What's the point of having a rule making process if the decision was already made?

Clearly there was no real intent to preserve dog access to the area - or reasonably consider it - but I do think that dog access to a small percentage of trails in the area - including one very nice stretch of coastal trail is a valuable resource. I would hope that regardless of what is decided with regard to the off leash areas that this issue will be considered on its own - especially in light of the numerous dog-free trails in the area.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1966	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Ramon, CA 94583				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,01,2014 23:00:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We are so disappointed to hear that the National Park Service is considering eliminating access for dogs to Muir Beach and the Pacific Coastal Trail. We are diligent dog owners who clean up after our pet, and have worked hard to train her to follow voice command. Our dog is 11 years old, and to be honest we do not hike without her because this is what she lives for. We commonly support Marin county businesses when we come. For example, today we went to Pelican Inn and up the coast to Marin Sun Farms for expensive meals. We will have little reason to frequent Marin County if there are no beautiful trails we can enjoy with our dog. Consider all the tourism dollars that will be lost by dog owners like us. Consider that people that don't like sharing trails with dogs already have many, many trails to choose from where dogs are not allowed. Please do not take away what little is still available for dog owners!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1967    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is mike and I have lived in San Mateo for 40 years. I walk my dog on just about every affected location and can't image what it would have been like without these off leash locations for the last 40 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative process because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I shutter to think of the loss of this benefit to the Bay Area . It is one of the few things I have to look forward to anymore.

Sincerely,

Mike

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1968    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent

I live in San mateo and I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Fort Funston for the past 18 years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.

I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

I can't even begin to explain the loss of quality of life if this flawed tragedy goes forward.

Sincerely  
Jeanine

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1969	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122-2230				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 08:48:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear National Park Service,				

I do not support the reduction in off leash area for dogs in San Francisco, and I also not support further restrictions on leashed areas either. Owning a dog is important to me, and has brought a great joy to my family over the last 9 years. I live in San Francisco and our regular weekend outings include walks on Crissy Field, Lands End and Fort Funston with our dog. I would not enjoy the outdoors to the extent that I do if I did not own a dog- as the dog walking brings to me out these special places. And also reminds me that I need to support our parks, both national and local.

The GGNRA would severely reduce the on and off leash walking areas for dogs and their owners, and is not needed. The 1979 plan for GGRNA has been working well and was created for a city where recreational use includes many different kinds of activities, including dog walking. What studies have been done to understand the impact to Golden Gate Park and other small parks when this walking area is reduced?

The reduction is dog walking areas- both on and off leash would impact the way I enjoy the parks greatly. I do support any changes and do not see the need to do so.

Best regards,  
Nancy Valente

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1970    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Diego, CA 92037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Dog Management Plan.  
- The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan.

- I support the No Action Alternative in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

- The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

- The GGNRA should retain the longstanding 1979 pet policy.

- The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone and Yosemite.

- The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs freely. More time in car = bad for the environment, and bad for Marin County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1971    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 09:29:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My yellow lab Luke and I strongly oppose the plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Luke and I often take walks in and around Muir Beach. Dogs are already off-limits on almost all of the GGRA. Please do not further restrict the little space we now have to exercise and play!!

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1972    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** muir beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 09:43:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to MUIR BEACH

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1973	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 10:48:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do consider modifying this plan to include more areas for dogs to be walked. I understand wanting to limit dogs but perhaps there is a middle way. thank you!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1974	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 10:53:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think things should stay as they are.				

If changes must be made, I strongly believe that off leash dog walking and dog swimming should be continued at Crissy Field east and central beaches. These are areas successfully used by dog walkers for years. Other areas in the city should also be maintained for off leash walking and the park should continue to be available to commercial dog walkers with a limit high enough to make their operation profitable.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1975	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95124 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 10:55:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi,				

---

With the dwindling areas where dogs can play off lease in the Bay Area, it makes no sense to change the GGRA pet policy just to satisfy a few extremists. The vast majority of dog owners are responsible, caring for their canine friends as if they are members of the family. Within any group, there will be a few bad actors but that doesn't require group collective punishment of the vast majority who do follow the rules. The GGRA is an urban park system with a working pet policy that has worked well and there is no need to change it.

Regards,  
John

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1976    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 11:02:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** San Francisco has the best dog parks in the world, period. Yet this ban is trying to change that and for no particular reason other than they can. Over 50% o San Francisco households have a dog and there are more dogs in SF than kids. This ban would affect not a small minority of San Francisco citizens, but a solid majority! If this ban goes forward, where are the dogs supposed to go? The parks are already crowded as it is, imagine how much more crowded they'll become when they have less places to go. Not only that, but exactly who is going to pay to police all these parks once the ban goes into effect? I doubt you'll find anyone who wishes their tax dollars would be spent on something so frivolous. Keep the best dog parks in the world as they are and make the citizens, and the dogs, of SF happy!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1977    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 11:05:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow fence-free off leash play for dogs in the GGNRA. If control is the issue, please consider instituting a dog permit that dogs can wear on their collars signifying they and their owners have passed a training and awareness course. Colorado has this policy and I believe it works well.

Taking my dog to any of the GGNRA areas where he's allowed to run off leash is one of the greatest pleasures of our shared life. We would no longer visit these areas if he could not run off leash, and this would definitely lead to a reduced awareness and economic benefit for all of the surround businesses and the concessions within the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1978    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 12:10:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I do not own a dog, but I'm strongly against the proposed changes to reduce the amount of space provided for off-leash dog areas.

I use the recreation area frequently including Crissy Field, Fort Mason, Fort Funston, and Ocean Beach for bicycling, running, and hiking, and I appreciate the presence of dogs and their owners enjoying themselves as well. Changing these rules would diminish the essential character of the area and San Francisco in general.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1979    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Rodeo beach and rodeo beach loop, Muir beach, Coastal trail and Wolf ridge loop. Walking my dog is one of my favorite activities as well as a great opportunity for exercise and sightseeing. I often walk with relatives (daughter, wife, in laws, parents) making it a healthy family activity.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1980    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kensington, CA 94707-1235  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 12:56:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** For Dog Mgt. Plan:

I'm a dog-lover. I feel that dog-lovers need to be conscious of the responsibilities of being a dog owner. Dogs are domesticated animals and will be with us as long as there are humans. I fear that this is not true for flora and fauna of the world as that we must protect them as much as we humanly can. The flora and fauna are very vulnerable to what we do or not do. They are not able to protect themselves (with a few exceptions like poison oak). For dog owners who are sensitive to the fragility of the world for themselves and those who follow them will find that there are plenty of places to take their pets. If they consider themselves dog-lovers and therefore animal-lovers, they can get to the correct places by car, feet, bike, etc. This is not true for our usual flora and fauna. We must protect the habitat that is needed for those

fragile and endangered entities.

There also must be our own human needs met. There are people who are afraid of dogs and those people have to right to know that they can go to places where there will be no dogs or at least know that the dogs will be on leash and in COMMAND and CONTROL of their owners. Many a person who is fearful of dogs have become so due to the lack of control or lack of a leash. It would be wonderful if parents could be assured that there places that they can take their child/ren to a dog-free place where the child could run freely. I find it disgusting that some dog owners go into tot play area with their dog.

Whatever policy is implemented, I believe that there such be a strictly no dog allowed for fragile endangered species habitat, dogs on leash which is strictly enforced with heavy fines for habitat that can carry the load of dogs and human use (this is probably the point of this study) and a few dog parks where the dogs are allowed to run without leash but under voice command. There is not place, unfortunately, for unruly, untrained dogs in a public land. That is my feeling. Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1981	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1982	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Cedric Brehaut and I live in San Francisco. I often walk my dog Ocean Beach, Fort Funston and Crissy Field.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternatives for these areas because they are too restrictive. They also do not adequately analyze the impact on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported. The increasingly large population of dogs in San Francisco and surrounding areas justifies an extension rather than a reduction of off-leash areas.

And finally, this proposal creates the potential for many unplanned consequences for dogs, their owners, and for the entire local community. Dogs need exercise, and if they get less of it due to new complexity for their owners in accessing off-leash areas, I believe incidents of aggressive canine behavior will increase. Dogs need to walk and run, and if they are not given this opportunity, the pent-up energy is expressed in much less desirable ways.

Thanks for your consideration.

Cedric Brehaut

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1983	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 13:10:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	MY DOGS' (2) OFF LEASH FUN AND MY QUALITY OF LIFE ARE DIRECTLY LINKED. LOSING ANY OFF LEASH SPACE IS A HARDSHIP AND WILL AFFECT MY HEALTH.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1984	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Glassdoor Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 13:31:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

---

I regularly take my dog to Rodeo Beach and the Alta Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1985	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 14:21:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I have been a Bay Area resident my whole life. I grew up in kentfield and i now live in San Francisco. As a child, we had cats, no dogs. We went o the beach (Stinson) an others and I had a wonderful childhood meeting many amazing dogs!

Now, I have a wonderful vizsla, piper. She is an amazing, show-winning dog. She is a 1-year old, well trained, excellent mannered, full of energy pup!

Every day she goes to at least one (sometimes 2) of the GGNRA places for an off-leash run. On fact yesterday we were at Chrissy Field. Almost everyone there (except the runners/bikers going through) was with a dog! Most of whom at some point ran off-leash (very happily).

As you evaluate shutting down many of your beaches to dogs off-leash I ask you to please reconsider. Please allow us to remain a city that loves our dogs. Please allow our dogs to love our city and let them continue to be allowed off-leash.

Dogs are better behaved off-leash than on and their log-term behavior is better as well.

Please contact me if you would like further information.

I am hopefull that your decision will be to allow our city to maintain its free spirit and allow dogs to be free to run also.

Thank you very much,

Kristin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1986    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94132

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 14:27:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Today is Sun, Feb 2, 2014 and it's raining. We took our dogs to Ft Funston to play and exercise. Everyone at Ft Funston when we were there were people with dogs. It's rare that people who don't have dogs think - 'oh it's raining, let's go for a walk. Dog owners go out in all kinds or weather because dogs appreciate being out no matter what the weather. Dog people use Ft Funston the area the most - rain or shine. So by limiting the off leash areas you are penalizing the the major consumers of the park - - and isn't that what the park is for - - to use? I don't understand the logic of penalizing your 'best customers'. If this were a commercial business that logic would surely put the company out of business.

Also there is no area in the city where there is as much real estate for off leash area. So now the much smaller proposed off leash areas will become way more crowded and there will be a greater chance of dog fights and injuries, and a greater chance of catching illnesses for the dogs as they are exposed to more dogs/germs in a smaller, more crowded space.

Please don't limit off leash at Fort Funston!



**Correspondence ID:** 1987    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** belvedere, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 14:30:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please let us have the last 1% o the GGNRA for our animals.

I OPPOSE The GGNRA proposed dog management plan. Marin is a beautiful county with a wide variety of outdoor trails etc. for people of all ages to enjoy. we are very lucky to have the GGNRA,which was created for us due to the dense population area that we live in.

We bring our well controlled dog to Muir Beach and Wolf Ridge.

\*The bay area is full of responsible dog owners and lovers. Off leash areas are vital for the health of our dogs. We all live in tight quarters and these beautiful animals need an opportunity to run free, under the supervision of their owners. AGAIN the GGNRA was originally developed for these kind of activities!!!

\*These areas are not National Parks and should not be treated the same way. We all need a place to go recreate with our animals.

\* there are no studies that have proved these animals are causing undue stress on these open spaces.

My taxes support these areas the same way as those opposed to off-leash areas taxes are spent. 99% o the areas are off limits, and those opposed get their way 99% o the time. Let us have measly 1%

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1988    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 14:49:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to oppose the plan for restricting the size of off leash areas in the GGNRA including Crissy Field, Ft. Funston, Baker Beach and other areas. Off leash dog walking and dog play is a normal and non-disruptive recreational activity enjoyed not only by dog owners but also by their friends and many other visitors who do not own dogs but appreciate having them around and seeing them play. Allowing off leash activities does not meaningfully affect other users of a semi-natural recreation area. GGNRA is not a crowded and developed park where off leash dogs could interfere with stuctured game fields or playgrounds. I support that some areas of GGNRA should be on leash only where pets could affect the park experience for others, including some portion of the Crissy field beach set aside primarily for people and children; however, the proposed plan goes far beyond any reasonable balance and should be changed. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1989    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 15:00:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

For Mori Point, I strongly favor Alternative A. But more specifically I'd very strong prefer access still allowed on Mori Bluff Trail. Mori Bluff trail is strongly favored by dog walkers because it allows a loop to be made into / out of adjacent City of Pacifica land where dog-walking is allowed. Removing dogs from the Bluff trail means no access to this popular loop.

I walk this loop several times a week and in my own informal surveys I would say the majority of users on the Mori Bluff Trail are dog owners. The area has a very long history of human use, a few dog paws are surely not going to be noticed. All the dogs I meet here are very well behaved.

Please give us access to the Bluff Trail! Without this I doubt I will be visiting Mori Point in the future. Getting to Old Mori trail means driving - - surely you don't want me driving my dogs in a car at this time when we are all so concerned about CO2 emissions? Walking is so environmentally friendly!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1990    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 15:04:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an owner of 2 active dogs here in SF, off-leash parks are paramount in the health and well-being of my dogs. I implore you to not eliminate off-leash parks in the city of San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1991    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 15:09:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I applaud the National Park Service for extensive study and work in preparing the SEIS, and for proposing alternatives that exhibit a willingness to listen to public comment and to compromise on the "no off-leash dogs in national parks" stance.

Overall I support Alternative E. It is generally a sensible compromise that provides the most off-leash access, and prohibits dogs in the fewest areas. However, Alternative E needs modification to provide additional off-leash access for residents close to large areas in Land's End and Marin and San Mateo counties. Further, Alternative A is best at Baker Beach and Fort Funston. These off-leash dog areas are enjoyed by highly responsible dog owners and currently serve a clear need for extensive off-leash dog areas. Taking away this access would disserve the public.

Dog advocates treasure nature and open space. Motivated and action-oriented, they can become one of the strongest NPS volunteer groups. But a "no off-leash dogs, or no dogs at all" position alienates them. The NPS needs to stop thinking that exclusion and enforcement are the way to protect parklands. Instead, NPS should support dogs in national parks and engage and educate the dog owner community to become volunteer monitors and managers of the parks to protect nature and other visitors alike. Such collaboration

will prove long-term to be the least costly and conflictive approach.

The plan states that without some action, GGNRA resources and values "might not be available for enjoyment by future generations." Yet some plan alternatives prevent enjoyment of these areas right now. Current and future generations require an approach that recognizes the rights of citizens who love dogs and the natural world to reap the benefits, recreation, and sheer joy of off-leash exercise in the national parks.

Alternative E, with modification to allow more off-leash access at Fort Funston, Baker Beach, and Marin and San Mateo counties, acknowledges the vital relationship between people and dogs. It positions and enables the NPS to collaborate with dog owners on long-term educational and outreach programs that support the parks, protect natural habitat, and improve the experience for all visitors.

Thank you for your continued interest in public comment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1992	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 15:30:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here), primarily at MUIR BEACH.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1993	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Belvedere, CA 94920 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 15:35:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1994	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	pleasant hill, CA 94523 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 15:38:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a responsible pet owner, and lover of beaches, it is important to me and other responsible pet owners, that Muir Beach remain open to dogs off leash. My experience at Muir Beach has always been a positive one. I have never seen any aggressive behavior of the dogs off leash. Neither have I witnessed any pet owner NOT clean up after their dog. It is important to allow dogs to exercise without the constant tether. I know the argument against mine, is that it is dangerous to allow dogs to roam free. In some areas that may hold more truth than others, but I truly believe that the pet owners who utilize Muir Beach, and most other GGNRA areas are not the irresponsible type. I oppose all the new GGNRA proposals, and I ask that you reconsider your agenda. Thank You.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1995	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	tiburon, CA 94920 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	JAK Planning & Architecture Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

---

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	1996	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94132-2730 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 15:47:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Don't outlaw fetch! There are ways to protect our parks and wild areas AND allow plenty of room for dogs, and their family members, to get adequate exercise outside. We need to find a win-win solution for the city of San Francisco and our 120,000 dogs. Many of these dogs live in apartments and condos and it's critical that they have plenty of off leash space for fetch and frisbee.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1997    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Belmont, CA 94002  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 15:48:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to oppose the plan. Hiking in dog allowed area, especially off leash area, provides me with my weekly exercise. There are already too little parks on the peninsula that allows dog. Even less parks allow for off leash walking. If parks doesn't allow for dogs, I will have even less choice for exercising. Getting outdoor with my dogs is very important for me and family. Most dogs stays in the trails and have minimal impact to the parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1998    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Belmont, CA 94002  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 15:52:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider reducing the area that dogs are allowed off leash. As a dog owner, this severely restrict the choices I have for my dog to totally be free and OFF LEASH. Thanks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 1999    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 15:55:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a homeowner, resident and HEAVY taxpayer of Marin, I am dismayed at the proposed changes in Alternative F for the trails that I currently enjoy in the Marin Headlands with my dog. In your document I find little to convince me of why my canine citizen should not be allowed to run with me, off leash. For me, this is one of the best things about living in Marin, and if I was unable to enjoy these areas with my dog, and the extremely limited area with which she travels with me through the trail system, I would seriously consider selling my home and leaving the area altogether. I find the proposals to be extremely short-sighted and myopic and lacking in correlation to the many responsible people who use these trails. Do not take away the rights of the many for the irresponsibility of the few. Consider that as populations grow, that there are alternatives that you have not explored such as alternating use days for bikes, leash/off-leash use that have been successful in other areas. Consider those views of the residents and the happiness that these trails provide for us and our dogs, and consider the taxes we pay because these are the reasons we love living in California. Take away the reasons for us to love California and we'll consider taking our taxes to other states.

I stand opposed to the measures outlined in your document. Enacting laws like this will only increase the tensions felt and only increase the number of people you will need to enforce the rules when there are

PLENTY of other alternatives to these ridiculous proposals you've outlined.

Sincerely- -an outspoken taxpayer, homeowner, responsible dog owner, environmentalist and friend to many in my community.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2000    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 16:23:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** On January 30, 2014, The SF Examiner reported that the Police Officers shoot & killed second dog in a week. The dog charged towards the officers & the owner made no move to stop the dog. The dog ran aggressively at the officer who fell & had to kill the vicious animal. The owner was arrested & booked on charges of assault on a police officer & assault with a deadly weapon. Even police officers were threatened by pets & the owners. These kind of attacks have been happening too often & one too many. At least the police officers carry guns to protect themselves. I do not believe ordinary citizens need to carry pistols to ward against unruly dogs & irresponsible dog owners in the National Parks. If the pets are allowed roaming in the Ocean Beach only, why they are running around the side walk along the beach ? They should be banned from the location. Additionally, dogs should not be allowed in the nearby Lands End trails if they already invaded the Ocean Beach. Leashing their dogs is the least they can do for the safety & security & health of the rest of the GGNRA users. Yet they rarely do. That is why banning dogs entirely will be the alternative. I do not wish to see lawsuits against the unrespectful owners & possibly GGNRA either. Please act sensibly. Thank you for your attention.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2001    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Salinas, CA 93906  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 17:19:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the NPS in coming up with a dog management plan and thank you for your efforts. Even though I currently live in Salinas I used to live in San Francisco and visit and volunteer for the park frequently. I still visit from time to time.

I urge you to ensure that the final plan protects resources including wildlife and makes sure it allows for a good experience for all visitors including those without dogs.

I understand that commercial dog walking is under review. This does not seem like an appropriate activity for a National Park. It seems that it would allow a small group of individuals to benefit commercially from the park at a cost to all other users.

I support providing places for people to walk there dogs but dog owners have become a very vocal group and I urge you not to let this sway the park into placing their needs above those of protecting the park or providing for the enjoyment of other visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2002    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 17:59:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner, I am all for more laws that keep dogs on leash. On more than one occasion in more than one park , I have been jumped on , knocked over and snapped at by off leash dogs. At each of these incidents I was told their dog just wants to play, or that the dog is friendly. The truth is that nothing would have occurred if their friendly playful dog been on leash. I would not have been knocked down , jumped on, or snapped at because the owner of the dog would have had control of the dog on a leash. I hope to be able to enjoy the parks with my dog on leash, knowing that other dogs will be on a leash also.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2003    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94618  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 18:17:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner, a lover of nature, and a frequent public park user, I believe that it's crucial to find ways to be responsible if we want to bring our dogs into public parks where the needs of wildlife must also be protected. Observing off-limits areas and abiding by on-leash laws are simply part of being a good neighbor and a good citizen in an increasingly crowded world. Here in Oakland we found ways to protect the sensitive resources at the Serpentine Prairie in Redwood Park where over-use had nearly destroyed the native grasslands. Hikers, equestrians, dog owners, and dog walkers all adapted to fencing off areas that were formerly multi-use. Now the prairie is recovering. Protecting the snowy plover and other sensitive wildlife in GGNRA can and must be a high priority. Those of us with dogs must exercise self-restraint and not assume that we are entitled to take our dogs wherever we want. We can do this by extending the love and affection we feel for our pets to all nature- -it's all part of the same continuum.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2004    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 18:44:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a Marin County resident and property owner and a frequent user of the GGNRA areas including the Marin Headlands, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach and Stinson Beach. Dogs owners in these areas generally do not respect the posted rules including dog restriction and use of leashes in these areas. In fact, on Rodeo Beach on Christmas Day of 2013, there were many pedestrians including children and families and dogs were clearly not in "voice control" or no attempt was being made to control dogs via voice by the owners. In fact, it is not clear to me what the definition of voice control is. Is

---

there a test or certification for voice control? In general, dogs running wild off-leash enjoying their freedom by default means that others occupying these areas do not have the freedom to enjoy them without the influence of the dogs. Dogs running free become dominant and the amount of bird life present when dogs are present is greatly diminished. The bird life in the beach areas of the GGNRA is prolific and it's unfortunate to see the birds less present when the dogs are running on the beach and in the surf unchecked. Signs at Rodeo Beach and Muir Beach indicating that dogs should be checked due to wildlife are largely ignored by dog owners. On Rodeo Beach at Christmas Day 2013, a man was walking on the bridge to the beach with his baby in his arms and the bridge was covered with pedestrians when a dog owner allowed his golden retriever to run back and forth across the bridge at full speed with no regard for it's impact on the safety of others. Similarly, sitting on the beach with a picnic this summer on Muir Beach, my companion and I were accosted by two dogs running wildly neither on a leash nor in voice control. If dogs are on the beach without a leash, whether or not in "voice control," the beach seems to be effectively ceded to be a dog beach, particularly with no definition of voice control and no enforcement of what rules exist at present. Those who might want to enjoy the beauty and serenity of the open space are consequently prevented from doing so.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2005	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 19:23:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As an animal lover, I certainly understand the benefit that dogs bring to a community and to individual owners. However, first and foremost, I consider myself a conservationist and as such, would ask that the NPS come up with a plan that increases protection of native habitat and species, and encourages responsible dog ownership/management. Bottom line, if we threaten wildlife and their home, we also threaten our own environment and we all- -including dogs and their owners- -lose. Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2006	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 19:26:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As an animal lover, I certainly understand the benefit that dogs bring to a community and to individual owners. However, first and foremost, I consider myself a conservationist and as such, would ask that the NPS come up with a plan that increases protection of native habitat and species, and encourages responsible dog ownership/management. Bottom line, if we threaten wildlife and their home, we also threaten our own environment and we all- -including dogs and their owners- -lose. Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2007	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Kentfield, CA 94904 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 19:27:41				

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs,

I am most concerned about the proposed reduction in off-leash freedom, and even complete banning of dogs, from so many areas of the GGNRA. I urge you to consider the repercussions such changes would have. People will continue to have dogs, but without access to so many of these open spaces they will drive more (increase traffic and pollution); or cause new sets of problems to occur by overcrowding of small neighborhood parks.

The GGNRA, by its very NAME, is intended for RECREATION!!! We live in an urban/suburban region, and it is vital that people, and their pets, retain access to the outdoors. We do not live in a wilderness region!!

Please do not change the longstanding pet policy from the 1970s. I believe the proposed changes go against the wishes of the majority of the public, regarding the use of their lands. Please leave beaches and trails open to be enjoyed by dogs with their owners. The proposed plan does not appear to be management for dogs.... I fear it may be more like banishment.

Respectfully yours,

T. Collins

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2008	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 19:36:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

My name is Rodolfo Garcia, and I'm 86 years old. I like to walk at Fort Funston with my son and daughter-in-law and their two dogs, Pancho and Marisa. Because I have some problems walking, I can't get down the steep path to the beach. So we walk together around the trails in the upper area of Fort Funston. But if your preferred alternative goes into effect, the off-leash part of the upper area will be so small that we really won't be able to exercise the dogs there. And I won't be able to get down to the beach with my son and daughter-in-law.

I oppose your preferred alternative because it would prevent me from being able to spend time walking with my family. I'm sure this will also affect other people who are elderly or disabled.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Rodolfo Garcia

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2009	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 19:57:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider reducing areas for off leash dog play. I cannot adequately exercise my dog if he must remain on a leash. I worry that the remaining off leash areas will become terribly over crowded that the dogs will become stressed and they won't be a safe place for exercise. I am all for conservation. I just feel we need to find a middle way.

Thanks for your consideration and hard work!

Mara

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2010    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 20:00:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposed plan is unacceptable with respect to all changes to the off-leash areas.

All parks in question need to INCREASE the off-leash dog areas due to the overwhelming demand for these spaces.

Any decrease in off-leash areas in Fort Funston or any other park in San Francisco is vigorously opposed by me, and my community.

Thank you,  
Holly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2011    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 20:02:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have a dog and I use Crissy Field and Fort Funston as places to exercise my pet. I do not think that further restrictions on off-leash areas are necessary.  
I believe that a significant portion of the complaints with respect to dog feces not being picked up can be attributed to commercial dog walkers. When they have 8 to 10 dogs to care for, it is impossible for them to keep an eye on all of dogs at all times to know when any of the dogs defecated. I believe individual dog owners are being penalized for the actions of commercial dog walkers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2012    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 20:11:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Fort Funston is the ideal location for a family to enjoy walking with their dogs off leash. It is one place that a family can enjoy a short hike with the kids and dogs who love running and releasing happy energy. The kids get a great energy release from the lack of backyards that most homes in SF lack.  
I have utilized Fort Funston for the last 10 years. I am part of a military family who had our dogs travel the world and always walked leashed. The first time I took my chow to Stearn Grove, I was afraid to take her leash off for fear of her running away. It was amazing to see her walk ever so gently among the other dogs as if to say "i am among my own".

---

I am at Fort Funston a few times a month to give my dogs a lengthy hike and to think that this beautiful park will be limited to them just upsets me to no end.

Have you ever walked at Fort Funston? It is a beautiful display of many sorts of dogs of many shapes and sizes. I don't think I have ever witnessed more than an occasional dog getting out of hand. I know there are some irresponsible dog owners. Shame on them - but please don't punish the responsible owners who way outnumber the bad ones. Please allow us to keep our dogs off leash at Fort Funston. I know there are those who say the dogs disturb birds and dig holes. I am sorry, but Fort Funston is more deteriorated by Mother Nature than dogs. There is sand swept areas all over. I dare anyone to say the dogs are responsible for any destruction of the landscaping. The wind changes it every season. Please keep it as it is and don't take away a wonderful recreation for all our family members, both children and pets.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2013	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94404 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 20:39:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Board Members,				

With such a large state, it is very surprising how little space is allowed for our canine companions to roam and get the exercise and stimulation they need. After moving here from Seattle for a job with a major biopharmaceutical company, I have been so very surprised and disappointed at how my life has been affected by the lack of space that I can share with my dog. I am a tax paying citizen, a great deal of tax due to my commitment to my career, but it seems my new home state doesn't take my investment into this state into consideration when it comes to my life, my passion (walking with my dog) or the needs of my companion, who I consider a replacement for the children that I've never had. I realize not everyone feels this way, however, many people do and that number grows every year. Us folks who are making 6 figures, living a life that includes their dogs, who have very few alternatives in a state that is supposedly wanting us to take part in it's beauty.

It has made me consider leaving the state, my life before I moved here was far better. I love my work in research oncology, but the lack of support from this state in a lifestyle for people with animals, it just doesn't feel like a long term possibility. And now, to read that those few spaces that we do have are being taken away, it's a message that people on the board clearly aren't a balanced representation of the real people that live in this state.

I will never spend another dollar supporting this state or it's parks or other venues if we are not allowed more space for our animals to get the exercise and stimulation their brains need to be happy. Animals are saviors to some people. People with traumatic pasts. People who have suffered trauma are supported by these animals. Every year we learn more about animals and their ability to feel and think and we as humans become more aware of their needs and how they provide us so much love and healing. How can your group turn a blind eye to the needs of the people that love their animals who help them live quality lives without a second thought? The lack of compassion and support to the humans who need these animals is just as wrong as the lack of support to let these animals get the experiences they need to feel whole and happy.

I was so looking forward to living here...this has been the biggest disappointment in my move. Cement and tiny little fenced in areas only force dogs to feel stress. If only your staff wanted to be cognizant of

the facts and create a place for the many people and animals as they do for duck and birds who don't pay taxes or ensure the future of this state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2014    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 21:02:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I walk my 2 dog at Fort Funston for the last 10 years on a daily basis. These parks are suppose to be for the people and for our pets to enjoy. If it is wildlife that we are trying to conserve, there must be a better way to barricade certain areas so that pet disturbances are lessened without lessening space. If people are complaining about pets, then certain areas like picnic areas are pet free and areas of open space are for people and pets to run around. If pet waste is an issue, allocating more areas for people to throw pet waste away can solve this problem. The public and all stakeholder who use GGNRA site must communicate and meet to iron out the details. If it is GGNRA who is dictating what lands are used and not used then these federal lands are not for the people, it is for GGNRA.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2015    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 21:07:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to add my comments to the discussion regarding the proposed restrictions in allowing dogs off leash at popular locations such as Muir Beach. Many people move to Marin to enjoy the hiking trails and beaches we have available to us. Many of us own dogs. As the number of trails and beaches shrink that allow dogs it also limits where people who want to hike with their dogs can take them. The changes will deeply affect the quality of life for people who enjoy these areas WITH their dogs. I recommend that more areas are opened up for hiking with dogs rather than taking away the few current areas people can hike with their dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2016    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** fremont, CA 94539  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,02,2014 21:36:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Aster Tseng and I live in the Bayarea. I walk my dogs at Ft. Funston for the past 3 years.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Aster Tseng

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2017    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 21:41:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very saddened that this is up for review again. I feel strongly that the current bylaws of the NPS are sustainable and balanced. Moving to Mill Valley was a life style choice as I want my family to grow up with an appreciation for nature and spending time outdoors. I have two dogs that are a big part of our family. As the laws currently exist, our walks are very limited. We cannot go to 90% of the trails around our house. We have been relegated to walk our dogs, and thus do our weekend hikes on the Oakwood Trail or on the Blithedale Ridge. In the summers, we can also add Rodeo, Muir and Stinson Beach to the places we're allowed. Otherwise, we need to drive to other counties to get decent hikes with our dogs. I believe that restricting the trails to dogs even further is a tragedy to the dog and family friendly area we are supposed to be.

More than that, however, i don't understand what legal basis under which you are imposing these new laws? I don't think the studies you have been doing are well controlled or substantive and my concern is that it is just a few very vocal anti-dog people that are leading this charge.

My vote is to leave the law AS IS. We are restricted enough and the dog walkers on the trails here are well behaved and responsible with clean up.

Please let me know if there is ANYTHING else i can do to protect the Park area and protect this beautiful place for my family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2018    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Elk Grove, CA 95624  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 21:55:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** All dogs need great off leash locations for the exercise they require. This ban is unbelievable and must be stopped. We come to SF for vacation and will no more. If I can't bring my dogs to a dog friendly place where they can have fun with us I will not come. Many others feel the same. Much loss of revenue for the area. This a sad situation. Please do not let this happen.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2019    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 22:00:56

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Too many dogs. I feel uncomfortable continually being approached by dogs, diminishing the pleasure of my visits to GGNRA sites and feeling like I have to indulge their owners. Dogs should be kept on leashes at all times in public places. The GGNRA exists for people to enjoy. It's not a dog park (or a dog toilet). I am not satisfied by dog owners who promise to clean up their animals' feces. They should be crapping in the park to begin with. Whether picked up or not, they still leave filth behind.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2020 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94108  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 22:03:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The city is cutting more space where dogs can be a dog. There are more dogs in the city compare to children. Children are leaving this where as increase of dogs keep growing.

The people in public service have no common sense. When animal lovers start using economic power against this in public office this is when things will change for animals.

As parents to pets we must hold the city responsible insuring that there pets are giving a city that is pet friendly. The park on Sacramento and Franklin just redid the park and to most of the area where dogs play and gave it to children. there are never as many children in that park as there are dogs.

Now officials want to take space again. As pet owners we need to use our resources and power to stop this official from taking space from our pets.

Jacqueline

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2021 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Lara McCaskill and I live in San Francisco. I walk and run my 4 year old Golden Retriever, Huck along Crissy Field, Rodeo Beach, throughout dog allowed trails in the Headlands and at Muir Beach. Every weekend, my husband and I take Huck for a run in the GGNRA. In fact, it was on one of these runs that my husband proposed to me at Rodeo Beach, with Huck in tow. I can't imagine this wonderful, healthy tradition of ours being taken away.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for dog access within the GGNRA because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, the health and well-being of our community will drastically suffer without proper dog-friendly recreation areas.

Sincerely,  
Lara McCaskill

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2022	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 22:11:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I feel like if these areas were to be taken away it would be a huge detriment to our communities. The Bay Area is known for its great out door activities and if this were to be taken away it would impact my choice to live here. Theres a reason why the Bay has become to be known as a dog friendly community and it is because of these awesome areas. Please do not take these parks away from us. There is NO GOOD REASON why.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2023	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 22:17:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider this awful change in dog policy. There are too many restricted areas for pet owners already. I will stop my support for your other policies if this change goes through as you have currently stated.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Marilee Jasan  
Mill Valley Orthopedic Clinic

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2024	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94949 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,02,2014 22:30:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** We need to keep places for the community to exercise our dogs off leash. It is important for our dogs to socialize and a necessary right for their owners.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2025	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 22:41:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed alternatives to the current policy as modified remain unacceptable. There remains no objective data suggesting that dog use on these trails has damaged the environment or threatened user safety in any meaningful sense. The only rational approach would be to allow temporary restrictions on trails to allow for periodic restoration where a need is identified. This is particularly the case for the Oakwood area which should be left alone entirely.

While I appreciate the need to protect wildlife habitat, these alternatives, particularly as they apply to Oakwood are ill conceived and will restrict what is a low impact use for little or no benefit to wildlife habitat.

Matt Wyman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2026    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 22:53:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Dog Management Plan is way too restrictive and therefore unacceptable.

I walk my 2 small dogs at Fort Funston almost every morning. It's the only off-leash open space area that we feel able to comfortably walk through varied terrain without worrying about motorized vehicles. There's enough open space so we're able to walk peacefully and meet other dogs now & then. If you limit the walking to fenced in on-leash only trails, this will funnel all the dog walkers to the same paths. It would ruin the freedom and whole off leash experience.

Please do not elect or enforce plans B-F.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2027    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 23:02:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The frequency of dog activity in our native wildlife habitats is putting several species at risk.

Hawks need to eat, Owls need to eat, birds need to nest, plants need certain nutrients to grow. All native plants and animals are important to our ecosystem. They have adapted to live here, and should NOT be forced out or threatened by the behavior of dogs, or lack of enforcement by our park system which they rely on for protection. An owner can only do so much to control a dog's natural instinct to run, chase, hunt, sniff, etc. And they shouldn't have to. This is why it is necessary to have designated, fenced in, areas



so dogs can express those instincts.

It cannot be left up to an over population of domesticated animals to push out the animals and plants that have already been here, adapting, and living.

I speak out for the microfauna to the fishes, for the rodents to the raptors.

This is as much their home as it is ours.

The fact that people do not naturally respect or understand these habitats, rather prioritize their pet's needs exclusively, it is up to law enforcement to create this boundary for preservation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2028    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 23:39:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I can see absolutely no reason at all for these measures to be taken. They make no sense. Who is supposed to profit from them? People? And how would they profit?

The land? How have dogs damaged the land? The dogs would suffer. That's very clear. What's more it is extremely unlikely that the people who have made this proposal actually own dogs. It appears they don't care very much about them either. I hope that those responsible will come to their senses and withdraw this proposal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2029    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,02,2014 23:47:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. This is a necessary action to ensure visitor safety, protect natural and cultural resources.

In addition, commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2030    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:41:56

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, in particular. What a dog-friendly beach affords us is a place for families with kids and dogs to enjoy time spent in nature together.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2031	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107
-----------------	-------------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 08:27:48
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I understand you are considering banning off-leash areas for dogs in San Francisco. This would be a very sad turn of events for me. My dog loves the various off-leash areas in California and my wife and I spend many weekend days there. Please don't change this.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2032	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Cumming, GA 30040
-----------------	-------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 09:27:59
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2033	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 09:42:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our dog is a retired guide dog who now helps our sons who both have muscular dystrophy. We love all taking her for walks on our great trails. Don't outlaw dogs on trails please!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2034    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 10:01:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs are good for the City and it's residents in countless ways, they deserve to have some open spaces reserved in the city boundaries where they can run free. If not in GGNRA, then where?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2035    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 10:13:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that dogs need to be on leashes for many safety reasons. First, their is human safety, where little children can be overwhelmed by a huge dog streaking by off leash. I also know this is very important for the protection of birds and wildlife. All the human activity is already a stress without adding off leash dogs to the mix. I have had experiences at Crissey field with off leash dogs that have made me uncomfortable and uneasy. There are other ops for dog owners to have off-leash fun and I believe that restrictions (i.e., have dogs on leash) at Crissy field are serve the overall greatest good. thanks for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2036    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 10:16:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern, going to the beach with my dogs (3 of them) has been a great experience for the whole family - my kid and her friends come along and they run with the dogs - exercise for youths these days is so important - without access to the beach to dog which are leash free would mean that my kid would not be interested in coming with me. Why? you can just walk the dogs on leash around the neighborhood. Also the well being and physical and mental health of the dogs is amazing by having this option. San Francisco and the Bay Area is so dog friendly - it's a blast to live here . We are very pro-environment and we tread lightly on the planet. Limiting access to the dogs at these beautiful parks will mean that everyone will pile up in city run parks. Please remain dog friendly for the enjoyment of everyone - humans and canines alike. Thank you. Veronique Lauriault PhD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2037    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi there,

I have lived in San Francisco for 4 years, and just adopted a dog a few months ago. As a new dog owner in San Francisco, I have been so grateful for what a welcoming, dog-friendly community there is here, and by the abundance of downright wonderful areas there are to visit with my dog. It is a treat not just to have open space to train and walk my dog off-leash, but to be able to do so in such beautiful places, where I can further explore and appreciate the natural beauty of this gorgeous part of the world where we all live together. As an avid hiker, camper, and lover of the outdoors, this situation has been delightful. Because my dog is a young, active, working breed, she needs constant off-leash exercise to be a happy, well-behaved creature. I live in Diamond Heights, and every single day my dog visits dog parks - - frequently Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Golden Gate Park, Stern Grove, McLaren Park, Glen Canyon, and Land's End.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I STRONGLY oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fenced-in areas completely alter the dog experience, making them feel nervous, anxious, and wanting to resort to a "fight or flight" instinct - - this frequently can cause more dog incidents as dogs feel trapped.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. Why solicit comments from the community if you simply plan to dismiss them?

Don't let fear-mongering and unsupported anti-dog claims destroy a truly magical part of living in San Francisco: the freedom to enjoy the incredible natural beauty of the Golden Gate, along with our friends, families, and our unleashed furry friends.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2038    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 11:24:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the Dog Management Plan.

All-in-all, I think the GGNRA should be open for recreation use by as many different users as possible, including people with dogs. I understand that dog use is a "hot-topic" item, but you should be able to look beyond the comments and see what makes the most sense.

It might be important to make a distinction between weekday and weekend policies. During the week, most of the GGNRA Sites have very few visitors. As such, dog use could and should be unrestricted. But on the weekends, use skyrockets. Perhaps then there could be dog-specific zones or tighter restrictions.

Overall, the GGNRA sites near San Francisco are meant to serve a more urban and local population. People that live here see these sites as extensions of their backyards (lucky us). As such, the policies here should be tailored to this more urban use, versus a policy in a more remote "destination" site such as Yosemite or the Grand Tetons.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2039	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	palo alto, CA 94306 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 11:41:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs need to run. Since I can't run, they need to be off leash!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2040	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 11:44:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, a severely restrictive plan to limit the number of trails and areas where dogs are allowed. I support Alternative A, no action.				

---

There are already so few trails available for dog owners to have their pets under voice control, and the proposed changes are unacceptable for locals who use these trails everyday. I walk my dog on Oakwood Valley trail regularly and there are many many responsible dog owners who also use this trail. I also use the Miwok trail in Tam Valley.

Dogs are already off limits on 99% o the GGNRA trails and there is no reason to eliminate use of the small amount that remains open to pet owners. GGNRA is meant as a recreation area, not a National Park or wilderness area. It requires a different type of management. Access for all users was part of the original charter and it should remain accessible to responsible pet owners.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2041	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 11:48:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hey NATIONAL PARK SERVICE!

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my family and my dog to some of the trails which still allow them...

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2042    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:01:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not deny off-leash access to our little pooch! We take our little dog to Fort Funston at least twice a month and she looks forward to this outing immensely. There are few places where she can explore freely and untethered, which is very stimulating to a dog. Not only is this enjoyable to her, but it is also incredibly beneficial to her health. She is not a young dog who strictly likes playing with other dogs. Therefore, she does not seem to enjoy going to the little fenced in dog parks where the square footage is usually fairly small and where no stone is left unturned even before we get there. In other words, she seems bored there. I also have a small child who loves going to the beach to "walk" the doggy. Please don't take away this valued family experience from us and all the other dog-loving families in SF.

Thank you for taking the time to read this comment!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2043    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:02:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi,

I've always been a supporter of the GGNRA and support the national park service. However, I think the recent current dog proposal that heavily limits the areas that we can use for off-leash walking of dogs is going to fundamentally change these parks for the worse. One of the best parts of living in San Francisco

is access to these great parks, parks that we can share with our best furry legged friends. I highly urge you to reconsider this proposal that will take away from the recreation and enjoyment that many people in the city highly value. If not, I will have to withdraw my sustaining donation to these parks since I will no longer support the goals of the NPS and the GGNRA.

Thanks,  
Tina

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2044    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:03:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Ft. Funston, Muir and Stinson beaches.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin and San Francisco residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2045    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:07:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a perennial hiker in the GGNRA, mostly in Marin Cnty, I send support for keeping current trails that are dog-free, dog-free. E.g.: Tenn. Valley.

If only you had the staffing to enforce. As you know, dogs are deemed children and are brought out, often off-leash, by their owners to annoy the rest of us.

I love dogs. Who doesn't. But not on GGNRA lands where they haven't been allowed and should never be. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2046    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Belmont, CA 94103  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:10:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I come to San Francisco specifically to walk my dogs at the Krissy Field area I keep the area clean and have my dog of leach.

Only this area with the adept ion of very few others in San Fran alowe a dog owner to take his dog of leach.

We deserve the respect of our fellow citisens to give pleasure to our animals and make the areas diversified with the natural behavior of well behaved animals not being restrained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2047    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:11:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposal is nonsense. No peer reviewed study has been done. My dogs generally go to a private location for walking but it would be a shame to have some of the more dog friendly locations closed, even if we only use them on occasion. Fort Funston is a favorite family activity of ours, as is a dip out in Ocean Beach from time to time.

If you want fewer dogs at these locations then you should consider opening open more locations to dogs rather than fewer. This move will put a greater strain on those too few that remain open.

I hope the proposal will be reconsidered. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2048    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:15:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is LaDonna Willems and I live in San Francisco. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Crissy Field, Stinson Beach and Rodeo Beach for the past 13 years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet. (And Ocean Beach is just 3 blocks from my home, so I and my dog, my husband and my young daughter are there almost every day.)

I oppose the preferred alternative for Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Stinson Beach and Rodeo Beach because it is far, far too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I ADAMANTLY REJECT the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.



I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer-reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

And finally, I reject these off-leash limitations because it will negatively impact my life and the life of my dog Vila. For 8 years I spent countless hours enjoying GGNRA areas with my previous dog LeeLoo. The joy in watching your dog happily romp on the beach and play with other canine pals, unfettered and off-leash, is like no other. LeeLoo passed away in 2010 and we held a small memorial gathering for her in her favorite place... Fort Funston. I want to continue to be able to give my new dog, Vila, the same joy and healthy exercise that LeeLoo enjoyed. I want my daughter to be able to experience "Fort Fun" with her family and her dog. The GGNRA's preferred alternative is a terrible idea. It absolutely breaks my heart as I think of how my family's life will change... having to leave our dog at home when we go to Ocean Beach just blocks from our house, having to get in our car and drive to find some space where she can run free.

Please take the overwhelming public commentary AGAINST this proposal into consideration. Plans A through F in this SEIS are harmful.

Sincerely,  
LaDonna Willems

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2049	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 12:17:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I come to San Francisco specifically to walk my dogs at the Krissy Field area I keep the area clean and have my dog of leash. Only this area with the exception of very few others in San Fran allow the dog owner to take his dog of leash. We deserve the respect of our fellow citizens to give pleasure to our animals and make the areas diversified with the natural behavior of well behaved animals not being restrained.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2050	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	KENTFIELD, CA 94904 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 12:22:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

---

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2051    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:26:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2052    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 12:45:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2053    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:05:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly urge to continue to keep trails open to dogs in the GGNRA area. I have been a Marin resident since 2003 and my family has used and loved the trails throughout the Marin headlands consistently since then. I exercise my dog on the trails in Marin about 4 times a week and dog friendly trails are already very restricted. I think allowing Marin residents to responsibly use the trails with their dogs encourages a love of the outdoors and good health and for women alone, dog provide a feeling of security. Furthermore, I believe the original charter specifically detailed both people and their dogs using the trails.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. And as far as I understand, there has not been any peer reviewed site specific research that support the dramatic restrictions on dogs in GGNRA. This is not a national park or wilderness area and should not be managed as such.

Please keep the trails open to dogs. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2054    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:10:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I understand the need to preserve nature and provide recreational equality to all groups. However, how is it acceptable for one group to accuse another of "damaging" the environment and to take away rights/access from the accused group without any solid evidence or statistics. This isn't fair, it's not equal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2055    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

I regularly take my dog to the Alta and Miwok Trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

As a dog-owner we are strong environmental advocates because we are on the trails so often, enjoy them, know how important they are to our quality of life and love them more when they are well-cared for.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2056	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 13:37:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My family and I drive to Fort Funston every weekend to walk our dogs off leash. There isn't a better place than Funston for off leash dog walking. The kids get to walk around freely with our dogs while enjoying the view of San Francisco and the ocean. We've met GREAT people and dog owners here. The dog owners who bring their dogs to Funston know that their dogs are safe around other dogs and people. If not, they will keep their dogs leashed. Rarely do we see any incidents. If/when incidents do occur, dog owners react appropriately to stop the situation.				

I think it would be a great loss to our family and other families to restrict off leash dog walking at Funston the way you plan to. Yes, we understand that we can still walk with the dogs on leash, but we believe that will lead to a lot of tension between the dogs.

Please don't set any restrictions for off leash dog walking at Fort Funston.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2057	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Cedar Hills, UT 84062 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	1965 Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 13:45:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep dogs free!!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2058	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:49:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I like to hike in the GG National Recreation Area. I have been aggressively approached by large off-leash dogs on several occasions. I object to this. I have been bit by dogs and object to them approaching me. I object to being made afraid by the simple act of taking a hike. It's my strong opinion that dog owners should compromise on this issue. I further believe that failure to comply be penalized with a substantial fine.

I don't think dogs will be concerned one way or the other.

The common refrain of dog owners is, "Oh, MY dog wouldn't hurt you." Well, when the dog is running toward me, how do I know this?

I will add that I have been actually attacked by dogs in Mountain Lake Park in SF (which, I realize, is not part of the GGNRA). The park has a large off-leash area. Dog owners going to this area, and coming from it, leave their dogs off-leash during their transit, and the dogs run amuck through the park. The park has been effectively taken over by off-leash dogs and their owners, as has the large paved road immediately adjacent to (north of) the park. (I don't know who has jurisdiction over this road.)

Because dog owners are well organized, their voices - their comments - may dominate this proceeding. I suggest to you that there's a large group of people out here who aren't so well organized whose opinions should also be registered. I would count small children among this number. I am happy to serve as their voice.

Regards,

Bob Frost  
San Francisco  
Tel. 415.221.3514

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2059    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 13:50:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am not a dog owner and I am concerned on how this dog management plan will affect the city parks. Restricting off leash dog walking access in areas where off leash dogs are now (for example: Chrissy, Fort Funston) can lead to an increase of dogs in our local area parks. How does the GGNRA plan to address/take responsibility this issue, even if the parks are not part of the GGNRA? Local parks may not be part of your jurisdiction, but if this management plan is approved and there is a significant increase of dogs in parks, there is a strong correlation between the two. GGNRA should be held responsible and should be prepared with a solution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2060    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:04:24

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Brianna and I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's plan to restrict off leash dog walking areas in San Francisco. I understand that this is to try and resolve issues that come from walking dogs off leash but I strongly feel that this is not the solution for the issues. There a lot of dogs in this city and they all deserve the right to have areas close to home where they can be taken to on a daily basis to run and play off leash. A dog cannot get the sufficient amount of exercise they need when they are walked on leash.

Thank you  
Brianna

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2061    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Lagunitas, CA 94938  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:10:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm writing to express my extreme opposition to the GGNRA's Dog Management Plan. Please reconsider these draconian restrictions to our community recreation areas. The banning of dogs at all of these wonderful areas will have a much worse impact on the community than any environmental impact your new rules are trying to mitigate. Please, from a true nature lover and environmentally responsible person. I beg you, please reconsider.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2062    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:12:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Chrissy field is heaven for my dog and many many others! it is a place, in this urban environment, to run free, swim , and play with others. it brings my dog peace as well as me! i smile laugh and love watching the dogs all play! this city is a city of dog and pet owners...people who love their pets, respect the environment and other using the beach too!  
To restrict or take away the freedom and happiness it brings dogs and their owners would be awful! i spend a lot of time at the beach at Chrissy and I always feel that everyone picks up after their dogs, watches them diligently, and are sensitive tho others trying to enjoy the beach. i love it! my dog loves it! the community loves it!  
please please reconsider the plan and let us live and love this beautiful place we are blessed with...and let us do it with our wonderful furry companions!  
Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2063    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA,

The changes made in the 2014 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SIES for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitor as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

Kindly remember that the GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It required a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk with their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County!

Best regards,  
Kristin Sjöholm

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2064    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 14:38:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was just at Fort Funston yesterday and I observed the following:

- 1) Due to the cold/wet weather, there weren't many people there. The ONLY people there were people walking their dogs, all off leash.
  - 2) There were new posts with wires up to replace the old sand covered ones in the areas that are off limits. It's great that GGNRA are replacing the posts to help restrict access to "protected areas", but it really isn't effective. Many times, you still see people (with AND without dogs) walking through the restricted areas. To be clear, GGNRA should post clear signage at each of the areas where both dogs AND people are not allowed.
  - 3) The new posts and wires do not prevent sand from sliding into the protected areas. If you walk down the paved trail to the very end, you can see numerous spots where the sand has clearly taken over the paved walkway and has covered plants in the "protected areas." This isn't something that the dogs or people have caused. That's mother nature. If the GGNRA is really that concerned about the "protected areas" spend the time and money on effective barriers to protect these areas. There's no point in putting up new posts if they aren't effective. The sand has been overwhelming the path and plants for months now. GGNRA needs to come up with a better idea to protect the plants, which are living areas for other animals.
-

4) Not one single park ranger was seen patrolling the area, again. I have been going to Funston for years. I can honestly say that of all the times I've been there, I have only seen a ranger patrolling ONCE. The ranger was driving his vehicle on the walking path. Not very safe in my eyes where dogs, people and children and running around. It's not effective to draft a plan if there's no enforcement. If you want to stop bad behavior (both dogs and human), there needs to be some sort of enforcement conducted in a safe, effective manner.

Some things for the GGNRA to consider!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2065	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 14:45:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing in strong opposition to imposing more leash restrictions. I previously lived in Southern California, where there are very few places to take a dog off leash. We have a German Pointer that absolutely needs to run hard every day and does not like to fetch.				

It's a huge positive for us now that we live in the Bay Area to have so many wonderful locations to be able to run her. My experience from daily walks and bike rides on nearby open space is that people are very thoughtful regarding their dog walking. If a dog is aggressive, they have it on a leash. But in most cases, the dogs are under voice command and closely monitored.

Any new restrictions on off-leash activity would have a significant negative effect on our experience - I often rave about how thoughtful the dog rules are in general and would be disappointed to see them changed.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2066	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA Staff.				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail, Muir Beach, and the North End of Stinson Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.



The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. In addition, dogs provide safety on trails from persons whom might be a threat to an unsuspecting individual. There have been assault crimes reported over the years on these trails and our canine friends provide much needed safety where rangers cannot be present.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2067	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern:				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail and enjoy seeing the many families and dogs out and about. We never have any trouble with our dog or with others and it is one of our favorite aspects of living in Mill Valley. We walk to Oakwood on the weekends - without this trail, our family would need to drive to another location to walk the dog off leash.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2068	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 15:24:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

---

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2069	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 15:24:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Miwok Trail and Muir Beach and the Coastal Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2070	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Marin County Dog.org Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 15:32:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to many of the impacted areas.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2071    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 15:34:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The GGNRA's restriction for ALL the dogs and the owners/parents in the San Francisco Bay Area is not going to benefit the City nor its parks and recreational areas for the better. The idea that dogs are driving away the natural habit of animals in the parks is an exaggerated point. If the Environmental groups are super concerned about the parks then they need to be closed to not only dogs but people as well. People/tourists are far worse than the local dogs that go to an off leash dog park, so why not cut tourism then? Oh wait! That would be bad for the economy and the City of San Francisco's revenue. What about the construction that is happening in/near/over the Presidio area? It is driving more of the wild animals to the City center and out of their homes. The Presidio police like to inform local and general public that the dog owners and their faithful companions, are the cause of the birds moving to other areas, coyotes dying and the other furry creatures becoming more of a risk of going extinct. By all means, blame them, but next time you visit the beautiful Presidio National Park take a good look around and see how much construction is going on ALL around the park that is so well preserved for millions of tourists to visit on foot, bike and car. Off leash dogs are not the problem.

Dog owners and their dogs are being accused of neglect and improper training of their dogs that are off leash. If an owner of a dog is not aware of their pet that is acting up, another dog will definitely put the unruly dog in its place as well as the owner of the other dog. If they do not learn quickly, the dog owners that do respect the off leash rules will then call the park rangers/police to site and ticket the disrespectful dog owner.

This new plan is NOT going to solve any problems that are place on the table. They are just going to enhance the current issues already. Put blame where blame is do-ill informed tourists and the development/construction/lack of park rangers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2072    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a San Francisco resident. I regularly visit GGNRA areas with my family, and often like to bring our dog. We most frequently visit Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Muir Woods, and Marin Headlands. I very much enjoy being able to bring our dog with us, and have her off-leash in open areas,

---

because it provides a way for our entire family to relax and enjoy outdoor time. Even when we do not bring our dog, I like seeing other people with their dogs - - it adds to the enjoyment of the setting, and gives us ways to interact with other visitors.

I was disturbed by the GGNRA plans to limit recreational uses of our urban open spaces. There is little actual justification for these plans, and they would strongly undermine a popular, enjoyable, unique setting as it is currently used and valued by residents and visitors.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2073	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Life Long Resident Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	--

<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member
---------------------	--------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.
------------------------	--

I regularly hike with my dogs on Oakwood Trail, Alta Trail and Homestead Hill- these are trails/fire roads

---

that I have been using MY ENTIRE LIFE to ride horses and walk with my dogs!

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and I have always shown respect to the rules and never used these restricted areas. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. I haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2074	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 16:03:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern,				

I am a Mill Valley native, a supporter of local community and a dog owner. I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Most every day, I walk my dog at either the Oakwood Valley Trail or at Muir Beach. At both places, I not only enjoy the beauty of my surroundings, but I do my part as a volunteer, cleaning the beach and trails of any left-over garbage from hikers or picnic-goers. And, of course, I always clean up after my dog. There is a very strong-knit community of dog owners who are not only respectful of our place in the environment, but strive to make it a better place because of our presence. Please preserve access for the majority of locals who love to be out with their dogs and who show positive stewardship of the land.

Many thanks for your time, and I hope we can retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

Sincerely,  
Amanda Wilkins  
39 Loring Avenue  
Mill Valley, CA 94941

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2075	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	belmont, CA 94002 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 16:13:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern at GGNRA:				

---

I ask that you please reconsider limiting dog access (both on and off-leash) within San Mateo County. These areas are already crowded with local residents and their canine companions as a result of restrictions placed on dozens of open space areas within the county.

There are millions of people living here that are trying to maintain their own health as well as that of their dogs in these parks, and now you want to further restrict our access based upon non-existing conditions. Dogs and their owners are not negatively impacting the natural resources in these areas, we are realizing the beauty of the parks by our constant use.

Further, if you continue to restrict access to the most active people within this county, you will find that these parks slowly fall from the public eye and when the next 'budget crisis' comes up, no one will be there to champion the cause to keep them open. I saw this happen first hand when Redwood City decided to close Bair Island to pedestrians and their dogs several years ago. Within about 16-months of the closure, a deal was made behind closed doors with a developer, and now the beautiful Bair Island sanctuary has been ruined, another lost treasure on the Peninsula. All of this happened because the public couldn't use the area and it was simply forgotten about...

The citizens of San Mateo County and their dogs deserve the right to access the few limited areas we currently have access to in this county. I ask that you please reconsider any further limitations to your tax paying community and their dogs.

In closing, I would ask that you please consider opening access for dogs and their owners in more parks within the county, rather than focusing your attention on these senseless limitations, as that would truly be representing the general population in this area that happens to pay your salary!

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Erin Sunkel & Otter the dog

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2076	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	tamalpais valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 16:18:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I would prefer more resources devoted to public education for appropriate use.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2077	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Don't punish the many because of the irresponsibility of the few. Enforce current laws better if you must, but these sweeping changes go way too far. Seeing children over 5 in SF is				

---

already rare enough. You also want dogs to become a novelty? Come on.

Other reasons the proposed legislation is faulty:

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

**Correspondence ID:** 2078    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 16:29:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been thinking about this a lot. You are restricting who may use these lands. No bikers, no people with dogs and so on. We are the people who support the open space. We donated money to purchase these lands. we show up to clear the non native brush. We give directions to tourists.

We love the open space and we feel safe in the open with our dogs. As you restrict use you will get less and less support with keeping the open space free of development.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2079    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 16:41:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Fort Funston is a terrific place for dogs and people. In all my time walking, there have been positive experiences with the dogs off leash. It would be a shame to not allow the dogs along the paths that I so enjoy to walk on with my dog.

It is such a beautiful place for me to walk and my dog enjoys the ability to discover nature on her own, especially living in the city.

The dog owners take care of the area and there is no litter or dog waste left - in fact because of them it is one of the cleanest public areas around.

Please keep this area available for off leash dog walking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2080    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 16:50:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.



The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you of your time.

Jennifer Dibble Fanning

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2081	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 16:58:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	If citizens didn't adopt these furry creatures, our streets would be filled with stray animals and cats and dogs would be put to the death by the masses. These animals become bigger than pets- they are family.				

The goal of the GGNR is noble. They want to protect endangered species and return our land to a more original status. Banning dogs is an easy move. What would be difficult would be studying to find the actually dangers of these endangered species (people, pollution, ect..) and working to minimize those impacts.

If we are going to ban dogs from an urban park, why not ban cars too? I would bet the cars do far more damage in a year that the dogs would do in a lifetime.

If you want real change, then make it. Don't scapegoat poor domesticated dogs who's only crime is that families didn't want them to live a life only on a leash, or worse, being put down.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2082	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pleasant Hill, CA 94523 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 17:01:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2083	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 17:11:18				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've been using Crissy Field since the early 80s when it was a military base still. Even back then everyone cleaned up after their dogs the few of us that there were. I've been down there in sunny days which are the few exceptional days when there are lots of people down there and the people in the dogs interact just fine. I'm for keeping it as it is with a off leash area. People who violate voice control and do not pick up after their dogs should get a giant fine however. I have traveled to most places in the world, 500 cities and I can honestly tell you that the Crissy Field off leash area is by far the best one I've ever seen anywhere.

In my 30 years of using Crissy Field I can count on one hand the number of people who have not been responsible dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2084    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 17:47:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Where are The Site Specific Peer Review Studies?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2085    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Ocean Beach Dog Walkers Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 18:06:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
To : GGNRA Superintendent Frank Dean

From Thomas Roop

Daly City, CA

I want to express my disappointment in this 2014SEIS Dog Management Plan with such a massive land take away for the Recreation of Off Leash Dog walking with the use of voice control.

I want to see and know just where are (The Site Specific Peer Review Studies) that were used to prove our Dogs are harming any Habitat for birds as well as the vegetation in the GGNRA???

I personally think the Original 1979 Pet Policy is all that is needed if you were to just enforce the existing dog mangement rules.

My dog and I go to Fort Funston and Ocean Beach and at Fort Funston daily and we try to go early or late in the day and travel the outter trails that circle Fort Funston and all of these areas we go too, you want to take away. These are areas with a lot of trees to make it easier for myself and our dog on hot days and going through the south end of Battery Davis and coming out the North Battery Davis on the sunset trail to go north to the Horse trail will not be possible in your preferred plan. I do not see anything that you offer to replace this experience and other ways that we travel are banned in your preferred Plan F...

At Ocean Beach I do not see; (The Site Specific Peer Review Studies) that were used to prove our Dogs are harming any Habitat for birds as well as the vegetation in the GGNRA??? The Snowy Plover is not endangered or on a Critical Habitat list that would justify the closing of Ocean Beach from Staircase 21 south two miles to Sloat Blvd. The law requires a Site Specific Peer Review to prove our Dogs are harming any Habitat for birds as well as the vegetation in the GGNRA, where is the proof?

This is very disheartening that you and your colleagues would spend our tax dollars to punish us and our dogs by taking away the land we walk and not even have a good plan along with a fair management style that will enforce your plan. The rules are on the books just enforce them and we can all live and let live.

As a resident of San Mateo County I really feel disenfranchised by the GGNRA and as you acquire land the rules go right to National Park Rules when folks in Montara have had a history of off leash Dog walking for over 20 years, that was not even considered....

Yes for the Original 1979 Pet Policy

Thomas Roop  
Daly City CA

CC Congresswoman Jackie Speier

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2086    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 18:15:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Miwok Trail, Oakwood Valley Trail, Oakwood Valley Fire Road, and Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2087    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 18:28:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Sarah Stromska and I live in San Francisco. My fiancé and I bought our first home in August 2013. The house is 2 blocks from Ocean Beach. Soon after our purchase we adopted a dog from the SFSPCA. We love taking him for walks on Ocean Beach - he loves to play with other dogs and chase the waves.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Ocean Beach. It is too restrictive. In a city where dogs outnumber children (25% of households compared to 18%), and where owning - or even renting - a reasonable amount of space is getting harder and harder to come by, places like Ocean Beach are vital to maintain the health of our furry friends and our community.

Health and social benefits aside, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to

prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban community. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sarah Stromska

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2088	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 18:40:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please DO NOT cut our access to off leash dog park space! Fort Funston in particular is one of the greatest off leash dog parks in the WORLD... why would you want to change that?!?! With more dogs than children in San Francisco, off leash abundance is a must for us to live happy lives.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2089	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

As a resident & home owner who lives less than a mile from the area in question, I regularly take my dog to many of the sites including Muir Beach, Oakwood Valley and Miwok on a daily basis.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2090	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 18:58:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Samir Garg and I live in San Francisco. One of my favorite aspects of this city is its pet-friendly environment. I thought this before I had a dog, and of course now with a dog - I appreciate it even more.

I strongly oppose the restrictive measures being put forth in some of the key areas I like to take my dog and kids - Fort Funston being the most critical.

Key reasons:

- With the off-leash culture, I feel we were especially diligent in socializing our dog and training him to be incredibly good with people as well as other dogs; this would not have been possible in an on-leash environment

- The city is a tough place to take animals out to let them run, so the few big off-leash parks have been a huge help

I hope that this key feature of San Francisco remains, as it's one that my family and I have enjoyed immensely.

Sincerely,  
Samir Garg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2091 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 18:59:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Feeling sad - - My 11 year old pug has been enjoying GGNRA lands for years off-leash. She and many other dogs deserve to have the freedom to roam, play, sniff, walk and be happy outside and off of a leash.

I hope this plan will be re-considered.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2092 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Self Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 19:06:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Angela Sharp, I live in the SOMA area of San Francisco. I have two labs that I take to Ocean Beach, Baker Beach or Crissy Field on a regular basis, 5-6 days a week. I can not imagine not being able to let my dogs run freely on the beach and to let them swim, as that is part of their DNA.

I live in the heart of the city and look forward to taking my urban dogs to the beauty of the GGNRA. I derive great pleasure in walking my dogs off leash in these areas. They can run and swim and I can experience the beauty of the beach, fresh air and knowing they are free and out of the noisy, crowded city.

This is a dog friendly city. Let's keep it that way!!! One of the great aspects of this city!

These are some points I oppose to:

THE GGNRA , SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO CHANGE LEASH LAWS IN PARTICULAR GGNRA AREAS JUST BECAUSE IT DEEMS THAT NOT ENOUGH PEOPLE ARE COMPLYING TO LEASH RESTRICTIONS.

THE MONITORING-BASED MGMT STRATEGY THAT REPLACED THE COMPLIANCE-BASED MGMT STRATEGY IN THE EARLIER VERSION OF THE PLAN.

THIS PLAN ADMOTS THERE ARE FEW SCIENTIFIC STUDIES THAT SHOW THE IMPACT THAT DOGS HAVE ON VEGETATION AND SOILS. A SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENT INPACT STATEMENT NEEDS TO BE BASED ON SCIENCE, NOT ANCEDOTE

THE FOUNDING OF THE GGNRA'S PURPOSE IS TO OFFER A "NATIONAL PARK EXPERIENCE TO A LARGE AND DIVERSE URBAN POPULATION", HOWEVER, THE ENABLING LEGISLATION SAYS THE PURPOSE OF THE GGNRA IS TO PROVIDE FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF RECREATIONAL SPACE.

I DO NOT SEE ANY DAMAGE TO ANY AREA IN THE GGNRA FROM WALKING MY DOGS. THIS WOULD BE A TRAGEDY IMPLEMENT THESE PROPOSED LEASH LAWS.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2093	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94710 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Bay Nature Institute Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	--

<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member
---------------------	--------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 19:18:38
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to commend the park for its thorough review process regarding the regulation of recreational dog walking activities in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and express support for the current proposals to clearly delineate where certain related activities will and will not be permitted. The properties of the Golden Gate National Parks are a tremendous public resource that deserve to be made accessible and enjoyable to all residents of the area, while at the same time safeguarding the natural assets - - including native plants and wildlife - - that make these areas so biologically diverse and environmentally significant. There are clearly areas where high-impact activities, such as off-leash dog play and commercial dog-walking, should not be permitted, either because of the sensitivity of the natural resources, or because they interfere with the passive and peaceful enjoyment of those areas by other members of the public. I know it is not possible to satisfy all constituencies all of the time, but I appreciate the careful thought that has gone in to the preparation of the current proposal and look forward to its final adoption in the near future.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2094	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 19:18:49
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Chrissy Field, Ocean Beach and on various trails that are part of the park.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2095	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Santa Clara, CA 95051 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 19:19:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dogs need off leash time where they can run and play with their humans and with other dogs. It is extremely cruel to reduce off leash areas. It is such an unkind way to treat these beings that help us and do so much for us. We have almost the whole city to ourselves, how mean is it to remove what little area they have for some freedom. Please look inside your heart and do the right thing by the dogs. San Francisco is an incredible city that is known for its openness and forward thinking ways. This would really be a shameful thing if we were to take these areas away from our Canine companions. Dogs that are allowed at least some free, unrestrained time, are better socialized and well behaved than their unhappy, always restrained counterparts.

Sincerely,

Monica Mendez

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2096	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 19:41:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Marin Headlands, Golden Gate Park, and Fort Funston.



Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2097	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	palo alto, CA 94301 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 20:00:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think your plans to eliminate the types of public and canine access to the parks is wrong.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2098	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Larkspur, CA 94939 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 20:19:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am HORRIFIED by Alternative F, the "preferred" dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. I would prefer the No Action Alternative, but really think you need FAR MORE access for off-leash dogs.				

I'm a life-long environmentalist, but I also know the very natural and healthy role that dogs play in our lives and the natural environment.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There is no true reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

I demand that you conduct peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Keeping dogs ON leash all the time creates many new problems for our society - - it creates behavior problems in dogs that are very serious and result in many injuries every year to HUMAN BEINGS. Dogs need to run free - - and they have done that for many centuries along the coast as they were the domesticated friends of Native Americans.

To keep them on leash is animal abuse - - does the GGNRA really believe that there is NO coastal areas where dogs and their owners can hike and play off leash? That is insultingly stupid.

The GGNRA needs to provide recreational opportunities for ALL Bay Area residents and their families - including their dogs. Perhaps you've never owned a dog, but leaving a dog behind when going to the seashore is like leaving your small child behind because they are banned from the beach.

As for the birdlife, it is far more threatened by natural predators including rats, rodents and coyotes, than by domesticated dogs under the watchful eyes of their companions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2099    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I regularly visit Fort Funston with my dog - this is one of my favorite activities, and I've been so grateful for this space where I can hike, and Morgan (my dog) can be off leash. This allows him to get exercise that I otherwise wouldn't be able to provide.

I oppose the plan because it is too restrictive. I've seen NO justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

I strongly oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Please do not implement this plan and take away the joy of experiencing this beautiful area with our companions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2100    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** So. San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 20:50:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2101    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 20:52:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE DO NOT TAKE AWAY THE OFF LEASH AREA FOR THE DOGS, IT  
WOULD BE CRUEL.  
THANK YOU

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2102    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san jose, CA 95126  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 21:20:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't think that commercial dog walking should be allowed in the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2103    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 21:27:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**    I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking  
within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.  
I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS  
management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality  
National Park experience for all visitors.

Regarding Commercial Dog Walkers using the GGNRA for commercial business:

Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA  
by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private  
financial gain.

Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact  
park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Thank you.

Andrea Jadwin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2104    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94143  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** UCSF Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 21:34:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

Personally, if Fort Funston and Ocean Beach no longer had large off-leash roaming ares, my dog would suffer from lack of exercise and free play. Additionally, the influx of dogs to inadequately-sized city parks would present a crowding problem. What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describe how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be, not as a national park, which is not something that is appropriate in a crowded urban area.

Sincerely,

Chris Stauffer, MD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2105    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Antioch, CA 94531  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 21:37:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The plan released in September of 2013 for designated areas for off leash dogs is more than aqueduct. I like most people like dogs and I like people but I don't appreciate when some human runs up and jumps on, I also don't like dogs jumping on me while the owner calls out "don't worry he's friendly".

Everyone doesn't want dogs running around sniffing their private parts and jumping on them while their irresponsible owner smiles. The dogs have several areas to run off leash please keep the way it was proposed. If you allow more areas for off leash dogs you will need more law enforcement to control irresponsible dog owners can't the limited resources of the Park Service be put to better use?

Norman Machado

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2106    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 21:49:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Shannon and I live in San Francisco with my husband, two children and Daisy, our golden retriever. I walk Daisy at Chrissy Field at least 3x/week and did the same for years with our last golden, Lucy. I meet friends there, we walk, talk, share joys and sorrows and enjoy our beautiful city...with our dogs. I meet new people too, we share dog stories and life stories. We commiserate, we learn and we laugh. On the weekends, my husband gets up early and takes Daisy to Chrissy Field for a big morning swim and wrestle session with her other dog friends. It is the highlight of his busy week. Before kids and before Daisy, we would take Lucy each and every weekend morning to Fort Funston. It was our chance to get outside, catch-up over a hike on our busy weeks and watch all the goofy dogs and soak in all the joy they bring to our lives. When Lucy passed, I looked back at all the photos we had taken at Fort Funston (or "Fort Fun", as we call it) and realized how some of the best days of my life were spent there with her. My point to all this is the benefits of these off-leash outings are just as beneficial to all the \*people\* - -if not more- -as they are to the dogs!

For this reason, I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Chrissy Field and Fort Funston (and other areas, but these are the ones I care most about) because it is too restrictive. The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported.

I was just remarking the other day how lucky we are in San Francisco to have off-leash beach areas for our dogs, unlike LA or San Diego. Please don't turn our city into Los Angeles!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2107    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Russ Thau and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog, Jimmy Dean, on Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, and Ft. Funston for the past 8 of years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, San Francisco is one of the most dog friendly cities in America and what makes this place so special. We understand all aspects of life and celebrate them. Everyone on these beaches are responsible with their dogs and I don't see any problems. Let us continue to enjoy to exercise our dogs in an open

environment.

Sincerely,  
- Russ

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2108    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 22:19:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Animal companions are an integral part of San Francisco life. They provide not only love, comfort, and loyalty to their owners, but they also teach compassion, responsibility, and unconditional love. As a lover of animals, a dog owner, and a San Francisco resident, it is important to me and to San Franciscans that we treat these animals/pets/companions with respect and love. An important part of that is to provide them with the exercise, stimulation, and freedom that they deserve. Therefore, I believe it is imperative that we do not ban or limit the off leash policy at Fort Funston. There are already not too many areas in San Francisco that allow these beloved members of our families to run freely.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2109    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 22:42:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a fourth generation San Franciscan and a second generation Sunset District resident. I live very close to Ocean Beach and spent many years walking my dogs there, sometimes as much as three times a day. I also frequently visited Fort Funston. I no longer do so because I have a dog who cannot be allowed off leash. If this was not the case, I would still regularly be exercising on GGNRA lands with my off-leash dog.

I am writing to demand that you reinstate the ORIGINAL 1979 Pet Policy per the 2005 Federal Court decision because all closures since then have not been based upon site specific, peer-reviewed studies as the law requires. From all my research into the so-called environmental reasons for banning or severely limiting dogs from these and other GGNRA areas, I see no valid reason for it.

I disagree with the premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. And, as I said, there has not been any peer-reviewed studies to prove this.

Further, the GGNRA is located in an urban area and was designed to be an urban, recreational area and as such was voted on by the people in the City and County of San Francisco. And there have not been any environmental impact studies about what the effects would be of so many dogs and people moving over to San Francisco property.

Finally, it will simply not be enforceable to go forward with the plan to eliminate 75% of the off-leash recreation area in San Francisco. The people who regularly visit the GGNRA will continue to go with their dogs and continue to enjoy exercising them there - - even with the risk that they will be shot with a taser by one of the rangers, as was done a couple of years ago on GGNRA land.

Please drop the preposterous proposed plan and reinstate the original 1979 plan. The NPS is a guest in San Francisco's backyard and not the other way around

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2110    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 23:10:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am strongly opposed to the limitation of dogs in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

The Golden Gate National RECREATION AREA was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. The GGNRA is not a wilderness national park like Yosemite and Yellowstone and should not be managed as if it were.

Less than 1% o trails and beaches in the GGNRA are dog friendly. That means anybody who wants a dog-free experience has 99% o the 80,000 acres to play in.

There has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study, AS REQUIRED BY LAW that supports such a drastic restriction of dog friendly areas. It must be proven before it is legislated!

I appeal to you to make no policy changes regarding dogs in the GGNRA, and to please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy for the GGNRA.

Thank you,  
Annette Sullivan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2111    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 934941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 23:16:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep all parks and beaches open to dogs!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2112    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 23:21:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and avid outdoors person, I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I

---

support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space." The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2113	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 23:44:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am strongly in support of a GGNRA plan to closely regulate dogs in the national parks. I do not want to have my visits to GGNRA lands dominated by avoiding dogs, by dog feces, by dogs chasing wild birds and small mammals, etc. I do not want my frisbee to be chased by other people's dogs. I do not want to see public lands taken over by private businesses, basically dog shuttle services, where I then have to turn around and leave because of my distaste for dogs.

---



Dogs are not people and I can't state strongly enough how much I would like the presence of dogs to be minimized in the national parks system. Insofar as they must be tolerated they should be confined to well-demarcated areas, and leash laws should be very strictly enforced in all areas with serious penalties for noncompliance.

thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2114    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Lafayette, CA 94549  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:35:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy. The Golden Gate National RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a DIFFERENT management approach than wilderness National Park areas like Yosemite or Yellowstone. Less than 1% o trails and beaches in the GGNRA are dog-friendly. That means anybody who wants a dog-free experience has 99% o the 80,000 acres to play in.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed site-specific studies or vital monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to intitiate such a dramatic change to the public use of their own public lands.

If the dog management plan is adopted, Marins estimated 60,000 dogs will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

These are public lands and the GGNRA need to listen to the public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2115    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 03:27:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan. The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2116    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 06:47:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2117    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** 1983 Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 07:07:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** San Francisco is known for its love of dogs, and free open spaces for people to enjoy with their family (and fur family members!) Please keep it this way!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2118    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 07:35:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please retain the long standing 1979 Pet Policy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2119    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Paws n Play Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Gary Nakagawa and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dogs at Fort Funston for the past 15 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston, because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Gary Nakagawa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2120    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Petaluma, CA 94952  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:03:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Golden Gate National Recreational Areas are public lands to be shared by everyone- -even people without dogs and wildlife. No dogs should be allowed at all, but if they are they should always be ON LEASH. No exceptions. No special areas. There are other park options for those who must have their dogs with them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2121    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Roseville, CA 95661  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:31:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not change from the 1979 Pet Policy!!!

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed site-specific studies or vital monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to initiate such a dramatic change to the public use of their own public lands

The Golden Gate National RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a DIFFERENT management approach than wilderness National Park areas like Yosemite or Yellowstone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2122    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:44:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of dog owners and their use of the GGNRA. Please do NOT limit dog access in the GGNRA any further than the current limits under the 1979 Pet Policy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2123    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 09:51:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Stop limiting off-leash ares for dogs. We are all dog lovers here. This will affect where we move. How else can we block this?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2124    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Homeowner Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:00:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Your ideals are misguided and do not represent your constituency .  
However you state your intentions,you have deceived us and have tried to run this through without our approval.  
Dog lovers pay taxes which in turn pays you to be a custodian of our open space not our overseers .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2125    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco for 10 year. We have a dog named Cooper (French Bulldog) for 3 years. My dog walker takes Cooper to Fort Funston everyday for off leash walks.My husband and I have takes Cooper to Crissy Field 1-2 times per month.  
Off-Leash dog walking is the greatest thing for all Bay Area residents and dogs because we not only enjoy the beautiful surrounding in its natural setting, but we also learn to be respectful to each other and to all creatures on earth.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.It will totally distort the beauty of natural environment and limit interaction between people, nature and animals.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan proposed here carried no evidence for any negative environmental impact due to off-leach dog walks. We as owners are very responsible on picking up waste and protect the environment. The plan lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on

vegetation and soils, p. 375).

As a scientist and dog lover, I 100% oppose this none scientific-based proposal on banning off-leash dog walking in bay area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2126    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:20:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam,

My experience with dogs is unfavorable. Each frightening encounter involved a dog owner who said their dog was harmless and then refused to restrain their dog. I have been barked at, chased and bitten by dogs merely by approaching their direction. I find dog owners/walkers to be ignorant that their dogs do not always follow voice commands. I fault dog owners/walkers rather than dogs for arrogance when it comes to protecting other people, wildlife and habitat value.

I believe the underlying problem is that there are too many people and too many pets. Human activities must be strictly limited, because the rights of others are being infringed upon, while the environment suffers silently. Therefore, I urge you to address the following:

â€ I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

â€ Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

â€ Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2127    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SF, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:21:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for trying to manage off-leash dogs fairly. I think any conversation about this needs to acknowledge that EVERYWHERE is off-leash. Don't take my word for it - go for a walk in any green space, anywhere.

I am all for having off-leash areas available in as many parks as possible, providing that the remaining areas have on-leash laws enforced. Until then, any discussion about off-leash areas is a waste of time. Perhaps we would make more progress by starting with small, but enforced, on-leash areas for the humans.

By the way, I believe revenues from ticketing would more than cover the cost of enforcement, at least until dog owners learn to change their behavior.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2128    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sonoma, CA 95476  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:42:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F to restrict dogs in the Golden Gate National Parks. I am a native Californian, having grown up in Marin County. I currently live in Sonoma, but now that I am retired, I often hike the Golden Gate National Parks. I am also a responsible dog owner. I suspect that those non-responsible dog owners are behind the complaints that have created this unfair proposed practice to restrict access for dogs and their owners.

Please consider expanding access rather than limiting access. Both dogs and their owners need space to walk and run. Sincerely, Myrna Dillon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2129    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 10:49:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

I discovered Fort Funston just a few months ago. My friend took me and my three legged chihuahua, Trike, along with her and her big Australian Shepard. She swore up and down it would put all other dog areas to shame.

And was she ever right! My puppy had the time of his life exploring the dunes and trees, and running around on the beach. He was most definitely doing the doggy equivalent of a big smile the whole time.

Everyone was friendly, the park was clean (and didn't smell of dog, or human, urine like most other parks in San Francisco), and Trike and I both got lots of exercise, clean air, and beautiful views. I jokingly call it "Doggy Disneyland" since it really is the happiest place on Earth for my little pup.

The thought that we could lose this beautiful place (and so many others) so soon after finding it is devastating. I beg of you, please reconsider closing down off-leash and recreation areas that are so dear and valuable to so many Bay Area residents.

-I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

---

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

-I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Thank you for your time,  
Morgan Weinert

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2130	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 10:50:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA Superintendent,				

I have been following the discussion of dogs within the GGNRA for years, an issue of concern to me because of the native flora and fauna that I appreciate on visits to GGNRA lands.

Recreational dog walking must be regulated on all GGNRA lands to protect the native nonhuman fauna, the often delicate flora, and human beings.

A dog management plan should comply with all established National Park Service policies and practices.

I feel that no commercial dog walkers should be permitted on GGNRA lands, and if the decision is made to allow them, the number of dogs they supervise should be limited to three.

Warm wishes,  
Sam Gilbert

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2131	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Trista Kang and I live in Outer Sunset, San Francisco. I have walked my dog on Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Golden Gate Park, and other SF parks for the past year.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for SF park areas because it is too restrictive. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No

evidence is given to support either assumption.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

To dog owners, dogs are a member of the family. I would consider my dogs' happiness as highly as my own when choosing a place to live. It's important to me and my family that we have a place to freely interact with nature, and I would move away from San Francisco if this restriction was truly put into place.

Sincerely,

Trista Kang

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2132	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 11:32:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am not sure why you feel the need to pass this extremely unpopular law. Fort Funston is one of the few places you can go and let your dog run free. Who is going to use the field or the beach when you won't let responsible dog owners use it? Your funding will be cut and then you'll wonder why. Be logical about this. There are so many places our dogs can't go, so why add to that list?				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2133	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 11:37:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	You should not ban dogs from the park or anywhere else because some owners have dogs and if they wanna take their dog for a walk or go running, and if their house is small the dogs can't run around the house because their dogs have no room to run.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2134	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 11:38:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	People have pets for companionship and for playing. If you can't play with pets in wide, open spaces, what's the point of having them?				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2135	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---



**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:46:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to oppose the ban of having pets/dogs in public parks and beaches. Sf residents are confined by 4 walls and most do not have yards or outdoor space even for ourselves. We including our family furry, feathered, or scaly friends need sunlight and fresh air. I feel this is a free basic need that is a right that can't be taken away. It is what mother nature provides for us all. I also want to say that animals have become a big part of the family like our love ones.  
I will do whatever it takes to stop this ban.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2136    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mountain View, CA 94043  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:48:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Rebeca Golden and I live in Mountain View. I've walked my dog at Fort Funston for the past 4 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, I am one of the many dog owners in the Bay Area who loves being outdoors but works full-time (sometimes more than full-time) in an office setting. Being able to get away from the concrete and the cars and be out in the open space with my four-legged best friend is essential to LIVING. Even those wealthy enough to be able to have a back yard around here still, for the most part, have no venue to be able to run and play with their dogs; apartment-dwellers like me can only exercise our dogs on concrete (and we do) - the ability to go and be outdoors is priceless. It reconnects us to our citizenship in the human race and our kinship with everything living on Earth.

Sincerely,

Rebeca Golden

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2137    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:49:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs and people need sunlight, And wouldn't anybody be happier if we play and spend time with our family in a place where we like?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2138    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:52:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan. I am a responsible pet owner who frequents, among other locations, Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Stinson Beach, Muir Beach, and the Marin Headlands. My dog is well socialized and has never presented an issue in terms of interfering with other occupants of any of the areas frequented. My husband and I love the outdoors and are very respectful of all of the park areas that we are blessed to access. We got a golden retriever as we wanted a dog that loves to hike both land and beach areas. Our dog has been our constant companion for the past 7 years. During this time I have never run into an issue with someone complaining that our dog was on park property and bothering them. On the contrary, I have had many an individual, including park rangers, say that our dog brings a smile to their face because she is such a happy dog. Restricting our dog to only off-leash, limited areas also restricts us to these same areas and limits our ability to enjoy the outdoors. Part of the amazing lifestyle we enjoy is the access to these urban parks with our dog companion. Restricting our dog's access also restricts our access and ability to enjoy the parks. I think this is an unintended consequence and should be considered.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2139    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:54:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think that we shouldn't keep this law because most animals need sunlight and need to get some exercise outside. Plus if you have a small house, they can't run around.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2140    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:54:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think that we shouldn't keep this law because most animals need sunlight and need to get some exercise outside. Plus if you have a small house, they can't run around.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2141    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:55:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I moved from NYC to San Francisco because I adopted from a shelter a young yellow lab and I enjoy hiking with her. I chose San Francisco because of the amazing off leash areas. My dog is very well socialized, I took many obedience classes (currently enrolled in Canine Good Citizen class), my dog is under my voice control at all times, I always carry treats and poop bags.

Being able to take my dog to Crissy Fields, Fort Funston, Marin Headlands, Baker Beach etc. makes me happy. It is a very bonding experience for us and keeps us both healthy.

My dog goes with her dog walker (who is a certified dog trainer as well) three times a week to fort funston. She plays with her doggie friends, runs and I know that my dog walker keeps the pack safe and at a distance from the other dog walkers. Too many dogs on a small territory would cause fights and wouldn't be safe for dogs and the dog walkers/dog parents.

I'm a very responsible dog parent and I know how important hikes are to my dog's mental and physical health. If the GGNRA restrictions take effect we will move again, I don't want to live in a city that has more dogs than children, where people take dog parenting very seriously but can't walk their dog off leash.

If you have to - require people to take off leash classes like this one:

<http://www.sfspca.org/programs-services/dog-training/classes/open-space-etiquette>

or take Canine Good Citizen classes.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive and support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash areas in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2142    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 11:57:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Why shouldn't animals get to be off leash in the city? It's not fair, animals should be free like humans are. What makes humans better than animals. Animals should be treated fairly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2143    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Megan Synnestvedt, and I live in San Francisco. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Fort Funston for the past 2 years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

---

I oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston, because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.

I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer-reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

And finally, this will have a huge negative impact on my life and the life of my dog. We would have to drive far distances to find appropriate areas to run off leash. And, my dog would have extra energy. Imagine all the dogs in the city with all that extra energy, this seems extremely dangerous to me.

Sincerely,  
Megan Synnestvedt

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2144	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 11:59:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not reduce the size and scope of dog recreational areas in the Bay Area. I own a dog, and I really enjoy the areas that we do have out doors for dogs. Owning a dog has drastically increased my family's time in the outdoors, and greatly increased my usage of dog-friendly open space. Please do not restrict dog-owners' access to pet friendly parks!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2145	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 12:01:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I want to help dogs and birds get the freedom they need to run and exercise				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2146	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san Francisco , CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 12:02:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** We should not pass this law because many families don't have big backyards and its also another way to get people to go outside. That is why I think its important to not let the law pass

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2147    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2148    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:06:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe dogs should have freedom to run. It is annoying when we go to the beach and my dog is unable to go in, and my parents need to stand outside, taking turns.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2149    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:19:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to many of the Marin county trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local

---

residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2150    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:22:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I wish to state my opposition to the current plan to change and reduce the currently far to small access to dogs on GGNRA trails and beaches  
james pursley  
2/04/2014

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2151    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** individual Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:24:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA has already excluded dog access from more than 75% o the beaches, trails and open spaces. This has presumably helped protect wildlife but has also concentrated the dog activity into the remaining spaces. Further restriction will increase usage yet more making the remaining dog-friendly areas even more burdened and encourage scofflaws to take their dogs further afield.

The policy of further restriction, especially if it is as severe as proposed, could well have catastrophic consequences for bird and wildlife populations in other parts of the park. It is widely acknowledged that the park service is woefully understaffed to patrol the park as it is now. We would all be better served to keep the dogs in already established areas where the park service can monitor the activity than to close those areas and have to monitor a much wider area. The idea is to keep pets away from more wild areas.

As an example of public policy going wildly askew GGNRA only needs to look as far as Wilder Ranch State park and the illegal construction of single-track bicycle trails.

Please keep dog-friendly areas open so we can keep domestic animals further away from wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2152    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Julia Ushakova-Stein and I live in San Francisco. I have been visiting GGNRA lands,

---

specifically Crissy Field and Fort Funston for the past 4 of years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

San Francisco is known for having more dogs than children. Would it be fair to take away playgrounds from children? It is too restrictive and cruel to take away off-leash areas for dogs in San Francisco.

I oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.

I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

And finally, I would have to get into my car and drive long distances to walk my dog, which will cause more traffic and pollution, or not go out on walks with my family because I would not be able to take my dog.

Sincerely,

Julia Ushakova-Stein

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2153	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Debbie Rutledge, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 12:32:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Debbie Rutledge and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Ocean Beach and Fort Funston daily for the past 2 of years. It's Buddy's favorite part of his day!				

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston and Ocean Beach because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, I just can't imagine our pets not getting the exercise they really need and receive from off

leash walks. Can you imagine a city full of under exercised dogs and the problems that will cause!

Sincerely,

Debbie Rutledge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2154    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:37:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow for responsible off-leash dog walking in SF. I have a tri-pod dog and her greatest joy is to run near me off leash! I don't want to lose this privledge, and many other dog owners are with me.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2155    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Ms. Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:38:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow for responsible off-leash dog walking in SF. I have a tri-pod dog and her greatest joy is to run near me off leash!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2156    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the dog rules at GGNRA as they are. I walk my dog with my 4 year old daughter at Ocean Beach at least once per day. It is the highlight of all of our days and the main reason I live in the Outer Sunset. The ability to get out and be outside on the beach, playing with our dog is a fundamental part of teaching my daughter about nature and animals and how to respectfully enjoy a special habitat. While it's arguably true that we could still go to the beach without our dog, the plain fact is that we wouldn't. The GGNRA at Ocean Beach is located in a city. Part of living in a city means embracing all inhabitants, including families. Closing the beach to dogs will severely limit the places my family can play outside. We have chosen to continue to live in San Francisco, despite many of our friends with children leaving, in part because of our relationship with Ocean Beach. Please do not ban dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2157    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Marin City, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 12:44:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** With less than 1% of the trails and beaches in the GGNRA dog friendly, this plan to impose further limitations on an area originally designated and intended as a recreation area that would include dogs is a bad one. The GGNRA is a "Recreation Area," meant for the use of the residents from the surrounding, densely populated San Francisco and Marin Counties. Eliminating dogs from the very few areas of the GGNRA that they are currently allowed would effectively exclude dog owners from using the park.

If the GGNRA had been intended primarily for preservation of land and wildlife, this plan would make sense. But that is not what this park was intended for and not how it should be used. Nonetheless, if the GGNRA is going to limit dogs for the sake of wildlife conservation, it really should provide some compelling evidence that limiting dogs will actually result in better wildlife conservation. So far there is no such evidence.

Dogs need exercise to be healthy behave well. There are not many places available to dog owners currently that provide the open space necessary for exercising them properly. If there is any really compelling evidence that "voice control" areas fair worse environmentally than "on-leash" areas, I wish the authors of this plan would present it.

Having said that, even if there were such evidence, to what lengths must we go for preservation of a future at the expense of the health and well being of those dogs and dog owners currently relying on the GGNRA's dog friendly areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2158	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Menlo Park, CA 94025 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 13:11:45
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	We have a rescue dog that needs to run far and wide, really fast. He is about as interested in running in the local off-leash tiny "dog-park" as a mountain lion would be. There are almost no areas where we can take him that is big enough besides Crissy and Funston (They are great too because he can just run up and down the shore and not make chase of animals as he does when he is inland). As it is, we make the drive regularly to Funston, which is terrible for the environment. If it closes, we will need to drive even more, or take him deep into park lands. Our dog doesn't read and doesn't understand fences, so fencing in an area isn't a good solution. He and lots of other dogs in the area just need some big spaces set aside for them.
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2159	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 13:13:29
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	This is a follow-up to my reply at the last comment period. Unfortunately, the latest version is not practical in what may have been an attempt to compromise. For example, requiring dogs at Muir Beach to be on leash is like taking a child into a candy store and telling that child he can't have any.
------------------------	---

The GGNRA locations which currently allow dogs off leash need to remain so. The percentage of space allocated for such activity is already minimal, especially relative to the percentage of the local population

who own dogs and rightfully desire to exercise their animals in the outdoors. While there are a few "bad apple" dog owners who may not follow park rules, there are others - such as teenagers leaving empty beer bottles on the beach - who also violate the rules. Should we banish them?

Let's keep the rules appropriate for the 95% of the population who are considerate and orderly. Closer monitoring and enforcement against those who disobey is very doable and can be paid for with additional usage or license fees if necessary. This is not that complicated.

The park space belongs to dog owners as much as anyone else and they should not be further excluded from usage. The NPS needs to keep current usage fully intact.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2160    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 13:17:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why would you do this? These areas are important for people to let their dogs run around and they are important to let people enjoy letting their dogs run around. If you put some god damn trash cans on the street maybe people wouldn't leave their dog shit everywhere as well. It's insane. There are 2 trashcans within an 8 block radius of me.

-Taymoor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2161    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 13:34:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** When I walk my dogs on GGNRA land I can go for hours without seeing a soul. Just empty trails and trees. We don't allow them to chase any wildlife, we carry the poop out. When I do meet people, I have NEVER met anyone objecting to my dogs. They all stop to pet them. It makes me wonder if these people deciding the parameters have ever been to the GGNRA land. All those who scrambled to make this area happen - many were hikers with dogs. I love my peaceful walks on the trails and beaches of Marin, I think banning dogs or off leash areas would severely impact the quality of living here. And it is pointless, unresearched and high-handed. Please do not allow this beautiful place to become off limits to me and my pets.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2162    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My name is Dominika Knossalla and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Fort Funston, Crissy Fields, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Stinson Beach for the past 2 years. I belong to National Association of Canine Scent Work.

---

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston, Crissy Fields, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Stinson Beach, Marin Headlands because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I can't imagine driving long distances to walk my dog or not going out on walks with my family because I can't take my four-legged friend.

Sincerely,

Dominika Knossalla

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2163	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Opposition to fencing dogs in the GGNRA and opposition to monitoring-based management				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Dominika Knossalla and I live in San Francisco. I've been walking my dog on Fort Funston, Crissy Fields, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Muir Beach, Stinson Beach for the past 2 years. I belong to National Association of Canine Scent Work. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston, Crissy Fields, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Muir Beach, Stinson Beach because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.

I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

I moved from NYC to San Francisco because I adopted (from a shelter) a young yellow lab and I enjoy hiking with her. I chose San Francisco because of the amazing off leash areas. I can't imagine driving long distances to walk my dog or not going out on walks with my family because I can't take my four-legged friend.

Sincerely,

Dominika Knossalla

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2164	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 13:45:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Not enough response to comments submitted in 2011.				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Dominika Knossalla and I live in San Francisco. I've been walking my dog on Fort Funston, Crissy Fields, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Muir Beach, Stinson Beach for the past 2 years. I belong to National Association of Canine Scent Work. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston, Crissy Fields, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Muir Beach, Stinson Beach because it is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.

What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describe how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be, not as a national park, which is not something that is appropriate in a crowded urban area.

I moved from NYC to San Francisco because I adopted (from a shelter) a young yellow lab and I enjoy hiking with her. I chose San Francisco because of the amazing off leash areas. I can't imagine driving long distances to walk my dog or not going out on walks with my family because I can't take my four-legged friend.

Sincerely,

Dominika Knossalla

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2165	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 13:47:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I live in the sunset.I dont own a dog,but i run on the beach almost everyday.I have never had a problem with dogs,in fact i love to see them.  
If it aint broke dont fix it.  
I remember hearing on the news last year about a man in San Mateo tassered by overzealous ranger.I would be more concerned about that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2166    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94704  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 13:47:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Sure dogs are "members of the family". But let's face it, \*human\* members of the family do not look like dogs, don't smell like dogs, don't sound like dogs, and DO NOT ACT LIKE THE CANID PREDATORS THAT DOGS INHERENTLY \*ARE\*. As such, dogs have a vastly more stressful impact on the wildlife that naturally resides (or tries to reside) in the areas under consideration. Even human children, who are presumably in training by their adult mentors to act like 'civilized human beings', are not as stressful to wildlife as even the most well-trained Fido. Dogs DO NOT BELONG in these areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2167    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 13:50:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

â€My name is Dominika Knossalla and I live in San Francisco. I've been walking my dog on Fort Funston, Crissy Fields, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Muir Beach, â€â€Sweeney Ridge, Stinson Beach for the past 2 years. I belong to National Association of Canine Scent Work. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for â€Fort Funston, Crissy Fields, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Muir Beach, Sweeney Ridge, Stinson Beachâ€ because it is too restrictive. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â€I moved from NYC to San Francisco because I adopted (from a shelter) a young yellow lab and I

enjoy hiking with her. I chose San Francisco because of the amazing off leash areas. I can't imagine driving long distances to walk my dog or not going out on walks with my family because I can't take my four-legged friend.â€ My dog is very well socialized, I took many obedience classes (currently enrolled in Canine Good Citizen class), my dog is under my voice control at all times, I always carry treats and poop bags. My dog goes with her dog walker (who is a certified dog trainer as well) three times a week to fort funston. She plays with her doggie friends, runs and I know that my dog walker keeps the pack safe and at a distance from the other dog walkers. Too many dogs on a small territory would cause fights and wouldn't be safe for dogs and the dog walkers/dog parents. I'm a very responsible dog parent and I know how important hikes are to my dog's mental and physical health. If you have to - require people to take off leash classes like this one:<http://www.sfspca.org/programs-services/dog-training/classes/open-space-etiquette> or take Canine Good Citizen classes.

â€

Sincerely,  
Dominika Knossalla

â€

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2168	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 14:14:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The GGNRA currently oversees the biggest, most cherished, dog friendly areas in the San Francisco Bay Area. Thousands of tax paying citizens take advantage of the beautiful outdoor space to bond with man's best friend. Don't take this away from us.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2169	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Havertown, PA 19083 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	my family Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 14:14:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

---

Don't you have ANYTHING BETTER to do for all the \$\$\$\$ you;re paid??? There are children hungry on your streets.....you are trying to restrict ppl PLAYING with their dogs... MOVE TO SOMETHING THAT MATTERS.

Marcie Smith... I may be in Pa... butI have family out there.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2170	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:29:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I submitted comments last week, but I would like to add a couple more that I think are relevant.

The challenge for the National Park Service is to find the balance point for multiuse in the GGNRA given all the different kinds of potential use and the need to protect the ecological integrity of the land. In my opinion the revised Dog Management Plan (issued Sept. 2013) does not find the appropriate balance for the portion of the GGNRA in Pacifica, an area with VERY many dog walkers and park land near many neighborhoods and therefore convenient for residents to walk their dogs on GGNRA property. How much should the "critical habitat" argument determine access by leashed dogs? I think the following point is critical. How much more environmental impact is there from a person walking with a leashed dog than from a person walking alone? I would contend for nearly all the trails the incremental difference is negligible, especially on trails where the checkered butterfly is the relevant species of interest (i.e. Sweeney Ridge trails)

In my previous comments (submitted last week) I made the assumption that many dog walkers would refuse to put their dogs on leash when walking on the trails. I want to modify that. If the public is made aware of the ecological importance of keeping their dogs on the trails, I am more optimistic that a "leash-only" policy can be implemented effectively. With appropriate education and signage, law-abiding dog walkers will help implement the "leash only" policy. The same goes for a no-poop-on-the-trail policy. In return for the privilege of having my dog along on the trail with me, I would gladly remove dog waste from along the trail, and chastise those I saw who did not pick up their dog's poop.

I also want to make a point about the detailed differences among trails on the Sweeney Ridge land. The trail east of the Sundance Nursery is VERY steep with crumbling footing. Hiking up from the end of Fassler Avenue is much better, especially with the new trail. Quality of walking makes a difference, so decisions should not be made simply looking at a map. Decision makers need to actually walk the trails and experience the terrain. In this case I see no reason why both these trails should not be open to leashed dogs.

It is vital for the National Park Service to understand in a profound way its mission to protect the land AND maximize accessibility of that land to recreational use by the public, especially in the special case of the GGNRA. These two goals need not be in opposition to one another. Instead of trying to make policies that are consistent for all national park land, those setting policy for the GGNRA need to look at the particular ecology and critical habitat of each site. What precisely are we trying to protect? What species are threatened? What are the needs of those species and how might they be adversely affected by people and dogs or other wildlife? What species are too abundant and should be reduced? Policies need to be based on strong scientific evidence, then implementation of these policies will be much easier and more justified. An educated public will assist the National Park Service in implementing justifiable policy, instead of looking for ways to avoid abiding by the rules.

In closing, I want to emphasize that the GGNRA land within Pacifica is adjacent to areas of high population density. Since the incorporation of the City in 1957, the citizens of Pacifica have fought hard to defend keeping their hillsides as open space. It is because of the vigilance of Pacifica's citizens that these tracts of land exist at all to become part of the GGNRA. Historically, Sweeney Ridge was used for cattle grazing and was later proposed for residential housing. Mori Point and Pedro Headlands were badly torn up and eroded because of use by motorcyclists. Over the years, Pacificans have worked hard to help restore native vegetation in these heavily impacted areas. Pacifica does not have a strong commercial tax

base. It has been proposed that "Our Ecology is our Economy". If Pacifica is known to tourists as a "dog friendly" town, we will be able to attract many more visitors to enjoy our trails and open space, adding to our economic prosperity. The economic consequences of severely limiting dog access to GGNRA trails are potentially profound to our fiscally fragile community.

I hope the opinion of residents and City Council of Pacifica will have some influence on the policies that are set by the National Park Service for Dog Management in the GGNRA. We care deeply about the ecology of our open space, but we also want to be able to use this space for recreation, including exercising ourselves and our dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2171    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Vanguard Properties Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:38:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is CRAZY! How can you deny thousands of law abiding, TAX PAYING citizens the right to enjoy our parks freely with our dogs. I have a lovely 7 year old boxer who weighs 45 lbs. We live in a small condo in San Francisco. It is cost prohibitive to purchase a house with a yard in the city and we dog owners rely on open spaces such as Fort Funston to run our dogs. It is cruel to expect a dog to get proper exercise on leash. It just is not possible for larger dogs. Please DO THE RIGHT THING, and stop this horrible proposal.

Most sincerely  
Mike Shaw. and Winston the boxer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2172    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:40:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2173    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:45:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My favorite activity in the entire Bay Area is walking my dog off-leash on the paths, beach and paved areas at Fort Funston. There is nowhere else in the entire bay area to have a comparable experience. There are innumerable beaches and coastal areas where people and wildlife can go where there are no off-leash dogs. The only special thing about Fort Funston is its accommodation of off-leash

---



dogs. That's the reason 99% o people go there. My father and sons worked on native plant restoration there and at Parcel 4 for years, and are completely disgusted with the results. It was a total waste of time. There is no good reason to restrict dogs at Fort Funston, and there are a billion reasons not to.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2174    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:46:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not limit our off leash areas. As a pet owner with a dog walker, and someone who used to bring my dog to work and walk him daily on Crissy Field, it would be devastating to see the areas where humans and dog play together go away. I can say from years of experience of walking my dog with the Crissy Field dog walkers that they are some of the most courteous and considerate people of the land the space. Everyday I watched them pick up after every dog, fill gopher holes, appreciate the beauty surrounding them and be courteous to those also using the land. After all, they are the ones that have to come back day after day so it's important to them to have a clean space and friends in the shared space.

Also, rarely during the day did I see anyone BUT dog walkers on Crissy Field. Would it be a happy medium to make work hours off leash periods and alternate weekend days?

Please do not take away our wonderful, unique off leash parks and really think about if it is the dogs that are the problem. I look at how beautiful and pristine Crissy Field and compare it to the Fort Mason field that is always torn up and littered. Crissy Field is off leash and Fort Mason isn't.

Please reconsider your options!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2175    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 14:58:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I had a friend laugh when I told her dogs were not allowed there. Her comment was that dogs belong in nature. I have hiked a lot of trails in Marin and have never seen a dog be a problem. You would not stop people hiking if a few people didnot follow the rules. Let Marin be a more gentle place and trust people to do the right thing with their pets. I am so tired of this over regulation it is like someone is trying to justify their jobs. All people have right dog owners and non dog owners make people responsible for their pets and if they get a citation take away their rights. I do not have a dog at the moment but some of my best times have been walking in nature watching my dogs joy. The problem is not the dogs but the owners awareness...give seminars educate do not punish people from their pure joy because of a cranky few. Sincerely

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2176    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:08:54

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I am a volunteer on the restoration projects in the Presidio as well as a park user and I also like dogs. I do not want to see dogs banded from all the park lands. However, I think that there should be some clear rules on where dogs are allowed, where they must be leashed, and where they are not allowed at all. These rules must be clearly posted and enforced.

While most dog owners are considerate and have voice control of their dogs, there are others who feel that their dog has the right to do as it pleases, where it pleases and if that includes digging up plants, chasing birds or defecating where others park visitors walk, it is their right because as they say they are "tax payers". I am also a tax payer, but I believe that we all need to have limits so that we can get along with one another and preserve our natural resources for future generations.

Thank you for tackling this contentious task!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2177 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:13:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2178 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:17:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i do not have a dog because my mom is allergic. But i love dogs and i believe that dogs/pets bring people together

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2179 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisc, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:20:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** While I find dogs to be inappropriate in an urban environment, it is their owners that make them so objectionable. They mess my front yard, bark late at night and now, it seems, seriously threaten the natural enviornment.

Nevertheless it is people that are the most disruptive of the environment, without question, and you can't (or aren't) getting rid of them. You might as well let the dogs have some fun by providing adequate play areas. With people tramping through and dumping their trash and butts anyway, there's nothing very natural about these parks now, is there?

**Correspondence ID:** 2180    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:24:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have a dog and I would love to bring him to a dog park and let him off the leash, but i wouldn't be able to if animals that are off a leash are banned. i believe that many other people want the same thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2181    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:34:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I visit Fort Funston almost weekly and it is an invaluable spot in San Francisco for my very active dog to get his required exercise. With this outlet, I do not infringe on surrounding areas that do not allow dogs (San Bruno), yet if I was left with no "legal options," I would most likely end up using areas that do not technically allow dogs.  
I am a very responsible dog owner who uses leashes in leashed areas, cleans up after him and is respectful of other people using the same spaces. Allowing viable options is essential for so many dog owners in the city who simply wish to responsibly utilize outdoor space with their pets.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2182    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:36:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i remember when i was a little girl, my family and i would go out with friends and walk our dogs in the park every Sunday and Saturday. we would walk them into the park and once we got there we would let them run free as we watched them from a park blanket. they were so happy. that was my favorite part of the week. but when my mom died two years ago we stopped walking our dogs together. we were still friends but defiantly not as close as we were before. i've seen dogs running and playing together and it reminds me of our walks together.i don't want to ruin peoples happiness by taking their dog walks away. i'm sure you don't want that either. please don't ban dogs without leashes and ruin ever bodies happiness.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2183    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:42:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

I regularly take my dog to Muir beach where I live 7 minutes away....

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2184	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94708 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 15:45:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	While I am not able to get to the GGNRA parks as often as my dog or I might enjoy, our parks are a great joy for all - those with kids, with dogs, with friends, who walk and talk and enjoy the incredible scenery. It is my opinion that the new 'Preferred Alternative' is overly restrictive and that the older Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access (from late 70s) in San Mateo and for new GGNRA acquisitions would be preferable.				

Reading through various reports, I see very little included in the impact reports from those who support dog walking in these areas and yet a great deal from those opposed. Many of the impacts cited were 'might's' or 'can's' or 'could's' - I find this lack of evidence along with the lack of site-specific studies to be disturbing.

My dog is leashed until it is apparent that it is safe for me, him and others, and he is thereafter under voice control. The parks are a wonderful place for us to be with other two and four legged friends, where we all get some exercise and fresh air.

I urge you to consider all of us, all aspects of park use.

Thank you,

Beth

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2185	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2186    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:50:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am against the entire Dog Management Plan. You are required by law to have Site Specific Peer Review Studies used to prove your assertions that our dogs are harming any wildlife, habitat for wildlife, or vegetation in the GGNRA. Where are they? They need to be made public by law.

I believe everything that can be said has been said, except this one thing. You can never win this. It may seem like it for a while. But the truth is, we will never give up the privilege we've enjoyed for well over 30 years of off-leash hiking on this less than 1% o GGNRA. This is the thing. We have love on our side. And love is a great energizing and motivating force. It will always win against beaurocracy and mean spiritedness. Our generation may pass away before the battle for off leash recreation is won, but another generation will come along to take our place. Wave after wave of dog owners who love their dogs as family members, companions, protectors, will push against this Dog Management Plan until a future generation of GGNRA awakes to the possibility and need of sharing the land they are entrusted to steward. You people would be well advised to rethink your philosophy around off leash recreation. You would save yourselves a lot of time, trouble, and money.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2187    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 15:50:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** They should not ban dogs running off leashes, because they cannot play and become overwhelmed by sadness.No one likes being on a leash and never aloud to play. Dogs cannot play on leashes and might not have a way of playing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2188    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:04:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe that even a pet should have rights to be able to run freely as they were supposed to. Should we deny mother-nature by denying her children the ability to run free? By passing

this law we are completely separating ourselves from the natural world, waging war on mother-nature. I do not believe that is an over statement. So I say no, and so should everybody with a conscience.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2189    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2190    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:19:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This ban just seems like being a prisoner all over again. Most people like being outside, so why can't dogs just be off their leash and be done with it. I mean, if people can have freedom rights, why not dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2191    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:20:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin

residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2192    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:22:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please keep areas open for our dogs!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2193    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:26:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that people should not have their pets on a leash. I think that because the pets should have the freedom to run around without a leash. I think that it's ridiculous to have your pet held on by a string. In conclusion, I think that pets should not be held on by a string/leash

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2194    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 16:30:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been a veterinary technician, dog behaviorist, and avid birder ... so I am fond of both dogs and wildlife. It is very unfortunate that there are irresponsible dog owners out there who don't think beyond themselves, at the extreme expense of our natural wildlife. I have witnessed dogs charging the wildlife at Crissy Field, in the Presidio, at the ocean beach. I have also witnessed a responsible owner with their dog on leash who had a free-roaming dog attack their dog. The nearby owner ignored the situation.

Restrictions must absolutely be put in place to preserve our wildlife. They were here first, and they are the ones who are endangered ... not the domestic dog (who is of course a lovely companion, when properly trained ... and cleaned up after!) It would certainly be lovely to be able to take a walk without stepping around or into poop.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2195    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Melissa Severini and I live in San Francisco. I have walked my dog on many GGNRA sites for the past 6 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for all GGNRA sites because it is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.

What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describe how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be, not as a national park, which is not something that is appropriate in a crowded urban area.

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

Sincerely,

Melissa Severini

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2196	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 17:27:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Kevin Clark and I've lived in San Francisco since 2006. I adopted a dog from a rescue in 2009 and have walked her all over the city. We're regulars at Bernal Heights Park, the Day Street Dog Run, Fort Funston and other parts of the GGNRA.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston because it is far too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.

What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describe how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be, not as a national park, which is not something that is appropriate in a crowded urban area.



And finally, please consider increasing the number of off leash areas in and around the city rather than eliminating them. The dog friendly nature of the area is one of the reasons I'm here and continue to stay. With these sorts of changes, I'll be forced to look for access south or east which means more time in cars and less involvement with the local community.

Sincerely,  
Kevin Clark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2197    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 17:51:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a San Francisco resident for the last 13 years and a dog owner for the last three. Thanks to having a dog, our family discovered Fort Funston. We enjoy it almost every week-end. Taking the dog for his weekly energetic frolic is a great pretext for the whole family to get some air and exercise. We would not do it if the dog was not allowed to run free up and down the dunes and hills, it's an essential part of the fun.

I am appalled that the National Park Service is considering restricting this area to dogs or requiring them to be on leash. In our regular hikes over the last two/three years, not once have we seen an incident involving a dog. All dog owners are responsible and all dogs are well mannered.

I understand the need for controlling erosion in this area and would be fine with closing off certain areas for short periods of time for reconstruction work. I would even understand a rule that dog owners have to take their dog waste back home so as to lower the burden of dog waste disposal on the park service staff. But take away the dogs' freedom to run and you will see frequency drop dramatically. The only alternative in the area would be Stern Grove that would, as a result, suffer from over crowding. Also, Stern Grove is inaccessible on Sundays over the summer due to the Festival, so dog owners would have no alternative.

Please let us continue to enjoy this little paradise for the whole family.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2198    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Walnut Creek, CA 94598  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 17:55:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please allow the dogs to be able to stay off leash. This will allow the dogs to get exercise, play catch, etc. Most of these dogs spend all day in confined spaces and need to get out and run.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2199    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:03:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I move here from Belgium 17 years ago. In Belgium we have 20 miles of beaches and seashores where families come spend vacation time. Dogs are aloud in the morning and late afternoon. The hours vary according to month of year. In the summer, dogs can only go on the beach before 9:00 am and after 6:00pm. in the fall, it can change to before 10:00 and after 5:00. Winter may be different.

I would not suggest varying hours in San Fancisco, just one time marked on board in several places.

I heard once on NPR that park and rec thinks that this is not manageable.

I wonder why.

With hours posted, if there is no police, ordinary people will kick people with dogs off the beach.

The same way that smokers are being told off.

It is just a question of habit forming. It may take a few months but people will get it.

I have 3 children and have had dogs my entire life.

For 10 years, I lived on El Camino Del Mar near Baker Beach and enjoyed the beach with my kids and our dog.

Most people are good people who follow the rules. Granted, there are always rule breakers who sadly spoil things for everyone. However, extreme measures hurt families with children.

What is the percentage of families with children that have dogs.

I am sure there are a lot.

There should be a possibility to have some place where dogs would be allowed all day in some places.

In a culture where gaming is prevalent, parents going out with their children and their dogs should be highly valued and encouraged.

It helps building families, keep kids healthy and help fight obesity.

Compromises means inclusion of various needs, not unilateral exclusions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2200	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112
-----------------	-------------------------

	United States of America
--	--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 18:07:49
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** why do u want to ban this i have been walking with my dog for along time at the beach and he loves he has never mis behave, when ever he uses the restroom(poop) i can up his mess if you were to ban having dogs on the beach or any other animals our animals wouldnt have any where to walk there dogs, yeah well some people people have yards but people that dont have yards cant so i say no to this new law

From,  
6th grader  
jacen canales

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2201    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:12:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a homeowner and resident of the area, I live directly across Great Highway from Ocean Beach at Kirkham, I am very much invested in the continued health of the ecosystem, and maintaining appropriate access to the public lands.  
I spend time on the beach daily, and I am very aware of who uses the resource in an appropriate way, and who abuses the privilege. Dog owners are, in my experience, some of the best stewards of these resources. I, and my neighbors with pets, are often the ones who are in the position of leaving the beach better than we found it.  
There are laws in place that would adequately protect the fragile ecosystem if they were appropriately enforced. Before punishing all pet owners with a blanket ban on beach access, work within the structure in place.  
Jeremiah Ball

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2202    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** REDWOOD CITY, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:17:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

First of all, thank you for considering my opinion. I recreate with my dog in the off leash areas of the GGNRA often and it's a wonderful part of the Bay Area experience, both for people (including non-pet owners) and pets. A place like Ft. Funston is a local institution for dog owners and those who enjoy dogs alike.

Secondly, and more formally:

1) I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

3) I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy as the MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions.

Best Regards,  
Matthew Goforth

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2203    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:25:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not adopt the plan banning dogs off leash at Fort Funston. This is an area where public recreation and natural resources have co-existed peaceable for decades and it serves large numbers of people in the community. The GGNRA plan does not take into account how well things have gone in that area and the recreation needs of the city residents.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2204    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:36:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Miwok Trail and to Muir Beach. The ability to do so is part of why I love this area so much.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2205    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:50:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my huge opposition to the banning of off-leash dog walking in the GGNRA lands. As a responsible dog owner I do not see why we must constantly punish our canine companions by denying them the ability to enjoy these areas. These areas are supported by my tax dollars and I will not stand by and see these areas further limited.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2206    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't restrict dogs to be on leash only.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2207    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:53:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs need to be able to have fun outside. Some of their homes don't have much space.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2208    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 18:56:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jim Thirtyacre

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2209    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Michael Vernik and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Ft. Funston for the past 3 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Ft. Funston and Crissy Field because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Michael Vernik

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2210	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 19:13:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I write in support of the proposed new rules and stricter policies for dogs in the GGNRA. GGNRA is the only national park that allows unleashed dogs, which has a negative impact on wildlife, plant life, and other patrons in the park. I say this as a dog owner and someone who has worked and volunteered in animals shelters for many years. But I am also a birder, and an environmentalist, and I don't believe that the narrow interests of dog owners should be allowed to trump all other considerations. Taking your dog to a public place, especially a national park, should be a privilege and dog owners should be aware of this privilege and the attendant responsibilities. Dog owners DO NOT have the right to go anywhere they want with their dogs, nor should they have the right to have their dogs off-leash in a national park, or to have their dogs at all in particularly sensitive areas. A balance of uses and strong enforcement are called for.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2211	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 19:17:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** If the government passes the law to always have pets on leashes, then pets that people own can't move more freely. My teacher, has a pet dog and two birds. He rides his bike along side with his birds that fly next to him. If the government passes the law, my teacher would have to ride his bike with the birds attached to a leash to the bike and the birds can't fly freely. Also, he has a dog that he walks. If the dog is attached to a leash all the time, his dog won't feel as free.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2212    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 19:17:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think everyone should support offleash. Animals can roam around the city with an owner as long as they dont harm anyone. Try to picture if you were trapped all day long and if you went outside you would have a chain around your neck like a slave.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2213    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94961  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, especially Little Beach, the more private portion that locals use. Our dogs are members of this community, behave appropriately and politely, when trained under voice command; visit with other dogs (important to their well being - off leash!)and people and create no danger. They offer us important social, physical and emotional support. When you leash dogs, they become more aggressive and it is OUTRAGEOUS that Marin County would only offer ONE beach to exercise our dogs, and ourselves. Many studies show how important it is to humans to have dog companions and to restrict us with leash laws makes the experience unhealthy and more dangerous.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2214    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 19:28:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Alita Macias and I live in the heart of San Francisco, Nob Hill, where there are limited areas for pets to get a good run. I walk my dog at Lafayette, Huntington Square Park, Crissy Field, Golden Gate Park, Fort Funston and Holly Park for the past 4 of years. I've had the chance to work closely with SF Puppy Prep, Wonderdog Rescue and SF SPCA over the years, which are organizations that have helped to save and create healthy environments for our dogs.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for all areas noted in GGNRA Dog Management Plan proposal because it restricts the ability of any San Francisco resident, who vast majority do not have access to a backyard facility in their own homes, to safely and healthily own a dog. If you've ever owned a dog, you know that at minimum they need to be exercised 30 minutes two times a day to avoid separation anxiety, destruction to rental property, weight gain, depression and other health issues. A dog that remains indoors and with no exercise is a dog that an owner will quickly become unable to manage and maintain ownership of. It doesn't take much for a dog owner to throw their hands up in desperation and abandon a pet, should the access to facilities become difficult. With a plan like GGNRA Dog Management Plan there is certain to be an impact on shelters, rescue adoption agencies and dog training/walking facilities as an increasing number of dog owners will abandon their pets. We already face extreme issues with overcrowding in shelters and stray animal control - why then force beloved pet owners to have to give up their pet when it could be otherwise avoided.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

In addition, there has not been a single, peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove that negative environmental impacts are not only occurring now, but that dogs are specifically the root cause of them. We want real science not anecdotes.

If my dog does not have access to open spaces, I'd be forced to give up my pet for adoption as he'd be unable to participate in walking groups with his walker, who would face fines from this new plan. He has very high-level of energy, left at home all day to his own devices would cause noise complaints with neighbors in my building as well as cause damage to the unit, which would force my property manager to evict me from my unit. The only alternative is to drive outside of San Francisco for exercise, which not owning a car and working full-time is a huge strain financially, notwithstanding losing my apartment. I have lived for 7 years without a vehicle and as a citizen of San Francisco my carbon foot print matters quite a bit to me - please do not make me have to buy a car or risk losing my housing, so that I can simply exercise my dog and keep him in a healthy state of mind.

Sincerely,  
Alita Macias

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2215	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is James Martyn and I live in Daly City. I walk my dog at Ft. Funston for the past 3 years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Ft. Funston because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, I love walking my dog along Ft. Funston and Ocean beach. I would miss walking my dog along the beach watching him chase waves and generally enjoy himself off leash.

Sincerely,

James Martyn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2216    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 19:52:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think dogs should be off leash because the dogs might feel upset and sad that they can't do anything. They would be angry and when I see dogs on leashes I feel like they are trapped like they can't do anything like a normal dog. That's why I think they should be off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2217    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is David Klug and I live in San Francisco. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Chrissy Field and Muir Beach for the past 2 of years. I exercise there with my companion dog off leash and under voice control for both my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I oppose the preferred alternative for Chrissy Field and Muir Beach because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not

adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored.

I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will make people and their dogs feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife.

I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer- reviewed studies (as they are required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if they deem park users are in non-compliance.

And finally, (please state in your own words how the restrictions will impact your life- examples may be having to get into your car and drive long distances to walk your dog or not going out on walks with your family because you can't take your four-legged friend etc.)

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2218	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 20:42:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This idea shouldn't be banned because people have dogs that they love very much.Dogs love walking and playing with their owners.Having fun with them before they die.So I feel like this shouldn't be banned because my friends and classmates have pets whom they love very much.So don't banned from people who walk their dogs on the sidewalks.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2219	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 20:45:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Animals like dogs won't get the proper exercise they need so if you ban letting dogs walk without a leash, they also can't enjoy free time in areas like the beach, parks, etc. so please, let animals walk freely without a leash.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2220	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 20:55:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I support off-leash dog access to all trails at Mori Point, Pedro Point, Montara mountain, and other sites in San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin counties. Fort Funston should remain completely off-leash. I walk my dog on Mori point almost every day, as do dozens of other Pacifica residents, with a respectful attitude that includes picking up dog waste and keeping dogs off of sensitive areas. Owners of aggressive or non-socialized dogs in this area already keep their dogs on leash wherever they are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2221    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 20:59:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please maintain as many off-leash dog areas as is feasible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2222    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Save off leash dog walking Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Yvonne Soria

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2223    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:01:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** they should not ban dogs running freely because it is natural to run freely.

( and even if they ban it you can just let it run with the leash on because it has a leash on but no one said you had to hold the leash).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2224    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:02:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i think it should not be banned because dogs and other animals need to exercise. some people have no yards and cannot bring their animals anywhere.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2225    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:04:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

I walk Funston 3 or 4 times a week. Its one of the treasures in the Bay Area, because of the people that go there. It's not pristine nature, there's still rebar and old fortresses, the waves are often overshadowed by target practice at the nearby gun club, but it's perfect as a point for recreation. We need to keep an open space like this for the huge number of people that have dogs in this area.

I can understand setting restrictions in some of the more dense areas. Chrissy Field is FLOODED with people now non-stop. I think setting hours for those areas makes a lot of sense. But leave Funston alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2226    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:16:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** you souldnt ban animals from going to parks because people may have animals but have a small yard/apartment and want their pets to go out.also the pets need exercise and sunshine like us.not like our pets are gonna kill someone so you shouldnt ban them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2227    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Lauren McGehee and I live in San Francisco. I walk my dog on Fort Funston, Crissy Field,

---

and Ocean Beach for the past 2.5 years.

I strongly oppose the restriction of off lease play areas because it is too restrictive. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, there are so few places that are off-lease dog friendly within San Francisco. My dog is very high energy and loves to run on open stretches like Fort Funston. Without these special places, he and I will not get the exercise we need and love.

Sincerely,  
Lauren McGehee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2228	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 21:24:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I don't want dogs to always be in leashes. I don't have a dog so when I see one outside or at the park I get to play and run with them. When they are in leashes i always think that the owners don't want them to be free. Dogs should be free to roam and play. I think that this law is a big mistake and they should just let dogs be. Dog are a mans bestfriend. Thank you				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2229	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 21:25:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not take away any more leash-free dog areas in the Bay Area. I have an English Mastiff, who is a gentle giant. Because of his size, he doesn't get the same benefits of being taken to a small, enclosed "leash free" area. Without places like Fort Funston, his health will suffer. The people who enjoy the benefits of leash-free areas often leave the place nicer than when they arrived. These leash free parks also provide happiness to non-pet owners, who enjoy the benefits of being around animals. It would be a travesty to see these leash-free zones taken away without quantifiable facts supporting a valid reason why San Francisco is adversely affected by dogs in our parks.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2230	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:30:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jay Morena

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2231    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Plesanton, CA 94566  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:33:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** More government control. There is no end to it. The parks do not belong to the Gov...they belong to we the people who elect to bring our dogs to these parks with our families. Our tax dollars fund and support these parks yet you want to limit our ability to use these parks to engage in play with man's best friend. I enjoy visiting the city on a regular basis with my dog. Do not support this measure. Allow dogs and families to play freely with an intrusive government

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2232    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Dog Owner Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:43:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

---

health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ssindy M. Koepf

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2233	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Walnut Creek, CA 94596 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Dog Owner Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 21:47:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I take my dog to the beaches in San Francisco atleast 3-4 times a month, rain or shine. They are great places where I can walk my dog, a Cavalier Spaniel, and allow him to play in the shallow surf without being on leash. It's great exercise for him, and a great environment for us to spend quality rather than a fenced in dog park.				

I bring bags to carry anything he tries to leave behind, so nothing is damaged nor changed from before we got there.

Please don't put restrictions on these dog friendly parks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2234	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Chris Crofford

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2235    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:50:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to make a comment. I live with a dog, a wonderful dog. When I take her to the beach I see how happy she is chasing her ball. I am not just about dogs and respect the limitations posted for the birds. If she even thinks about chasing a bird she gets a "time out".

This is not an intellectually perfect note, it is from the heart. Please please please do not that this joy away from my dog and my family who love the beaches I grew up on away from us.

Please go outside of your box and consider how much this means to us.

Regards,

Christie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2236    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Bolinas, CA 94924  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:53:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I find the picture you posted a situation at one specific park for which you are drafting policy that effects all non prohibited areas (few as there are) that are still open in to dogs on leash in my area. The GGNRA was created with the blood and sweat of local West Marin citizens and ranchers for the purpose of creating open spaces and trails that would serve the people living here as well as the people of this nation. If you pass this policy you are restricting use to the local public. There are very few alternatives than the few dog accessible trails that remain here. All parks are State, county, or federal lands granted by the people for the people. It would be ridiculous to cause in accessibility to local citizens who walk with their pets and yet allow biking for people that live outside of the area. I urge you to rethink, and or scrap this anti-dog, anti- local policy. You might instead take note of the wealth of dog prohibited park spaces that are already available to those members of the public that are concerned about dogs. And if there is an ongoing problem in a site specific area reduce your policy to that area. Dogs are part of many families and despite I have not seen any incident of dog attacks or interaction with wildlife in the parks around my neighborhood that would justify decreasing access as recommended in this project. There is far more adverse interaction with the park lands from bus loads of dog less people that defend on our communities every weekend than there is from those few that come out here and hike with their dogs to enjoy our regional parklands be they National or otherwise. Those dog owners should not have to chose between spending time with their dogs and enjoying the outdoors. Perhaps you should research how much dog welcome area has already been lost before you consider further restriction.

Sincerely, Amelia Neffati

---



---

**Correspondence ID:** 2237    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 21:55:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Sarah Burke and I live in San Francisco. I have walked my dog on Ocean Beach for the past 12 of years.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Ocean Beach and the other GGNRA parks because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, nature and natural spaces are to be enjoyed by all. Please impose that dog owners clean up after their pets, and leash their pets when necessary. But to restrict dog owners to enjoy natural local spaces with their dogs...why do this? Our dog is part of our family, and having to drive long distances to enjoy nature because our dog Maya is no longer allowed in local parks around San Francisco will affect not only our family time, but perhaps more importantly, such a restriction is just another example of the ever-changing San Francisco; once a place of soul, peace, love and freedom, now the home to the Google bus and park restrictions.

Sincerely,

Sarah Burke

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2238    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Laura Cheek and I live in SF. I walk my dog around Chrissy Field, Fort Funston, Bernal Heights, Marin Headlands, ect.

I fear that the restrictions will limit the places my family and I go on hikes, since we highly value having off-leash areas where the dog can roam. Living in SF is restrictive as it is for a dog, so it would be nice to keep our parks open to off leash recreation.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for SF parks (Chrissy Field and Fort Funston) because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Laura

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2239	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 22:12:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	1. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS don't adequately address the concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 and that the comments in 2011 rand 3 to 1 AGAINST the plan. 2. I support the "No action alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands, as well as the San Francisco locations. 3. The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands." Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy. 4. The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite. 5. The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs which is bad for the environment and bad for Marin and SF.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2240	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Los Angeles, CA 90029 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Golden Gate National Recreation Area because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Dogs are a large part of our lives and they need space to run free. Designated dog parks for off leash use are a benefit to our society as it is a place for a large group of our population to congregate and enjoy the outdoors with our fellow neighbors. Removal of such a place will lead to increased issues with dog walkers on confined sidewalks and increased issues with dog waste on sidewalks.

Sincerely,

Isaac West

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2241	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for fort Funston, Crissy Field, Baker Beach and Ocean Beach because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, (please state in your own words how the restrictions will impact your life- examples may be having to get into your car and drive long distances to walk your dog or not going out on walks with your family because you can't take your four-legged friend etc.)

Sincerely,

M. Garrity

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2242	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Ruby Rieke Design Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 23:08:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

\*\*\*\*\*

Letter #2

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Ruby Rieke

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2243	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 23:09:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** There are very few places to let a dog run in a city like San Francisco. One of those places is Fort Funston and it truly is a paradise for dogs and our kids. Before owning a dog we never went to Fort Funston, now we go almost every weekend. We've taken a number of people with us and they too have enjoyed Fort Funston, but had never been and would not have gone had we not had a dog.

There is no reason to restrict dogs from being off leash in a place that is almost entirely used by dog owners. The dog owners know they have to have their dogs under voice control and I have never seen a

problem at Fort Funston concerning dogs not on leash. Without these dog owners there would be no need for Fort Funston as it would be highly under utilized.

We pay a lot of taxes, and there are more people that would prefer a no leash required but under voice control policy than there are people who want to use the park without any dogs. So really, there is no reason not to let the dog owners have a place like Fort Funston to use for their dogs.

Sincerely,  
Christopher Aaron Fraser

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2244	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94710 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Ching-Wei Jiang

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2245	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 23:52:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I feel like dogs should be able to roam free to a certain extent. They're a living being and should be able to have some freedom. They were born to run and enjoy what the world gives them. We shouldn't be the ones taking that away from them. I understand some dogs can cause some trouble but they should have a place of their own. Sometimes we should stop thinking about what we want and think about other beings besides us.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2246	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 03:15:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The newly restrictive dog management plan makes no sense. If the problem is that people have not been adhering to the existing plan, the solution is to enforce the existing plan, not to make it even more restrictive. This only punishes the people who HAVE been following the plan, and those who flout them will simply continue doing so.

The whole point of the GGNRA was to provide open lands for human recreation in a dense urban environment. If you severely restrict our ability to bring our dogs with us, that will just mean the public will derive less enjoyment from these valuable public lands.

Please pay attention to the public comments on this issue and revise the plan accordingly. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2247    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 04:00:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my support in favor of rules to compel dog owners to keep their dogs on leash. I understand many dog owners would feel burdened by these rules but I also feel very strongly that negligent dog owners have ruined off leash for responsible dog owners. An incident where an off leash pit bull chased and attacked a Park Police horse serves as a reminder of the horrible consequences of a negligent dog owner. Although this is an extreme example it is an intolerable situation. Dog owners ought to be held accountable as a community and unfortunately there is no way to separate the responsible and irresponsible dog owners and so in order to protect public safety reasonable measures need to be taken to protect the public. It is unfortunate for the responsible owners but it is not an unreasonable burden for owners to keep their dogs on a leash. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2248    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 07:08:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011 and that the comments in 2011 ran 3 to 1 AGAINST the plan.

2. I support the "No action alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and Marin Headlands, as well as the San Francisco locations.
3. The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands."  
Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.
4. The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.
5. The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars in search of places to walk their dogs which has a negative impact on the environment and has a negative impact for Marin and SF.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2249    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2250    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 08:52:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Moved to SF because it is so dog friendly. People are responsible here about picking up after their dogs. There are so many dog owners, and it is truly unfair to restrict access to public areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2251    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:12:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep GGNRA as a leash free area for dogs and their companion/owners to use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2252    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Marin, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I am a veterinarian in the community and I regularly take my dog to areas of GGNRA that currently allow dogs. As a veterinarian and a dog owner I cherish this opportunity and recognize the benefits both dogs and owners receive from having access to these areas.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Dr. Liz Milauskas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2253    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94111  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2254    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:51:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Additionally, in the SEIS the GGNRA asserts they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" as utilized in its enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI and the GGNRA's first Superintendent, the Honorable William J. Whalen, in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA. These promises, along with the conventional definition of the term "recreation", do not comport with GGNRA's current philosophy exemplified by Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management and Science for the GGNRA, who in 2007 was quoted as saying "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design.

Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to

impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it, e.g. the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management. Alternatively, for sites heavily utilized by dogs and their guardians, such as Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2255    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 09:58:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not treat our beloved dogs like cheap cattle!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2256    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco , CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:07:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Taking dogs to recreational areas to play is an important part of many dog owners. It is rare, if ever, to hear people being bothered by an off leash dog sharing park space etc, in fact, people show great affection to dogs in general. The new policy is trying to solve a problem that doesn't exist, and frustrates a large portion of the population it tries to serve. I hope policy makers gather real data and opinion, instead of sticking to a plan that came only from their personal preferences.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2257    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:22:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2258    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Salesforce.com Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:31:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in SF for almost two years with my Anatolian Shepherd. Whenever I get the chance, I take him to Ft. Funston and Crissy Field and we have a blast. I consider this a major factor in my decision to live here. I'm currently planning on moving to the Marina just to be closer to Crissy Field, but these proposals are making me reconsider. If this goes into law, I will definitely be moving to the east bay instead of paying the higher rent with no benefits. Please do not pass this!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2259    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:32:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You can transpose people living today with people from 100 or 200 years ago. The results will be much the same.  
Those people living today who wish to deny FREEDOM to man's best friend are the very same who would have denied FREEDOM to the slaves.  
There is no meaningful difference between how people like that think.  
It is about subjugation for your personal agenda & for what benefits you personally.  
Dogs on chains, people in chains serve the same mentality.  
Taking away my dog's freedom is the same as taking away mine!  
Please just move on to more important issues.  
Signed,  
A concerned citizen.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2260    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94402  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 10:50:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the Sept. 2013 Dog Management plan by the GGNRA. Cutting the areas where dogs can be on and off-leash by 90% is absurd. And this plan will have NO off-leash anywhere in San Mateo County!! You are not just cutting the dogs out of enjoying these properties, but children/families as well. Please spend the time to consider the opinions of all opposed to this plan, and come up with a strategy that is family friendly. These are the people who support California and its public lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2261    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 11:15:43

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello

I oppose the GGNRAS's preferred alternative to off leash dog walking, and my family supports the no action alternative.

I spend time at Ft. Funston and around Mt. Tam hiking with my family and my dog. These are beautiful and important days for us as Bay Area residents. I believe its crucial to have these areas open to off leash dog use.

The GGNRA is an urban park, not a wild area. It's crucial recreational space for our city. By severely reducing off leash dog walking, the GGNRA violates the legislation that allows different user groups - including off-leash dog walkers -to recreate.

Please enforce the existing rules to manage dogs, these are adequate for our city and its open areas.

Thank you!

Arin Fishkin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2262    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 11:17:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not impose any new leash requirements! Remember your mission as a "recreational" area. To a dog owner, letting a dog run is the best recreation to be found.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2263    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** oakland, CA 94607  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 11:38:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I frequent Fort Funston and a host of other historically dog-friendly Bay Area landmarks with my dog. I prefer off leash voice control parks. Please keep the GGNRA's available for off leash dog use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2264    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 12:24:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any

---

compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2265	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 12:33:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern:				

I am a 3rd generation Bay Areaan, born in Oakland and residing in San Francisco for the past 24 years. I have been avid parkgoer since my birth in 1972, when my parents would take my brother and I all over the Bay Area to experience the glorious nature around us. I have pictures of my mother rocking me to sleep as an infant in Mother's Meadow in GG park, of my father carrying me on his shoulders in Muir Woods. We've camped everywhere we could, from Angel Island to the Marin County Coast, and hiked up Mt. Tam. We've spent lovely days at Stinson Beach and Bolinas, even though it was too cold or rough to go in the water. My entire life can be viewed through the lens of the amazing park systems you manage. And now, I take walks a few times a week through the Panhandle and GG Park to maintain and improve my health and fitness. So thank you, from the bottom of my heart and the soles of my feet, for the work that you do to preserve and maintain it.

I am not a dog owner, but I love that they are also a part of the park experience. And I don't understand why their access should be further limited within our park system. The dog owners I have observed over the years are some of the most responsible parkgoers I encounter. I can not believe that dogs present any real problems in the very limited off-leash space they now enjoy. Those areas are essential, I believe, for the social well-being of both the dogs and their owners.

Park impacts, I believe, would be far better served by Leave No Trace education and activies. Please reject any more misguided efforts to reduce negative impacts on our beautiful parks by blaming dogs and dog owners. I honestly don't understand how anyone thinks this is a good solution, unless they personally are afraid of or dislike dogs.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2266	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 12:34:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Letter #2 - - Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2267	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 12:40:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I walk regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, so I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for the past 11 years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I find true refuge whenever I go to a GGNRA property. It is my place to unwind and where I go to feel good from the various sights I see. From the many dogs that walk around looking so satisfied from their excursions, grinning ear to ear, to the ever changing landscapes that nature is providing. Going to these grounds never gets old, I would go everyday if I could, I know of some people who do. And this petition isn't just for "dog people", but believe me we are passionate about it, it's for the people who run or walk the trails too. They choose to walk amongst the furry four-legged probably because it makes them happy too or provides some entertainment to take their minds off their work out.

I recall a family came to visit from Sacramento and they were amazed, blown away at what an amazing

dog friendly area Fort Funston was. They wished they had brought their dog , but they got their "doggy fix" anyhow. They explained that there was no such place in existence in Sacramento. I met a lady who lives in San Jose but brings her dog up to the area twice a week for the sole enjoyment of allowing her dog off leash, and ability to play on the beach. That's amazing!

I am a member of the local veterinary community, a responsible member who is advocating for the right to enjoy these places as I have for the past 11 years. Please, and thank you for listening.

Sincerely,  
Genovieve Gomez, RVT

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2268	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito , CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 12:59:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to strongly protest the proposed limits to use of GGNRA areas by owners and their dogs. Please find a way for all of us to share this beautiful area. Thank you! Sincerely, Noreen Spanski and my dog, Roxie				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2269	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 13:08:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	While I agree that sensitive areas at Crissy Field should be properly fenced and marked to keep dogs away from endangered species, it's important to keep the park dog-friendly.				

I walk there nearly every morning with my neighbor's terrier, a sweet little dog that likes to burn off energy but is quick to return to my side when called. I have not encountered any scary dogs or careless owners. In fact, I find that dog walkers as a group tend to police each other when it comes to courtesy. The people who think it's amusing or otherwise acceptable to harass wildlife or leave messes are not the norm in my experience.

Crissy Field should indeed be for everyone, including non-dog lovers. However, I implore those in power to consider the uniqueness of the park for those of us who love our city and our pets. Crissy Field is home to natural species, but it's also a sanctuary for those who enjoy a natural setting with our own special animals.

From my experience, mornings without dogs at Crissy Field would be a great loss and diminishment of life in San Francisco.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2270	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 13:10:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family lives in San Mateo and we strongly support limiting the negative impacts dogs have on our open spaces. We live near Sargarloaf and experience first hand the feces the noise pollution and the limits dogs are putting on the use of the park for not just people and children but also the native species. I know dogs are cute, but I hope their owners don't bully down some sensible limits. Dogs are great in dog parks, back yards and homes, but in nature and parks where children and other less protected species dwell they are out of control.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2271 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 13:19:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This plan is way too restrictive. The number of people and dogs this will hurt far outweighs your purported reasons for the changes you want. Currently, there are very few incidences where dogs interfere with humans enjoyment of your parks. Also, dog owners and walkers are for the most part responsible for picking up after their dogs. I know that I'm meticulous about it.

I would really hate to loose Ft. Funston as a dog park. It's our daily dose of comfort and enjoyment and I know of many who don't even have dogs who enjoy watching and interacting with them.

San Francisco is already a place that's very expensive to raise children, so many families leave. Those of us who can't afford children, often adopt dogs as a substitute. Let's keep San Francisco a dog-friendly place.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2272 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94119

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Marrvelous Films Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 13:25:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Before anyone decides to take away the rights of off leash dog walking, someone needs to consult with the behavior problem which will develop when animals (and people) are made to live on ropes. Animal behavior specialist should be consulted before we create negative impact by restricting socialization of dogs and humans alike in this area.

Dogs who are not socialized in open, free areas become problem dogs. Is that what we want?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2273 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**



**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Lance Farrell - Proud Marina off lease dog park goer for over 6 yrs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2274	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Self Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 13:46:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Representative				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,  
Garth

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2275	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 14:16:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I live in Sausalito and use the Alta Trail and Oakwood Valley trails at least once a week. I walk with my dog for exercise and to enjoy the natural setting. O believe this is what a recreation area adjacent to a highly urbanized center is intended to do. In this area I can only endorse Map 4A which is the current situation. If you make this an on leash area it will not serve me and will lessen my enjoyment this open space.

I occasionally take my dog to Stinson, Fort Cronkite and Muir Beach.

After reviewing the maps for Muir Beach I find that 5A and 5E are acceptable. This is historically an off leash area the wildlife in the area is habituated to this reality.

Walking with my dog makes me feel safer and as a senior citizen I am a potential victim of crime.

Walking with my dog gives me needed recreation.

This is a recreation area and I can't understand why you want to restrict our historical use.

Michael Sheats

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2276	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 14:19:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs deserve to run free. They are living things just like humans. I have dogs and would hate to see this happen. Please do not make dogs on leash at all times				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2277	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 14:22:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sara Dwight

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2278    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 14:22:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I will try and keep it short and simple. I have been biking, hiking and walking all of the Pacifica trails and beaches for the past 8 years. Even before they have urbanized Mori point. I have witnessed dog owners, bike riders and families from the trail to the beach. I have to laugh at these people that have zero tolerance to dogs. Over the years I have witnessed more families or should I say parents that let their kids run wild, tramp, pick and virtually destroy wild life then any of our four legged friends. Yes there are a very few irresponsible dog owners that do not pick up after pets and that is unfortunate. Just as unfortunate when you look at Lindamar beach after a nice day and all the trash that is left behind by slobes. This I believe creates more havoc then any furry friend could do. And about the snowy plover..... the dogs are running on the beach and not up in the dunes. The few that I do see chase the poor little plover, they just fly away. What is next, I will not be able to fly my kite on the beach due to the plover. People, nature will find a way. Remember the spotted owl that could only live in trees. What did they find 5 years later, a spotted owl nesting in a Walmart. Can we bring common sense back to the table please or should we make a leash law for kids or better yet, their parents.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2279    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 14:25:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been in SF for years and dont personally have a dog but realize that many people in the city dont have yards for their dogs to run and play and they rely on these locations for their dogs to run and get exercise. It brings me joy to see the dogs playing and engaging, exercising. In fact I think it would be a disservice to their species to deny them of this activity that is essential to their well being.

With sincerity,

Sarah Rios

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2280    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 14:32:49

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Proposed changes will severely affect the off leash fun our dogs can have at spaces like Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Ocean Beach. Why should we go to a dirt dog park when there's an abundance of amazing beaches and trails to roam free? We clean up after our pets, exercise strict caution with them when off leash, and generally love the outings with our dogs. The exercise is fantastic, keeps them happy and healthy, and provides them with enough activity at times when they're with their dog walker so that I can devote more of my time to foster dogs and volunteer work with the Humane Society and local rescues. By the way, any ideas on how fencing is going to help anything should really be looked at more closely. I fail to see the thought process behind it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2281    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 14:47:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Miwok, Oakwood, Muir beach and Rodeo beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2282    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94710  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 14:59:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

Several times a month, I go all the way from Berkeley to Fort Funston because it is such a special place for me and my dog. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2283    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:29:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not reduce the areas where I can walk my dog off leash. I have a large dog that needs to run. I live in San Francisco, and have walked with dogs off leash my whole life; at Baker's Beach, Land's End, Sutro Heights, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, in the Presidio and at Crissy field and Fort Point. I appreciated the beautiful new paths and improvements that have been done over the years. I respect that areas with fragile new plantings and agree they should be protected from humans and dogs who would destroy them but once they are established they should be hardy enough for the area to be used by the public. Dogs need exercise running. So do children. My dog is a princess and does not trail blaze. My godchildren love to trail blaze. If a dog is not friendly with other dogs, children or adults, those dogs must be required to wear a muzzle and be on a leash. If I have ever been with a dog that is not good off leash, I have controlled that dog with a leash. I think it would be very narrow minded, lowest common denominator thinking to stop the rights of all dogs for a few bad ones. Please clarify the law that dogs should be under control otherwise they should not be off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2284    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 15:44:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Fort Funston, Crissy Field & Ocean Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2285    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:29:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve existing off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA. I am an avid walker and responsible dogowner and enjoy sharing our National Parks with all users.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2286    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:35:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been commenting and going to meetings for years and years. That means I have had dogs for years and years (since 1990 in San Francisco). The points I keep coming back to: (1) I don't see problems on the beaches and I have been going for so long and so frequently. It makes me feel like it's about expanding tourism or making money somehow and not about dogs and people and nature. Are there people with dogs writing these regs???(2) Speaking of nature, since when are dogs not a part of it? I am very pro-nature in every sense of the word (I am nature!) but to restrict further the areas where dogs play? Dogs help people cope in a very un-cope-able world. They lower blood pressure and get people outside walking and running. This is good for the universe. To restrict these immeasurable benefits at a time when housing is expensive could mean a San Francisco without dogs - - and more dogs being put to death - - and more isolated individuals. How very sad.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2287    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

Sincerely,  
Lucy Boas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2288    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:42:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a San Francisco resident, senior citizen, and dog owner I wish to state my opposition to the proposed Dog Management Plan. The GGNRA is supposed to be for everyone, and the area where dogs are currently allowed off leash is a very, very small percentage of the massive GGNRA. The dog walking areas are used by a broad cross section of the community, and by taking away the majority of that small area our rights to enjoy the GGNRA as we have historically been allowed to use it are being taken away.

You could make the dog walking areas places to increase the income of the GGNRA by encouraging the enjoyment of those areas. Just placing coffee and food trucks in those areas would bring in needed income. Figure out ways to make them better not restrict their use.

Joanne McGrail  
San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2289    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 16:44:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please consider leaving the off leash areas as is. We so enjoy spending time with our sons, their families and pets in these areas and have NEVER had anything but a pleasurable experience. The people we have met, with or without dogs, are happy and so are pet owners and their dogs.

I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

Thank you for considering my opinion. I recreate with my dogs and my family and friends' dogs in the off leash areas of the GGNRA often and it's a wonderful part of the Bay Area experience, both for people (including non-pet owners) and pets. A place like Ft. Funston is a local institution for dog owners and those who enjoy dogs alike. I cannot imagine not being able to enjoy Ft. Funston as it currently exists.

Secondly, and more formally:

1) I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

3) I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based

---

Management Strategy as the MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions.

Please, please why would anyone want to change such a wonderful experience for so many?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2290    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:00:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow dogs (except pitbulls of course) to play off leash.

Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2291    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:07:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I applaud the new restrictions on dogs in GGNRA areas. I live between Sweeney Ridge and Milagra Ridge in Pacifica and hike there often. I have had dogs run at me and have seen large dogs chase coyote, deer and rabbits. Wildlife cannot be protected without some restrictions on dogs. Unleashed dogs invite conflicts with people and coyotes. I also volunteer in a Wildlife Rehab program and see the effects on birds, skunks, opossums injured because of contact with dogs. I realize that dog owners need a place to walk their pets, but strongly enforcing leash laws and making some sensitive areas no dogs will help wildlife, plants to thrive. I moved to Pacifica for the nature and have been seeing in degraded due to unleashed dogs. I support more dog park areas but not in GGNRA and park areas or areas where neighbors are disturbed by barking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2292    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:29:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I recently moved from the Sunset district to LAkeside district of SF. I visit Fort Funston and Ocean Beach about 4 times a week with my two small dogs. The benefits for both my dogs and I are amazing. It gives them freedom to explore beautiful outdoor settings while at the same time exercising their obedience to respect the environment and other people and dogs who are enjoying it as well. Without access to such places, we will be limited to our home or small gated areas which aren't enough stimulation for them or myself. Without the stimulation, my dogs easily get bored, which leads to unnecessary barking at all hours and therefore unhappy neighbors. My dogs have been going to Fort Funston and Ocean beach since they were puppies. Our family would be devastated if this access was taken away as it is one of the reasons we choose to remain residents of san francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2293    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 17:39:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

As part of your Dog Management Plan, I think you have grossly overlooked the importance of these off-leash, manageable dog areas. Every time I visit a park in the San Francisco area, regardless of policy, I find that owners tend to have their dogs off-leash, for better or worse. The danger of people shirking policy is that the bad dog owners win. Those who are okay potentially endangering the safety of children or other animals are the ones who will begin to dominate our parks and those who are looking for a safe and managed space to let their dogs off-leash will have no where to go. This not only endangers the lives of people but also infringes upon the rights of those dog owners who do effectively manage and clean up after their pets. The people who should be impacted by this are not the ones making use of approved spaces but those who do not make use of those spaces. When you eliminate those spaces, the rule-breaker's domain gets larger. Not only should you not shrink the size of space available to dog owners but increase it in order to cut down on the unmanaged dog off-leash population. With effective policy comes the ability to manage those who cannot manage themselves.

Please reconsider the impact to the overall community and to dog owners all over the Bay Area.

Best,

Hannah

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2294    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** ASLA Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 18:10:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Regarding the proposed restrictions on off leash dog use of areas in GGNRA where it is currently allowed. These are urban parks and beaches. They are not the most pristine of California's shoreline. Dogs are not native species, nor are humans. How can GGNRA consider leasing space to commercial ventures while at the same time restricting recreational use?

My dog is an officially licensed service animal key to the health and functioning of my family. Why should she be suspect, and suspect of what? I am responsible for her care and cleaning up after her, but she deserves to feel her own energy and exercise with her friends. Is she a greater potential threat to the beach or the bay than a car leaking oil or CSO discharge?

Please defend the off leash areas that exist now, serving a region of 5 million people. This is not a wilderness. Within 100 plus miles in either direction from San Francisco I can count off leash beaches on one hand.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2295    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 18:23:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that this is really bad because pets are somewhat forced to stay home. I have a dog and she really like going outdoor and exploring the world.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2296    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 18:38:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties such as Crissy Field, Fort Funston and Ocean Beach since we moved to the area.

We Moved to SF because its Dog Friendly

One of the main reasons why my husband and I chose to move from London in the UK, to San Francisco was that its known to be one of the dog friendliest places on earth, with lots of stomping ground for our happy bouncy dog. We believe that an exercised and socialised dog equals a happy and good dog - and that is of course something that most dog trainers would agree with too.

The City Parks will get Over Crowded

I'm worried that if the bigger GGNRA parks will close down for off leash dog walking in line with your proposed dog management plan, then the thousands of dogs who get their daily exercise will have to come to the smaller city parks - which are already full of other dogs! I'm talking about parks such as Alamo Square Park, Duboce Park, McLaren Park, Buena Vista Park to mention a few.

I don't need to tell you the dangers of over crowding dog parks, but apart from less enjoyable exercise for canines and humans alike, one worrying long term result could be that if San Francisco's pooches will get less exercise overall then that could result in more stressed, misbehaving dogs who might end up in the city shelters if their owners feel they can't cope.

The Dog Management Plan was not Modified as Promised

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

---

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Linda Liebrand

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2297	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Erika Hall

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2298	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 19:10:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Miwok trail, Muir Beach and other trails around Mt Tam.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2299    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 19:22:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the Dog Management Plan. It is extremely restrictive, without any evidence of the dogs affecting the environment and wildlife at Fort Funston. The restrictions will cause dogs and their owners to over populate the remaining areas available for off leash dog walking. This is not beneficial to anyone. Let the dog owners and their dogs enjoy the beautiful beach and surrounding areas, as they continue to be extremely responsible and conscientious about keeping our beaches clean and litter-free.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2300    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Castro Valley, CA 94225  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 19:38:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Golden Gate Park system was established with off-leash parks. Those parks should stay in tact. The Federal government should not be renegeing on the promises that were made when the property was set aside for park land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2301    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94947  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 19:48:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

My dogs and I walk the trails with our friends on a daily basis, often two times a day, and it would be a crime and a shame to deny us that privilege - the same privilege should be afforded to ALL CITIZENS who wish to enjoy the parks.

I don't believe your SEIS has shown in any justifiable way that Alternative F should be preferred - so I hope you take NO ACTION.

Thank you for your time,  
David Bacon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2302    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:12:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We are being completely limited as to where we can take our dogs. Pacifica has one off-leash park (if you call that small pit of sand a "park"), and now we hardly have any on-leash areas to take our dogs. Pacifica's best attribute is its hiking trails, yet we can't enjoy it, even when we are dog owners who are following the rules. I resent the fact that I'm being punished when I keep my dog on leash and abide by the rules. Please give us more trails for dog walking, on- or off-leash!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2303    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:25:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't ban dogs from enjoying our beautiful parks in San Francisco. As a dog owner and a passionate lover of this city I would be devastated to no longer be able to enjoy Fort Funston, East Beach and Ocean Beach with my best friend. Dogs are such a beautiful part of life - and San Francisco is the most beautiful city in the world. Please don't make this mistake.

Thank you so much - Annalee Gould

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2304    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:29:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have been walking our dog on Ocean Beach since the day we got him, he does not get to go out much and being able to walk off leash is the only thing he has to look forward to. He is extremely well behaved and under complete voice control, so there is not the slightest chance that he will disturb any wildlife such as the snowy plovers. I feel that a mob of drunken men playing frisbee on the beach will cause far more disturbance to the endangered bird nesting areas than does a well behaved dog walking calmly with his owner. If the goal of the GGNRA is to prevent dogs from running wild and disturbing the wild-life, then they should make a rule against that behavior, not being off-leash per se.

The constant proliferation of rules against dogs in parks is becoming a real problem. For many of us, walking our dogs is how we relax and cope with the daily stresses of life. When you restrict our ability to do this, it is going to have consequences for the well being of a great many people.

I also note that I have walked on Ocean Beach for years and I have never seen snowy plovers north of Taraval. I suggest that if the real goal is to protect these birds and not just to restrict dogs uniformly, restrictions would be most reasonably put into place in those areas where the birds actually nest.

Respectfully yours,  
Wallace Marshall

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2305    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:44:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it's too restrictive and will drain resources on an already resource strapped city. Let's put our monitoring services to good use and keep people safe in urban environments that are currently hotspots for drugs and crime like the tenderloin and upper Haight. Dogs off leash should be the least of our problem and it sends a pretty strange message about our priorities if we have someone walking around our policing leash laws when we have so much serious crime rampant in our neighborhoods.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2306    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 20:54:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

As a San Francisco resident for 13 years and responsible dog owner, it is imperative that the off-leash areas in the city remain off-leash. These places are used by people to enjoy meeting other dogs, socializing and creating a educational environment for our pets.

A socialized dog is a well behaved dog. Most dogs who live in a closed habitat can become vicious and anxious, that which I witness in other counties and cities.

For the dog population that San Francisco county has (factually having more dogs than children in population) it is extremely important for this society as a whole to keep the off-leash areas we have now.

Thank you for your consideration

PG

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2307    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jana

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2308	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94912 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	www.dogtrotters.com Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 21:08:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am a proud owner of a dog walking company ( Dog Trotters ) since 1997. I have been walking groups of dogs in the golden gate open space and Marin open space for 17 years, I am also Native American and think it is our freedom to be on the trails while respecting them and keeping them clean. Dogs and animals need to be on the open space to play, run and be out in nature. It would be a crime to Native Americans, dog owners and Dog walkers to put laws on open space and then police them to keep dogs off of them. In the eyes of the Great Spirit please keep the open spaces of Golden Gate open to dog owners and dog walkers and all people. Dog walkers and dog owners live in harmony with others who use open space (bikers, families, children, joggers and all who love nature) Dogs are pack animals and behave themselves very much when they are having fun with their own kind. I wonder who are the ones who are trying to kick dogs off golden gate open space even have dogs and know what Marin dog owners and dog walkers would lose by doing this ? This would be a tragedy ! In the name of our ancestors, please keep Golden Gate open space open to all dogs (off leash) so they can play, run and be dogs. Me and my fellow dog walkers are committed to picking up all our dogs poop and keeping the trails clean and people friendly. Sincerely, I Don David Topliff / Owner of Dog trotters & dog walker with Heart / www.dogtrotters.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2309	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 21:23:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** GGNRA and the National Parks are prohibiting access by a large population of the U.S., namely dog owners.

The term "Recreation Area" implies that we should be able to bring all of our family members, including pets. It's not a preserve, it's not a reserve, it's not forbidden private property.

As a dog owner, I find it undemocratic, unfair, and unrepresentative to institute draconian rules which enrage the public, discourage funding for parks, and degrade faith in government.

Please reconsider your stance, and allow use of public space by all.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2310	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 21:30:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs are living things like us. Dogs have the right to run around, play, and enjoy their life that is shorter than ours and the only way they can is to keep the dog parks open. Most people do not have enough money to move out to another area where dog parks are still open. Closing down 90% o SF's dog parks will cause dogs to loss something very important to them, their exercise. Dogs need exercise, its very important to them and closing down dog parks, is like taking away what dogs do for a living.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2311	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 21:31:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Marin headlands and Chrissy field are an integral park of our family's life and dog's enjoyment. The proposed limitations are short-sided and don't reflect the fact that most dog owners are respect the environment and third parties. Do not take this access away from these animals. There is plenty of room for everyone.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2312	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 21:34:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	In my opinion, dogs should be allowed to be off-leash. Collars wrap around the dogs neck like a snake and when the dogs wants to run, the owner yanks the leash and the dog can get hurt.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2313	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94612 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 21:36:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would be very disappointed if most of these areas were designated as "on-leash" rather than the current "off-leash" laws. I currently live in Oakland because of the off-leash regional parks and have considered a move on San Francisco only because of the existence of fort funston and crissy field. There are so very many places where dogs are already not welcome in the city. I do not understand why there should be more.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2314	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---



**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 21:46:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Dean,

I am writing in response to the proposed off leash restrictions in the GGNRA.

I have a sweet 5 year old mutt, Milo, who is the love of my life for my husband and I. Especially since we don't have children our dog is a huge part of our little family and thus family walks are a regular occurrence. There is nothing quite like watching our sweet furry boy run and play off leash. My dog is well behaved, under voice control and I keep him out of replanted/restricted areas. We always try to leave the park cleaner than we found it and regularly pick up trash from careless visitors.

Some of our most favorite places to walk in GGNRA within San Francisco are Crissy Field, Baker Beach and Ocean Beach. We have been visiting one of these places at least once a week over the past four years. In addition, I know that our dog walker is a regular at Fort Funston and I speak for her and myself when I say I cannot even imagine walking there with my dog on leash. We call it Fort FUN for short because that's what it is for our dog when he can be free there.

Outside of the city we LOVE to walk and run in the following parks as well:

Mori Point

Sweeney Ridge

Stinson

Muir Beach

Rodeo Beach

Marin Headlands

Fort Baker

I am very concerned that if the GGNRA further limits dog walking as recreation, what few surrounding parks and trails that do allow off-leash will become overcrowded and overburdened. We need more access, not less.

I have been told there are more dogs in SF than children. What will happen to the few parks that allow off leash walking? I live near Dolores Park and can see first hand what an over used/abused park looks like, and I'm not referring to the dog owners at Dolores. I think that most dog owners/walkers are respectful and do their best to be considerate of the other visitors in the parks. I think we have been enjoying our open spaces concurrently.

The GGNRA is an urban park, not a wilderness area. It's critical recreational open space for a densely populated urban area.

San Francisco is a wonderfully dog friendly city and it is one of the things I love most about my city! All the beautiful open spaces there are for my family, which includes my dog, to walk together, makes SF a truly special place.

Another concern I have is that SEIS lacks scientific data. Instead, it makes assumptions and assertions with absolutely no peer reviewed site-specific studies as required by law. Without these studies and corresponding data, there is no legitimate or legal foundation for these policy changes.

The plan doesn't differentiate between impacts caused by humans or other animals. It just assumes all the negative impacts are caused by dogs.

There is no federally designated critical habitat in the GGNRA. Yet they cite possible impacts on critical habitat as a reason to ban dogs or restrict access to dog owners.

By severely reducing off leash dog walking, the GGNRA is in violation of its enabling legislation that allows different user groups -it specifically mentions off-leash dog walkers -to recreate.

I oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternatives and support the NO ACTION alternative.

Please, PLEASE enforce the existing, and fair, rules to manage dogs.

Thank you for your time,

Wendy Osborne  
Mission District

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2315    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 21:49:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I just moved to the area last year and I love living near the beach. But most of all, I love that my dogs can run freely and meet other friendly dogs in the area. Please keep open areas for dogs to run free! We live in a one bedroom apartment and it's amazing to see their little faces light up when we get to the sand. They have large smiles while enjoying their runs around the beach and the parks. People always comment how cute and friendly they are. They create no problems by being off leash. They bring smiles and happiness to other people around them. This is one of the many things we love about living in the city, it's a dog friendly city.

My hope is you realize the freedom that comes for dogs and their owners to have them off leash.

Thinking positive thoughts that you will honor our request to keep open off leash areas.

Thank you,

Tina

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2316    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 22:01:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am wariting as a resident of San Francisco asking you to not increase restrinctions on off leash dog walking in the GGNRA and to keep the 1979 guidelines for dog walking. I take my dog to Fort Funston every week because I can walk him off leash there. He is awlays under voice control and does not bother others using the park. It is a rare exception that I see a dog that is distrubring other people there. There SEIS fails to provide enough evidence to justify the need to restrict dog walking. Public comment to the 2011 DEIS was largely opposed to restrictions on dog walking but SEIS fails to acknowledge these comments and the public's will. Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and Crissy Field are all part of the city of San Francisco and it is vital that the needs of San Francisco residents are taken into consideration. When I go to Fort Funston I see hundreds of resposible dog owners out with their dogs. This resource is vital to physical and psychological health and it would not be in the public good to restrict dog walking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2317    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 22:03:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I am writing as a resident of San Francisco asking you to not increase restrictions on off leash dog walking in the GGNRA and to keep the 1979 guidelines for dog walking. I take my dog to Fort Funston every week because I can walk him off leash there. He is always under voice control and does not bother others using the park. It is a rare exception that I see a dog that is disturbing other people there. There SEIS fails to provide enough evidence to justify the need to restrict dog walking. Public comment to the 2011 DEIS was largely opposed to restrictions on dog walking but SEIS fails to acknowledge these comments and the public's will. Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and Crissy Field are all part of the city of San Francisco and it is vital that the needs of San Francisco residents are taken into consideration. When I go to Fort Funston I see hundreds of responsible dog owners out with their dogs. This resource is vital to physical and psychological health and it would not be in the public good to restrict dog walking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2318    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 22:04:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2319    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 22:44:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am particularly concerned about the restrictions being proposed on off-leash areas in Pacifica such as Milagra Ridge, Sweeney Ridge, Mori Point and the beaches. I have lived in Pacifica for 32 years and have hiked daily on these hills and beaches. Having hiked with a dog companion all this time, I know from direct experience that very little, if any, damage is done to the environment or species residing within these open space areas. More damage has been created by off-road vehicles of the past, horses and negligent human visitors. The bottom line is that we all inhabit this planet and all have a right to use these wonderful places for our recreation and entertainment. One group does not take precedent over another. But it seems dogs have become the poster children for intolerance and hysteria among a few making it the "tyranny of the minority". Companion animals are an essential part of many people's lives and that goes without further explanation. Quality of life for both humans and their dogs is at stake here.

I read the article about this in the Tribune today and was shocked at the scope of restrictions being considered. If it weren't so serious, it would have been funny especially about Mori Pt. and how the trails are being selected for dog or no dog. Sweeney Ridge is inaccessible for many people because of the steep, slippery terrain and there is little incentive for dogs to venture off the trails, so to restrict dogs to leashes or not at all in that area is unreasonable. I use this as just one example of how too much thinking and planning may ruin the enjoyment of these areas for everyone. There are many dog owners in Pacifica who simply won't utilize these areas without their dogs and some off-leash areas are absolutely necessary for the well-being of the dogs as well as fully enjoyment by their owners.

---

In closing, I would like to suggest that there is no real need to regulate open space to death, that it is there for all of us to enjoy, and that things are really fine as they are right now. The frogs, snakes and butterflies are thriving as they have for many more years than we have been "managing" this their territory, so "if it ain't broke, don't fix it". Just leave things alone, educate people regarding stewardship of the open space and let the dogs have some fun and exercise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2320    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 22:50:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jessa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2321    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

---

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Amit Gupta

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2322    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 23:40:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Areas where our dogs have been welcome to walk or play off-leash for decades would be severely cut or banned outright under the revised GGNRA dog plan.

As responsible citizens, we must be realistic and fore-thinking about how to accommodate more than 250,000 local dogs in a region with limited space.

There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

There is no credible reason to deny fair and reasonable access for both on- and off-leash dog walking that has taken place on GGNRA land for more than 50 years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2323    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 03:38:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This plan is outrageous and tramples all over the expressed wishes of a hard working LOCAL population who need recreation and access to trails on PUBLIC LAND, including with our companion dogs...The NPS is single-mindedly ignoring the majority of the local population who pay taxes and help fund the NPS and their activities. You are supposed to work for US, not follow the wishes of a FEW.

You seem to be just going through the motions of requesting comments, as opposed to genuinely HEARING the majority of the local residents who need to have access to these trails with their pets.

Further, all comments expressed in 2011 were THREE to ONE AGAINST the GGNR plan. Criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, HAVE NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED

---

BY NPS.

The longstanding 1979 Pet Policy should be kept.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood trail and Miwok Trail. THIS WILL BE TAKEN AWAY UNDER THIS PLAN...

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There NO REASON GOOD ENOUGH to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

City parks will be overrun by dogs unable to access these trails...there are simply not nearly enough dog parks to offset these losses of trails in the GGNRA.

THIS IS WRONG HEADED. I STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS PLAN.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2324	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 06:29:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** First if all thank you for your work on the trails restoring and preserving the beauty of our natural landscape. I vehemently disagree with the proposed changes to dog and human access on the GGNRA. Please raise the fines for the violators who do not curb their dog rather than punish all of us who use the land recreationally with our pets.

I hike the trails every day. It is very, very rare to see a dog chasing wildlife, I personally think that aspect is way overblown and used to justify certain actions. Raise the fine to \$1000 for people not cleaning up after their dog, or willingly letting their dog chase wildlife.

Please let them exercise on the trail rather than crowding the city streets or not getting exercise at all. Please make no changes, or give the dogs more space and raise the fines. Thank you so much.

Odin Barr

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2325	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Oakwood Trail, Alta Trail and the Miwok Trail. Walking my dog on these trails and beach has provided me and my family with a healthy way of exercising and enjoying our area's natural beauty.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. If these trails are made off-limits to dogs I and others will be forced to drive further to walk my dog/hike contributing to more traffic congestions and gas consumption.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2326 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 08:02:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider the ban on off-leash dogs throughout GGNR. There are currently only a handful of trails and places dogs are allowed off-leash, leaving hundreds of trails for everyone else....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2327 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 08:05:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I found out about this proposal while visiting El Rodeo beach with my two dogs last month. We make the two-hour trek to this beach specifically because our two big, extremely well-behaved dogs love the space to run and the socialization off-leash offers them an opportunity for further development and training. It is therefore confusing that the GGNRA is proposing to ban off-leash dogs from a number of areas, when the existing areas that dogs are allowed off-leash are so few. Of course, not all dogs are as well-behaved as my two, but is punishing all dogs for a few outliers really the best solution here? Problem dogs act out not just off-leash, but on-leash as well, meaning that creating new government regulations that not only cost money but affect around 40% of Bay Area residents really doesn't get to the heart of your perceived problem. To me, this is a power move by a few government individuals who probably had a bad experience at some point in their lives with dogs. Don't punish the well-behaved dogs

and their faithful owners for this personal vendetta against a few outliers. Thank you for your time, I hope the government can drop this and get back to real issues sometime soon.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2328    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 08:21:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm a long-time San Francisco resident and dog owner, who also frequently uses the GGNRA (Crissy Field and Fort Funston in particular) with my dog. I'm writing to express my opposition to the new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The GGNRA trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy, and the philosophy behind it, needs to continue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2329    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Novato, CA 94947  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Reg Compliance Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 09:05:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to GGNRA trails and beaches.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2330    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, or some

---



alternative that maintains and manages off-leash access for dogs.

I regularly take my dog to Marin Headlands fire protection roads, Muir Beach, Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Blithedale Summit, Lucas Valley, Rodeo Beach and Samuel P Taylor.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. If there are any concerns, these should be managed while maintaining access for dogs and their owners and families!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2331	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 10:20:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not take away off-leash areas for dogs. I understand the importance of having leash laws, and I completely support leash laws when appropriate, but there has to be a place where we can let our dogs run and play with one another. We should be trusted as responsible dog owners.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2332	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 10:31:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am fine with dog owners having a couple of areas where they can bring their dogs. Let them keep Oakwood and the north part of Stinson where they're already allowed. I only go to those places when I am with a friend who has a dog. Personally I don't have a dog, because someone in my home has severe animal allergies ... but I do love dogs. However, I have several issues with the way I have observed MANY dog owners in the GGNRA in Marin:				

1. Their practice of leaving a plastic bag full of dog poop on the side of the trails. I believe that if you own a dog, part of your life will be carrying around a plastic bag full of poop. I don't think it's reasonable to leave it on the side of the trail. Time and time again, I have witnessed several friends "forget" to pick up that bag on the way back: "Oh darn, I can't remember where I put that baggie... oh well."

2. I have witnessed many people who claim to have voice control over their dog, not be able to control them. Most of the time, their dogs run off far from view, so really, the dog owners have no idea where their dog actually is. How can you claim you have your dog under voice control when they are too far

away from you to see you or hear your voice?

3. I have witnessed many, many people ignoring the "no dogs" signs on trails in Tennessee Valley. Once I was on a hike with a very vocal proponent of letting dogs be off-leash in the GGNRA and she (a) started to walk on a trail that wouldn't allow dogs, saying "oh, I know you're not supposed to bring dogs here, but I do it anyway"; and (b) at one point lost her dog on our hike and we spent about 15 minutes trying to find him. It is this attitude of "MY dog wouldn't hurt anyone"... "MY dog isn't like other dogs" that is so annoying. Guess what. Even though I like dogs, I don't want your dog charging at me or my child when I'm on a hike, especially on a trail where no dogs are allowed in the first place. It seems like people take advantage of the fact that our national parks don't have the funds to have many rangers... so they bring their dogs on no-dog trails because they know they're unlikely to get caught.

Yes, I realize this is a national recreation area and not a national park, but the dogs should stay on the trails, just like the people, so that they don't disturb the habitat. I watch people's dogs run off the trails all the time. Having them on-leash would fix that issue.

There are two enormous dog parks that I know of in Southern Marin - - one in Mill Valley and another in Tiburon. People can throw balls for their dogs there. It's not like the GGNRA is the only place to recreate with a dog in this area-that argument is just nonsense.

Again, I'm fine with letting the dog owners keep Oakwood. I know that when I go there, I'll encounter many, many dogs. But because the dog owners flagrantly ignore the rules elsewhere, I support banning dogs on other trails.

It's not people like me who are ruining it for the dog owners, it's the irresponsible dog owners who ruined it for them. Unfortunately most of the dog owners I see have a flagrant disregard for the rules.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2333	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 10:35:27
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I live in San Francisco with my husband, 2 kids and a dog. I walk my dog regularly at Chrissy Field and Fort Funston. These are currently offleash areas and as city parks, have been so for a long time. It is one of my greatest pleasures to walk with my dog off-leash in these areas. My dog is obedient, does not sniff or take other people's food and is gentle with strangers and children, and has good recall. I always clean up after my dog, and regularly pick up other people's trash I see along the way- as do many of us responsible dog owners. On weekdays, the vast majority of people on these beaches are those of us walking our dogs off leash. While part of the national parks, these areas are right smack in our city, and are used as CITY parks by residents. They need to be considered as such. There is little reason, other than the few irresponsible dog owners and the few powerful NIMBY neighbors, to further restrict dogs off-leash opportunities in these areas, and it would be discriminating against the vast majority of beach enjoyers to do so. We respect the limits of the off leash areas, we allow the snowy plovers to reproduce, we pick up trash. We are responsible park users. I appreciate your consideration of my comments. Michelle
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2334	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America
-----------------	---

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:36:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** People should not band dogs from the beach because owners love to walk their dogs their. The beach is one of their favorite place to go. If people hate dogs and they go to the beach a lot, that does not mean that they should ban dogs from the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2335    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 10:38:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My comments are specific to the Ocean Beach proposal. Though I suspect my comment will we heard like a candle in a dog lobby tempest, I support Plan C or F or one of the all leash all the time proposals. At minimum, I would like to see a regulated zone at the north and extreme south ends of the beach where dog owners can let their dogs run amok as they are inclined to do.

In the middle of the beach there have always been inconsistencies enforcing the leash laws. If we don't impose clear-cut zones (including possibly all leash, all the time, all places on Ocean Beach) and times where the dogs are supposed to run free, then all this deliberation will be for naught. Let's face it, there won't always be enough funding to enforce the mid-beach zone, but if there are clear rules that everyone understands which keep dogs in the North/South zones for off leash activity, then possibly the mid- beach goers will be able to justly enforce the rules.

Additionally, while the vast majority of dog owners try to clean up after their dogs, many don't "see" when/where their dogs poop, and some owners even forget bags to handle the business. I also see well-intentioned owners pick up the poop then leave the bag to be trashed upon their return walk only to forget the ugly blue plastic bag there for the tide to take away and choke some poor turtle.

Minimizing dog impact at minimum to the North/south zones of the beach (where there can be a culture of accountability) would be best for the plovers and the people who want a clean peaceful place to recreate. Keeping the majority of off leash activity to the North/South ends (or none at all) might also allow for some focused signage and garbage cans to be placed to facilitate proper adherence to the rules.

Thanks for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2336    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:00:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Pam Daghlain

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2337	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

I am a lifetime resident of Southern Marin, 44 years. I have had dogs my entire life and know the responsibility necessary to own and share the land with dogs.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. I haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2338	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:15:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the GGNRA Compliance-based Management Strategy regarding off leash and on-leash dog walking in the GGNRA. Compliance based management strategy cannot be part of any plan. This strategy will potentially end off-leash access without giving people a chance to comment on the change. It also punishes responsible dog owners for the bad actions of a few irresponsible ones. It must be removed.

I also oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the DEIS for this major changes. I support formalization of 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Walking my dog at Fort Funston 2-3x a week, Chrissy Field Beach once a week and at Pine Lake Park 2-3x a week is our family's nature time. My kids live, play and go to school in an urban environment. We have a large dog who needs to run play with my kids, and kids who need the outdoor experience our dog gives us. I'm afraid what will happen to Pine Lake if GGNRA land goes all on-leash/no dog. It's a terrible loss for urban citizens to walk freely with their pets in these small areas. I feel a terrible loss of Constitutional rights.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2339	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 11:23:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ashley Dean

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2340	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:24:44**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** my preferences for the proposed alternatives are as follows:

Upper Fort Mason: Alternative A

Crissy Field: alternative 10-B

Fort Point: alt. 11-F

Baker beach: alt B

Lands End: 13-E

Sutro Heights: A

thanks-

SA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2341 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:32:13**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** My wife and I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

We regularly take our dog on the few trails that permit off leash walking, as do many other Marin residents. These areas are less than 1% of the GGNRA so although we are very grateful for this public resource we do not believe we are imposing on other residents or the wildlife, as it small and controlled area that the dogs are permitted.

Please leave the area as is and don't deprive of us one of the outdoor resources that attracted us to Marin and led to us moving here.

Sincerely,  
Matt Hollander

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2342 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,06,2014 11:35:38**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** please keep the GGNRA open to dogs -

dogs are family, many don't have children and their dog is their child and dogs need space to run and play.,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2343 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Rodeo beach, Crissy field, and Fort funston as well as many of the trails in Marin. Being able to take advantage of these off leash areas with my dog is one of the main reasons we live in Marin and pay the high property taxes etc.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2344    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:03:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let dogs run free...

It seems that most dog owners keep the dogs on leash, what could possibly be the harm in this? In addition

I feel that there should be several long trails where dogs are allowed off leash as well.

Please do NOT close off the GGNRA to dogs entirely. Choose areas that are more sensitive in terms of the fora and fauna, close a few, but let's find a balance here. Are we humans and our pets not a part of nature?

I propose three zones:

No Dogs  
Dogs on Leash  
Dogs Run Free !!!

Thank you  
Sincerely, Xander Wessells

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2345    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:05:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Rose Pray

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2346    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:11:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to muir beach!

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.



Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2347    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:18:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

The Pedro Point Highlands have been negatively affected by decades of motorcycle and other high impact uses. Why are dogs being restricted? Where is the science behind saving habitat which was lost decades ago? For safety the dogs can be restricted from the cliff top. But to not allow dogs at all? It make no sense.

This is just another case of the NPS defaulting the position of disallowing dogs just about everywhere. The revised plan is incredibly restrictive, especially in San Mateo County. It is clear the NPS would prefer no dogs, period. The NPS seems to have forgotten this is National RECREATION Area not a National PARK. The 39% o taxpayers that own dogs should be allowed more than the 1 or 2% o the areas they are being offered in this latest "revised" plan.

Please Revise it again. And Seriously this time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2348    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am a new dog parent. We decided to adopt our pup, who was abandoned by his previous owners, because even though we live in an apartment in a city, our town has always been a dog friendly place. We have restructured our schedules during the week to give him time and attention but are still restricted by time to our neighborhood sidewalks and local parks. So on the weekend we all look forward to time in one of the several GGNRA areas that will be affected by this new plan. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from giving myself and my dog the recreation time, which includes both physical and mental exercise, we need on a regular basis.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco, San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you.  
Sincerely,  
Eugenie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2349    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** ross, CA 94957  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, we support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

We regularly take our dogs to numerous parks and wilderness areas in Marin. ((Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.((

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.(( Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

There must be more important issues that our communities face these days than where people can walk their dogs. If we can suggest, please spend your time productively on the issues that matter most to the health and prosperity of our communities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2350    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:28:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider severely restricting off-leash space in the GGNRA. If anything, it needs to be increased, not reduced. The benefits to humans and dogs by being active and in nature are immeasurable. And spending time in nature fosters a concern for the natural environment that doesn't come without that experience. It would be better to spend your time educating people about the value of nature and how to minimize their impact on wild spaces. Access to these wild spaces with my off-leash dog is the main reason I live in the Bay Area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2351    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94609  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:29:39

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't take dog access away. While I don't hike in Marin every weekend its a great excursion for us about once a month. There are already so few places to hike in the Bay Area with dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2352 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Kensington, CA 94708  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:30:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a long time dog owner and frequent user of the GGNRA, The plan makes sense in terms of developing an effort to have dog owners be more honest and vigilant about their dogs impact on the GGNRA environment. This is clearly a problem of a few causing problems for the overwhelming number of responsible dog owners. Unfortunately, most dogs, including mine if not carefully watched, will run after birds and wildlife (especially on open beaches) with whatever intention (e.g., play, instinct, predator behavior?). This is not acceptable, so restrictions and regulations are clearly necessary. While I do not see a problem with restricting and enforcing dog walking to "...on leash only" in most of the proposed to-be-protected areas, I urge park management to ensure the use and maintenance of proposed areas to be designated as off leash but must be under voice control. I also urge that the park service either keep or create at least 1-2 off leash areas on the San Mateo coast. In addition, please consider significantly increasing the fines and enforcing penalties for violators - the word will get around and people will be more likely to be more compliant with the regulations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2353 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Los Altos, CA 94022  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:37:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dog owners are dedicated park users and wildlife enthusiasts. Please stop alienating these users.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2354 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:43:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA, by its own rules, must conduct site-specific, peer-reviewed studies as the foundation for any policy changes intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The GGNRA acknowledges the required studies do not exist. This renders the proposed policy changes arbitrary and capricious, and as such they are unlawful and cannot be implemented. The ORIGINAL 1979 Pet Policy should be reinstated per the 2005 Federal Court decision because all closures since then have not been based upon site specific, peer-reviewed studies as the law requires. For lands added after the drafting of the original 1979 Pet Policy, DOI policy requires historical usage be maintained. Any changes would have to be justified by the requisite site-specific, peer-reviewed studies followed by a formal rulemaking process.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2355    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Walnut Creek, CA 94597  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:50:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

The revised plan is far too restrictive. I favor keeping the access the same as it is now (I think you call that alternative A?). But I appreciate there could be an issue with some dogs going off trail and into sensitive areas.

The Answer? Easy! ENFORCE THE LEASH LAWS!

A leashed dog cannot go into sensitive areas. But why restrict them from the trails entirely?

If NPS simply enforces the leash laws with the current level of access, the law-abiding dog owners can continue to enjoy the parks. But sensitive areas are protected. WIN-WIN!

Why is NPS coming up with these incredibly restrict plans to hugely limit access of current law-abiding users? Whereas what they should be doing is enforcing the law on those user not following the rules.

It is a bit like proposing we close down all the roads in California simply because a few people are speeding - - but yet we don't want to solve it by giving out speeding tickets. Crazy!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2356    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Aspect Foundation Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 12:54:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I am one of many business leaders in San Francisco who oppose this ban on dogs in areas where we have been recreating with our dogs for 20 years.

Increasing numbers of San Francisco offices, including my own, allow dogs at work. Nearly every hotel in San Francisco now allows dogs. With all the tech companies moving into SF, the numbers of downtown dogs will only increase. Why, when the entire SF Bay Area is becoming more dog-friendly, is the GGNRA becoming increasingly intolerant of people recreating with their dogs?

Dogs without proper exercise can become aggressive. SF parks will be overwhelmed with dogs if GGNRA proceeds with these ill-conceived, short-sighted measures.

I attended the GGNRA meeting about this issue in Pacifica about a year ago. It was 100% clear that the issue had already been decided, and the forum for public input was just an empty gesture. I would like to know, where are the compromises that have been made since that time? What was (and is) the impact of the public outcry?

And - who exactly does not want dogs at Fort Fun? Where are the names of these people who oppose recreating with dogs in national RECREATION area? I've never met one person who did not enjoy the

---

dogs at Fort Funston or Crissy beach.

There are plenty - hundreds, if not thousands - of state parks, national parks, and beaches that are off-limits to dogs. These are great places for people to enjoy nature without dogs.

For the 50% ad growing numbers of San Franciscans who DO have dogs, for all the commuters who bring their dogs to work every day, for all the tourists who bring their dogs to our hotels - - we need off-leash recreation area. This is OUR national recreation area.

California is a very big state, with plenty of room for people, dogs, trees, snowy plovers and everything else to co-exist and thrive. Unlike much of CA, the SF Bay Area is very densely populated with people and dogs. It is our responsibility to care for these dogs. They need socialization and exercise in OUR national recreation area.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2357	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Palo Alto, CA 94303 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 12:56:16
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose the preferred alternative in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I exercise and socialize my service dog trainee in the GGNRA. This kind of off-leash play and exercise is important to the social development of the dog. It has also been a personal source of mental and physical health.
------------------------	---

The outpouring of objects to previous drafts doesn't seem to have been addressed by the most recent draft. Elected officials have voiced their concerns and I have not seen a response.

I live in a dense and growing urban area, and open recreation areas are harder and harder to find. The 1979 policy set aside areas for dog waking, and the need for these areas has grown since then, not reduced. We need more dog-friendly and off-leash areas in the GGNRA, not fewer.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2358	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,
------------------------	---------------------------

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2359    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:11:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2360    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:18:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA seems to have lost sight of its purpose: it was intended to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Katherine Lambert

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2361    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:20:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is wrong. Why are people trying to legalize it? Who are we to say where are dogs are supposed to go? I bet the only people who support putting dogs on leashes at all times are people who don't own dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2362    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:24:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs and other pets need wide open space to run, play, and interact with other beings. depriving them of this is inhumane. There is no reason to have dog parks, if the animal is restricted by a leash. The whole point is to let the dog run and play with other animals

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2363    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:26:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not punish me and my dog because of the inconsiderate rule-breaking of a small minority of dog owners. It would be like banning all cars from the road because a few drivers drive drunk. The obvious solution to the problem, which annoys the majority of dog owners as well, is enforcement of the current rules.

And let's not be naive about the power of rule-making to stop the improper conduct of this small majority- they will simply break these new rules and run their dogs off leash regardless. The only way to stop them: enforcement. So seeing as how enforcement is the only way to stop the inconsiderate conduct that we all deplore, let's not punish the majority of dog owners who respect the rights of everyone to enjoy our natural environment. I understand that we live in an era of reduced government resources, so let's get creative instead on enforcement strategies to punish those who break the rules. The current GGNRA proposal will only deter responsible dog owners from enjoying our wonderful trails and beaches; it will do nothing to stop the problem.

Many thanks for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2364    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:29:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
sage bearman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2365    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:31:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I write with great concern about the plan to close most of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to dogs. While I recognize the importance of protecting wildlife areas, San Francisco is a city with, already, too little green space for families and their dogs. The GGNRA takes some of the pressure off of the tiny, overused, crowded squares of green that serve as dog runs in this city. In the few and small dog runs we have besides the GGNRA, dogs are so crowded together as to increase their aggression and limit the amount of exercise they can get. The grass is unusable by children, leading to turf wars between parents and dog-owners (I am both). It's a relief to take our dog to Crissy Field, Fort Funston, and other areas where she can just run.

Please consider not reducing the dog space so drastically. The city needs it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2366    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 13:33:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** As active members of the Mill Valley community and dog owners, we are saddened about the push to take away GGNRA trails and beaches that allow dogs and their owners the opportunity to walk, run and exercise freely. Given the scope of GGNRA land and the inordinate amount of trails available for hikers, mountain bikers, and the like, it is truly incomprehensible to us as to why the GGNRA representatives are trying so hard to take away what few areas we have to enjoy our dogs.

No matter how many studies have been done or arguments made to retract these GGNRA dog areas, their is a fundamental problem. It is the fact that 46% o pedestrians walk these trails with their dogs (Marin County Parks

Visitor Use Census and Survey - Nov 2011) and if you take them away where will they go? Dog owners will be forced to take their dogs on walks and hikes on non-mandated dog trails and beaches which will cause a whole number of additional problems we can avoid if we are allowed to simply maintain what we currently have.

Dogs aid in the health and well being of all their owners, both young and old, providing exercise and companionship. They are the lifeline for many elderly people. Dog owners are not asking for anything more ..... we just want to keep what we have allowing us to utilize trails and beaches designated for dogs lovers, some allowing our dogs to play freely off leash and get the much needed exercise they also need. We ask that you PLEASE grant us and our dogs that opportunity -to keep our much needed trails and beaches. There are SO many options for non-dog owners to take advantage of in our beautiful National Parks in Marin County. REALLY, SO MANY! Why not start a campaign promoting how wonderful these options are to those people that don't want to coincide with dogs? If we follow the rules, we ALL could enjoy the amazing beaches and park trails we are privileged to have in the GGNRA landscape.

Thanks for taking the time to listen-  
Charlie & Diane Barrett  
Tam Valley Residents

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2367	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 13:43:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner I am alarmed you may be closing off leash areas. They are vital to the health of the dog and the human! if it's about rogue dogs or unpicked up poop, please just increase your vigilance and your fines. we'd be happy with that. heck, we'd probably pull together some Citizen Dog Crime Watch on your behalf. Dogs need to run and play in order to combat all those hours they're left at home. Please don't do this.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2368	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 13:48:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Why are you taking away one of the best things about living in San Francisco/Bay Area!?!? Less exercise for people and their dogs! WHY???????

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2369 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:19:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm 63 years old next month and just really tired of more and more public lands being restricted for the benefit of only those rich enough to afford them. STOP IT. Have any of you been to Yosemite lately....at YOUR OWN EXPENSE?. I doubt it and I know your beauracratc equivalents in San Francisco haven't been looking out for my canine interests either. 18 years I've been waiting for improvements to the dog park across the street....NADA. Now you want to take away another resource for dog lovers because? Because making stupid decisions and creating problems for everyday people keeps you employed? Do you have the slightest clue how much money is generated into the local economy by dog walking and dog owners and other related goods and services? I didn't see anything mentioned about that in your reports. Why? What the hell is wrong with you people and why are you hiding in the background? Please make all your personal information and whereabouts known so we can comment on your Facebook page. Feel the love. Everytime you people get your hands on something you screw it up. SO LEAVE IT ALONE and do something constructive for a change. Why don't you come up with a plan to fill the Grand Canyon with spotted bowels and lupens.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2370 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:36:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

The ability to take our dogs on trails in the area and enjoy the natural beauty is critical to our family's quality of life. Additionally, I imagine the streets of the cities will become a nuisance as they will be filled with people walking dogs, and unfortunately, many will not be diligent about picking up dog poop.

Thank you.

Deborah Huber

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2371 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 14:59:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thanks for taking my comments into consideration.

Vineet

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2372	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 15:03:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent:				

I have lived in San Francisco for 5 years (Pacific Heights and Russian Hill). As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA (I go to Fort Funston 5 times a week and Crissy Field at least 4 times a month), I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. Being able to take my dog to these places and enjoy letting her run off-leash is an extremely important part of my life and is a huge part of why I love living in San Francisco.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. I have never had a bad experience in either Fort Funston or Crissy Field - for the most part everyone there is a responsible dog owner with their pet in full voice control. I don't think there is a need to reduce off-leash areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I hope you will not reduce the off-leash areas in Fort Funston or Crissy Field. They are my favorite places to go in SF and is part of what makes

this such a beautiful city.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Joyce Wang

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2373    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly city, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:07:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed shutting down of off leash areas in San Francisco  
Please reconsider this proposal as there are already limited areas that dogs can go. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2374    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Granada, CA 94018  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello, my name is Alison Wertenauer. I walk my dog off-leash on Surfer's Beach in El Granada, which I heard is owned by the city of Half Moon Bay. I walk my dog there two to six days a week. I pick up after any pottying my dog does. We play fetch and my dog gets the much needed exercise she needs. If a dog is not properly socialized, it's owner always has it on a leash. My dog is very well socialized with other dogs and people, in fact she loves them and is very well behaved.  
â€I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
â€I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
â€I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2375    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:24:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The GGNRA, by its own rules, must conduct site-specific, peer-reviewed studies as the foundation for any policy changes intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The GGNRA acknowledges the required studies do not exist. This renders the proposed policy changes arbitrary and capricious, and as such they are unlawful and cannot be implemented. The ORIGINAL 1979 Pet Policy should be reinstated per the 2005 Federal Court decision because all closures since then have not been based upon site specific, peer-reviewed studies as the law requires. For lands added after the drafting of

---

the original 1979 Pet Policy, DOI policy requires historical usage be maintained. Any changes would have to be justified by the requisite site-specific, peer-reviewed studies followed by a formal rulemaking process.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2376    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:43:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My whole family, and many friends walk with my dog and enjoy the excuse to get exercise and stay healthy and fit EVERY day, and normally twice a day. Dogs NEED to run around and socialize with each other. I do not have the hours it would take to provide my dog with the exercise he needs by walking him - I have to work! BUT, he needs to run and run, he needs to explore and sniff, and he loves to give pleasure to the people he meets who all adore him. Please don't take this HEALTHY daily pleasure away from us all. I put up with people's small children every where I go - if we ban dogs from having fun - perhaps we will be banning children from having fun next and putting them all in a strait jacket with tape over their mouths so they don't bother anyone else or the environment around them....

Keep dogs and children free to explore, and run around.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2377    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 15:44:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2378    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in the Upper Haight neighborhood of San Fransisco, CA. My dog and I frequent the Crissy Field area, Rodeo Beach, Muir Beach, Stinson Beach, Marin Headlands, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston areas in the GGNRA. Walks and hikes in these areas with my dog off leash provide for a wonderful way to exercise with my dog. We both get home feeling exhilarated from being in the outdoors, exhausted from a good workout, and happy.

My dog is like a child to me and I try to take her with me as much as possible. While, it make sense that places that serve food, small spaces and certain outdoor endangered habitats are not preferable for dogs to be, I would certainly hope that me and my dog would be welcome in open spaces that have historically been dog friendly and have not been severely impacted by presence of off-leash dogs.

I oppose the "Preferred Alternative" because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences, will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitored-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375) so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in area where it has been practiced for decades.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most

people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2379    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Crissy Field, and Oakwood Valley.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. There has been no dialogue about less restrictive alternatives. If you ban dogs, and off-leash use, the trails and beaches become useless to the vast majority of the people who enjoy them.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Tony Brass

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2380    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:04:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I totally support increased regulations re dogs and especially off-leash dogs in the GGNRA, local parks, and elsewhere. I am so sick and tired of trails that smell like dog crap. Dog walkers should be cited and fined for each and every dog and at least double fines for unleashed dogs when in violation of local ordinances.

The hired dog walkers are the absolute worst. Please fine these people. What other business owner can take advantage of public lands without regard or recompense for the damage they do?

I do not even take my child to many local parks because they are overrun by unleashed dogs. These dogs poop and pee everywhere. She is scared. This is totally unhygienic and unfair to my human child.

If I hear one more dog owner compare their dog to a child, I am going to puke.

---

I have called so many times for enforcement, especially in the GGNRA around Tennessee Valley.

Please increase enforcement. Please fine, fine, and fine. You can easily pay for the increased enforcement.

Sincerely,

Patty Compas  
126 Vendola Drive  
San Rafael, CA 94903  
415-847-4838

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2381	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 16:09:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a dog lover who uses Fort Funston on a regular basis, it makes me very sad to consider the upcoming off-leash ban. I don't know when the last time was that you have been to Fort Funston, but people go there specifically because it is a wonderful place to take your dog for an off leash adventure. People don't seem to go there with any other expectation which is why I don't understand the motivation for this change.

Most other places you take your dog, they must be leashed. I feel Fort Funston is such a great place because he can be free. We were just there last weekend for a few hours of beach fun with the family. We have a big dog who needs to chase a ball in the ocean to get his energy out and I just don't know what we'll be able to do to fill the void if the leash policy is changed.

Please reconsider.

Sincerely,  
Julie Shumate

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2382	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 16:30:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Being a dog owner, avid hiker, and working a sedative job, I value my dog walking time on GGNRA lands very much. The constant threat of taking this right away is both annoying and frustrating. I frequently walk my dog on leash in the Sweeney Ridge, Oakwood Valley and off leash at Fort Funston. Sweeney Ridge and Fort Funston are highly altered landscapes in an Urban area. One has to wonder why anyone could rationalize banning leash walking on Sneath Lane trail, which is a cement road leading to an abandoned Nike Missile Site. It is hard to believe that my dog has any impact on the landscape (I always pick-up after him).				

---



Basing rules on assumed non-compliant dog owners should be extended to all activities in the park then. The same rationale should ban all children since they have been known to throw garbage or go off trail. Never once have I encountered any enforcement. A first step perhaps would be actual enforcement before one decided to ban all dogs because it is just all uncontrollable.

I understand that some sensitive landscapes do need protection from off leash dogs, but some of the proposed limits on leash walking are too draconian.

Having these recreation areas open and available for myself and my dog has a major impact in how I relate to the Bay Area. Confining my experience to a few overcrowded parks will have a direct impact on my lifestyle and how I relate to the GGNRA. If there is a constant erosion for access to me and my dog I would have to assume that GGNRA is unable to manage these recreational lands and will work with my local politicians to pull the parks back to local management.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2383	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 16:31:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Corey Brew

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2384	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Body Mind Acupuncture Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 16:32:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am and have been a very responsible dog owner in San Francisco for 16 years. I take pride in my canine companion, who is a very healthy active Aust. Shepard. She has been going to run				

---

at Ft. Funston, Ocean Beach and Crissy fields, 5-6 days a week for her entire life and loves it! She loves chasing a ball and swimming. She is a high strung little dog, who needs to run, fetch and catch in order to feel "normal". Otherwise, she would be like a marathon runner who was only allowed to run on a track once a month. She is well cared for and picked up after, like most city dog owners who use these off leash areas. I see more dog messes left on city streets, than out on the sandy beaches in this town. Please don't take away what our dogs need most, FREEDOM!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2385    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 16:55:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Not a single resident plant or animal benefits from the presence of dogs in the GGNRA.

I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and provides a quality National Park experience for ALL visitors.

I would prefer no dogs; but I support the NPS attempt to regulate recreational dog walking as a necessary evil.

The most restrictive plan is best because the presence of dogs anywhere in the GGNRA will necessitate major enforcement efforts to protect natural and cultural resources, as well as provide, visitor safety.

While I reluctantly support the NPS current efforts to regulate recreational dog walking, I adamantly oppose individuals with multiple dogs being allowed within the GGNRA. Voice control is no control. In addition, commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users. It is a practice which should be prohibited since it will adversely impact park resources and values.

Enough already. Give us a break from rambunctious dogs. I'm tired of seeking balance where dog owners and others constantly clash over the rules. In future, any ticket given to individuals in violation of the new dog policies should result in a stiff fine collected.

The vast majority of park visitors ask that you just say "NO" to the DOGPAC.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2386    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:02:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been here for 9 years and do so enjoy walking my Dog in areas that are allowed..... I can not imagin what it would be like, to not have these open space's.... Have you ever been to the L.A. area ??? It is just dreadful for the people that do have dogs.  
The GGNRA.. that the change in 2013 seis.. did not adequtely address the citisns...  
I support No action Alternative in the seis for each area  
The seis contains no peer review.. site studies or vital monetoring..  
PLEASE RETAIN THE 1979 PET POLICY  
PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE!!!!

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2387    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:11:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a long time resident of Marin County I very much resent and oppose the ever increasing "rights" (so-called) of dog owners. Our area seems to regard pets as equals to human beings. My taxes are happily paid to improve our parks, clean up the environment and make life better for the next generation. They are not intended to support canines, owned by other people, to have rights in those areas. I have been attacked and bitten by an off-leash dog. When I see one on the trail I cringe to one side. This is an infringement of my rights to walk peacefully in our park areas. The dog lobby is a vocal minority. I hope they are leashed soon.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2388    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern at the GGNRA,  
I am writing to urge you to do everything you can to stop the Golden Gate National Recreation Area from implementing its new dog management plan. This plan will cut where people can walk off- and on-leash by 90% cmpared with where people can walk with dogs now. It is going to create a huge impact on the Bay Area, which we simply cant afford.  
I had hoped that this new plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan, because thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. But the GGNRA did not make significant changes. They ignored what people want, and are moving forward with an extremely unpopular plan no matter what we say. The GGNRA was created in 1972 for the maintenance of needed recreational open space, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. That's why it's designated as a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. With the new dog management plan, the GGNRA is reneging on its promises to preserve and protect recreational access to the GGNRA. There is no credible reason why people with dogs are not allowed to have adequate and reasonable space to walk their dogs in the vast 80,000 acres that comprise the GGNRA. Please take action to stop the GGNRA from imposing this radical plan on the San Francisco Bay Area.  
Thank you,  
Vivian Hernandez  
A regular dog walker at Fort Funston for over 6 years and the only place I can walk my dog safely off leash at the same time that I can enjoy some fresh ocean air and what mother nature intended for all of us to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2389    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:25:01

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a concerned resident of San Francisco who owns 3 dogs and who utilizes parts of the GGNRA (Baker Beach, Crissy Field) to allow my dogs to play exercise, walk, and socialize. The GGNRA lands were earmarked for public use in 1979, given by the city of San Francisco and the lands were to be reserved in perpetuity for recreation or park purposes. The GGNRA plan to limit severely dog walking and off leash activity in 2011 was commented upon with numerous objections to this radical change, so much so that the GGNRA came out with an alternative plan in September 2013.

Unfortunately, the objections raised in the 2011 comments went largely unheeded and the alternative plan is just as objectionable. I am writing to favor a "no action" plan and preserve the ability for dogs and their owners to utilize these lands in the largely responsible mode that they have been doing for years. Firstly, there is no hard evidence that the current situation has had any environmental impact. There has been no study as required by law that demonstrates any impact. Furthermore the impact on other city parks and properties if the change were to be adopted has been totally ignored. The current usage of these lands by dog walkers is only 1% of the GGNRA land and the new restrictions would reduce this to 0.1%. Where will the many dog owners in San Francisco and other affected surrounding municipalities go? This will most assuredly impact in a detrimental way the remaining smaller areas that can be utilized. As an aside, from what I can see from personal observations, there is a far greater impact from humans. Why not restrict humans too from these lands. The numbers of dog related citations is less than 0.1% of all dog related visits according to the GGNRA's own statistics. Human citations outnumber these. It makes no sense to restrict dog usage, because these lands are parks and recreation lands, not wilderness. They benefit the population by being available for use by our citizens. If off leash usage of the GGNRA's land is severely restricted by dogs and their owners as proposed, there will also be a negative impact on dog/dog and dog/human interactions. Namely, when dogs are able to exercise, socialize, and play off leash, there are fewer attacks, fights, and bites. This fact is certainly supported by the comments made by researchers and veterinarians. Is the irresponsible change proposed by the GGNRA going to result in more injuries. Evidence would strongly suggest that, so that this potential deleterious outcome in my opinion has a greater negative impact than the potential environmental impact suggested by the GGNRA and its total lack of evidence. With numerous comments against the proposed change in dog access from the 2011 and the current 2013 comment period, and the support of these comments by numerous dog loving groups, and several governmental leaders, it makes no sense to change anything resulting in less access by dogs and their owners to these areas in the GGNRA. Let this recreation area remain a recreation area as was originally intended by the city of San Francisco and its citizens.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2390    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:30:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir beach, Alta trail, Miwok trail, Wolf Ridge and others.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local

---

residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2391    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Napa, CA 94559  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:35:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lynn Mirassou

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2392    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:39:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not close off what little open space we still have available to enjoy with our pups off-leash  
Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2393    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 17:46:44

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2394	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 17:53:32
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support requiring leashes for dogs. Although many are well-behaved, about 10% are out of control - - jumping on people, harrassing other dogs, and definitely not under any voice command. It's unsafe and it creates a tense atmosphere for everyone else. Furthermore, restrictions related to endangered wildlife are habitually ignored. (For example, how many leashes do you see during snowy plover season at Ocean Beach?) The safety and comfort of *people* need to come above that of dogs or their owners; and the safety of protected local species needs to have priority over stir-crazy dogs. Again, I support the use of targeted off-leash areas and the implementation (and enforcement!) of leash requirements.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2395	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 17:53:41
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,
------------------------	---------------------------

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2396	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 18:02:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Adam Borod

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2397	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 18:05:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a dog owner who regularly walks my dog in the GGNRA, I vehemently oppose the Preferred Alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

First, it is too restrictive. The new plan calls for major reduction of off-leash areas. Studies have shown that leash can made dogs frustrated as it prohibits them from running freely and socializing with other dogs. Fencing up a designated off-leash area is also problematic because it limits movement of dogs to a small area. GGNRA is really the only open area in the SF Bay Area that can allow large number of dogs to free roam, while those who dislike dogs can have many other parks to choose from. It is ridiculous to close down the only place where off-leash dog walking is possible.

Second, it is unfair. It seems the plan is to punish all dog owners when only a few irresponsible dog owners don't pick up after their dogs. I think there are ways to penalize those bad apples without ruining it for everyone. Maybe have someone to patrol the area and ticket those violators. Also, it is hard for family with a kid and a dog to enjoy the outdoor when there is a designated off-leash area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2398    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:07:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to teh GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Rodeo Beach and the Oakwood Trail.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2399    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:21:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Heather Runes



---

**Correspondence ID:** 2400    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I really enjoy taking my dog to Ft Funston and oppose the possible ban. Dog owners like myself are taxpayers and outdoor enthusiasts, and big supporters of state and national parks, and it is not fair for us to be excluded from using these shared public resources.  
Cathy Wydner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2401    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael , CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:30:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a strong proponent of striking a balance between protecting sensitive coastal habitat and allowing open space for dogs to be off-leash.

Care should be given to sensitive areas that would be damaged by the presence of free roaming dogs. Space should be provided for off-leash exercise. However and more important, stronger compliance should be a high priority when it comes to off-leash areas for dogs that are not under voice command. Pets that run free, that do not respond to owners voice commands should cited and multiple violation should come with an eventual banishment from open space in GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2402    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:36:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I live in Scott Weiner's district of SF and I'm emailing because I'm upset about a proposal by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to severely limit dogs and off-leash dog walking in Ft. Funston, Crissy Field and other parks.

Just about one in every three households in San Francisco has a dog, and this is going to dramatically impact San Franciscans. It is also going to impact city parks, because if this proposal passes hundreds upon hundreds of people and their dogs are going to flood places like Maclaren Park and Golden Gate Park.

Please don't do this. Things are great the way they are.

My best regards,  
Robby Bearman

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2403    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:37:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

My best regards,  
Robby

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2404    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:49:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir beach and the surrounding trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Please rethink your decisions.

---

Sincerely,

Lydia Luhessa Caddell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2405    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 18:51:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is purely politics! It's all about cut backs! Your doing the same thing in Pacifica regarding Mori Point!  
I bring my dogs every day and I mean every day for them to exercise! This is the only place you can let you  
dog run free without getting a ticket! Yes a ticket! I live in Pacifica where you risk getting a ticket for your  
dog off leash! Please keep this open for our dogs! This is dog heaven and for the owners!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2406    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Theodosia, MO 65761  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 19:01:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We love walking our dogs on the trails. On-leash access doesn't seem unreasonable. PLEASE don't limit such access. We recently enjoyed an afternoon of frolic at Muir Beach where the dogs were off-leash and in-the-surf.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2407    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I absolutely love living in San Francisco. What's so fantastic about this part of the country is the many places to spend time outdoors year round. There's nothing my husband and I love more than spending time outdoors with our dogs. Unfortunately, in the city of San Francisco, most people (like ourselves) do not have yards, so we head to places like GGNRAs to get exercise. We've always felt a sense of community in these parks, meeting others who care just as much about taking care of these amazing areas.

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

years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kristin Kelly

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2408	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

I live in the Outer Sunset, just one block from Ocean Beach. I visit Ocean Beach at least once, sometimes twice daily with my dog. My dog walker also takes her to Ft Funston and/or Ocean beach dialy.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2409	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 20:17:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I think that the proposal to limit dogs at Crissy Field and Fort Funston is unnecessary. Right now Crissy Field is a perfect place - the runners and bikers have a path, the dogs can run off leash on the beach and the wildlife and naive plants are protected by a fence. I don't see ant extra dog poop and I don't see why things should be changed.

---

As dog owners we are often treated like unimportant citizens. We pay our taxes and follow the rules, only to have them curtailed even when we follow them.

Many so called off leash areas in San Francisco are next to roads and play grounds. The beaches are the best place for everyone to have dogs.

Ocean Beach is basically off limits, so the other beaches which are much smaller should be available.

We are all Californians, and we all need access. There are more dogs in San Francisco than children.

Please don't change anything.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2410	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Pleasanton, CA 94566 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 20:50:50
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** Dogs need to be on leash in public areas, period. I have been attacked when on my bicycle just minding my own business and the owner said, "He was just wanting to play with you". My child has been knocked down by a "he's a good dog, he would never hurt anyone". A large portion of dog owners do not pick after their defecating animals. Wildlife is chased off. I have nothing good to say about off leash dogs that are not under their owners control. If people want their dogs to have a free range to run then they should buy themselves a property up in the hills with a couple acres. I am so tired of having people's dogs harass me and my family. We actually avoid the shoreline in SF because my daughter is terrified of the dogs that are allowed to run wild and are far from under control of their owners. Not cool.

Dogs need to be leashed.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2411	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94116 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 21:03:31
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** SAVE OFF LEASH!!! i think we should save off leash because if you have an animal or a dog, theres not a lot of room in your backyard, if you have one. animals can't stay inside forever either. i don't have a dog but lots of other people do and I'm sure they want their dogs to be happy and run around all they want on the beach, in the park, or anywhere!  
the only thing i really want to say is... SAVE OFF LEASH!!!! please, thanks!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2412	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 21:06:51
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

---

**Correspondence:** I have been walking my dog at Fort Funston for three years... I feel very lucky to be able to do that and cherish those days as does my dog.

If the proposed changes do happen it will be an absolute loss of privilege for those of us that enjoy Funston so much..

To have an enclosed area put in place will be a disaster and waste of time and money. The reason so many people go to Funston each day is to enjoy the walk while their dog is greeting others and running and having fun. This is one of the few places in the city that you can let your dog run free - please don't take this away from usâ€

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2413    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 21:43:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello:

My name is Brian Bullard, a forth generation San Franciscan , and owner of Fur Family & Friends, a pet care company in Marin.

I walk on Latte Lane, in Mill Valley, and Donahue in Sausalito CA. I also have a permit with Marin Open Space, so I use their trails as well.

I am very concerned about the dog walking restrictions that are being talked about.

We cant all bring dogs to dog parks or easily conduct business if our land that we pay taxes for, are further off use.

There are hundreds of dog walking companies that use the current open GGNRA lands with good relations. To put us on city streets and private lands would not be a great option for pet care firms.

Many dog walkers are one client away from being homeless and several are over 55 years of age with little hope of landing a new job , only to depend on our Government for medical and food financial help. Bringing California further in debt.

I hope you think of individual dog walkers, and the dogs they represent.

Dogs lives are happier off leash. More dog restrictions may mean more unwanted pets and overcrowded shelters.

Sincerely,

Brian B Bullard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2414    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 22:35:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm sorry this is just ridiculous. I love how it's all the dogs fault for the destruction of the environment and chasing the birds away. I swear when I go to Ocean Beach or Crissy Field I see trash left by humans, children that are running around unsupervised chasing birds and people just walking on plant life where they shouldn't be. It's 1% o the land that should be left alone for dogs to run free and enjoy the freedom of the outdoors. I'm sorry you want to save the environment and your birds you seriously need to look at the human species. We are the most destructive creature on this planet. Also if your going to start going after the dogs for being so destructive and chasing away wildlife why doesn't any of this include the horses that are riding down the hillside or running along the beach at Ft. Funston. I've seen your precious birds using all their valuable energy running away from the horses and even

---

people that are running or walking along the waters edge. Also why isn't the Audubon Society assisting with the injured and sick pigeons that are in the city if they're so concerned about the well being of birds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2415    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 22:45:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2416    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 22:56:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It's getting nearly impossible to find a beach that allows dogs, let alone any that allow off-Leash. Some say it's about protecting the Snowy Plover, which is a novel idea and one I support...but then there they all are with their little kids, tromping through the dunes, playing football and laying out their picnics and chairs, umbrellas and leaving behind trash. The hypocrisy is HUGE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2417    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 23:18:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Regulation of recreational dog walking is an appropriate activity for the NPS within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The NPS has established management policies and practices which protect park resources and help to insure that all visitors may enjoy the national park. Adopting a Dog Management Plan is entirely appropriate and I support it. Most dog owners are responsible and keep their pets under control. As in all of life's activities, some do not. I have witnessed unpleasant sights on

---

Crissy Field where dogs not under control have chased birds and other wildlife.

In addition, I am troubled by dog walkers using national park land for commercial gain. All other commercial activities that I am aware of are regulated by NPS, pay usage fees, and adhere to detailed regulations. The nature of commercial dog walking means that this activity creates an additional burden on the already understaffed NPS, with no benefit I perceive to the rest of the public.

I accept that dogs may be permitted in a national park so close to an urban setting, when they are not commonly permitted in other national parks. But that nonconforming activity needs careful regulation. I believe that the NPS Special Rule and the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan set the appropriate boundaries for this otherwise nonconforming use.

For reasons of personal privacy and the protection of my personal data, I prefer not to provide personally identifiable information.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2418	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Redwood City, CA 94062 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Katherine Olivetti

PS I live in Woodside within the Redwood City postal district. I often drive to Fort Fumston, Crissy field, and Lafayette Park so that my dog can recreate with me off leash. Please, please preserve this privilege.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2419	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:46:26				

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I regularly walk with my dog in the GGNRA, therefore I'm writing to oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2420    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 02:08:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** February 6, 2014:

GGNRA/To Whom It May Conern:

I am writing on behalf of dogs and dog owners: to preserve off-leash space in San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin counties. I'd like the see the GGNRA continue to permit land use per the 1979 Pet Policy set forth in the guidelines from the United States Department of the Interior.

It's my belief that people, natural erosion, rising sea level, man-made pollution, and urban sprawl are the greater factors at play (in terms of threatening our natural resources). I think the GGNRA should focus its concern with reducing pollution, maintaining trails, restoring native vegetation, providing community education and outreach, and monitoring (and fining) litterbugs who trash our resources. Two years ago, I was hiking with a group above Rodeo Beach: there are former bunkers and Nike missile sites that could be removed and restored. The erosion on some of those trails is staggering. And many of the trails looked in need of grooming.

Now, I'm sure that there are some dogs that are a nuisance to people, and I'm sure there have been complaints. And undoubtedly there are some naughty dog owners out there. But I'm pretty sure that people (i.e., humans) cause more harm than Bay Area residents' animals. I also find it particularly troubling that a family traveling with their pet would run into some serious problems trying to plan day trips around here.

I can't list all the places that I'd like to discuss, but the following are areas that I feel strongly about keeping open to animals under voice command/control. Overall, I think Alternative A (no action) summarizes my position. However, I'll focus on several:

Muir Beach: Alternative A (no action).

I am often in Marin and the closest beach during my visits is Muir Beach. I think it's very unfair to make it leash only or to prohibit dogs. I feel very strongly about this. I understand the creek is a sensitive salmon habitat, but I see kids playing in the creek and in the dunes. I've seen parents chatting while their kids dig in the dunes in the off-limits area (of course the sign was half buried by drifting sand).

Additionally, the creek is often closed at its mouth, unless it's storm season. I could see restricting dog access or increasing signage during sensitive salmon runs, but this shouldn't be a permanent, year-round rule. Most people's dogs just want to run along the waterline by the shore.

What about local residents with dogs? Are they going to have to drive all the way to Stinson beach to have coastal access for their dogs? I want to add that driving my dog to Stinson Beach or Bolinas increases my carbon footprint-and I am not keen on that. I prefer to drive as little as possible. I can't take my dog overland because the hiking trails don't permit dogs. Plus, I think the Coastal Trail and/or fire roads should be open to dog owners so we can visit places like Pirates Cove. I used to go there and picnic

and pick up trash. But now I don't go because I cannot take my dog there.

I can't believe that if a person were hiking the coastal trail that he/she couldn't walk the entire length with their dog companion-because it would be against the law. Why? I've been on trails in Marin that are so overgrown that the path is barely visible through the vegetation. Animals and their owners help keep these trails open and groomed. If anything, the ticks and poison oak are the greatest hazards. Why don't you consider other solutions (e.g., permits for dogs to be on trails)? I don't see the harm that animals have on the trails. For example, Tennessee Valley to Tennessee Cove: if a dog is on leash, it's not going to spook a horse or scare off animals any more than a bunch of kids running around. In the past, I used the area often, but now that it doesn't permit dogs, I have stopped using it. It doesn't sit well with me. I find it troubling that my dog cannot accompany me on this route.

Ocean Beach: Alternative A.

Ocean Beach is the closest beach to my home. I use the north end of the beach daily, and I feel lucky to have it be off leash so that I can exercise my dog. However, it's frustrating that I can't walk or run the length of the beach with my dog off leash. I understand there's a season snowy plover habitat/hatching issue, and I agree with limiting off-leash access during those times of the year. But I don't think there should be year-round closure of the area between Sloat and the Beach Chalet (where the snowy plover sign is located). I've seen the young plovers heading to the ocean. They are sensitive to what's going on around them, but they're not hatching year round. I've witness dogs chasing birds, but it's not usually the case. A bigger issue that I see: kids playing in the dunes and homeless people sleeping in the dunes. Isn't this the sensitive snowy plover habitat? But my biggest peeve at the beach is the trash: I regularly pick up trash from beach visitors and trash that washes up. I think the GGNRA should be more concerned with policing people who litter and who disturb the peace at the beach. Fine them \$300 to \$500, and they'll be sure not to litter again. Last week, I saw a family of five get up and leave all their trash behind. Disgusting.

Baker Beach: Alternative A (or maintain an area where dogs can run off leash); maybe make the south area off-leash. Who complains about dogs on this beach: the nudists? Which is a greater distraction and embarrassment?

China Beach: Why aren't dogs permitted there? I find this ridiculous. I'd like to use the space and grill out, but I can't take my dog down there? It's a tiny beach. What's the deal?

Crissy Field: Alternative A

I'm happy with the bird preserve area, but I hope you don't restrict more areas for dogs. The shoreline is such a great place to exercise ones dog. How about fixing the gopher holes in the former airstrip. And what's up with the giant metal sculptures?

How are they helping to preserve nature? They don't provide habitat for birds.

Fort Miley: Alternative A

Rodeo Beach: Alternative A

Fort Baker: Alternative A

Lands End: Alternative A

Fort Funston: Alternative A

I strongly disagree with any leash laws here. If the GGNRA needs to put up fencing to preserve sensitive habitats, then it should do so. There is a lot of erosion there, but just look at the cliffs along Daly City and Pacifica. There's plenty of coastal erosion going on. Fort Funston is a great place for dogs. Yes, it's a highly impacted area-but because dogs are restricted elsewhere. There's a high concentration of dogs. Might this be because of restrictions in other places (e.g., just south in San Mateo or in the City of San Francisco itself)? If the GGNRA wants to preserve nature, then commit to opening Lake Merced to the ocean-as it was before the Great Highway was built. Get rid of the golf courses, which allow pollution to run off into the lakes. It's disgusting.

Sutro Heights: Alternative A

Sweeney Ridge: Alternative A (allow dogs)

San Mateo: I recently read that San Mateo County no longer has off-leash areas for dogs. Is that true? That seems very unfair and overly restrictive.

Pt. Reyes: I don't like that Limantour Beach is now leash-only. If there were a beached seal, I could see that dogs should be leashed, but if one's dog is under voice command, there shouldn't be a need to restrict them from being able to exercise.

Why is the fire road to Wildcat Lake and Bass Lake off limits to dogs? I can understand keeping dogs on leash (it's a fire road!), but to not allow dogs at all on the fire road really irks me. I know there's a bird sanctuary, but leashed dogs aren't bothering birds anymore than hikers.

Up north, I recently learned that Jack London State Park had changed its dog policy. Boy, I'll bet Jack is rolling in his grave. If you think about it, our great leaders, writers, and thinkers (who sought to help our wilderness areas) had dogs. The Roosevelts were dog lovers. So was John Muir and John Steinbeck. How would they feel about restricting dogs in our great outdoors? They'd think we're nuts.

I think the GGNRA should back away from restrictive dog policies. It seems that the 1979 agreement was a promise from the government to the people. It sets out clear guidelines. But my personal opinion is that America needs fewer rules, not more laws and regulations.

I have to say, I've been to several public information meetings. And one thing I don't like about the GGNRA's presentation is that the diagrams you had at your public meetings did not show before and after representations of the areas you are seeking to change. So it's difficult to imagine the entirety of what is potentially changing. But it's clear that I will be losing public-access areas to recreate. I am very much opposed to anything that prohibits dogs. While I agree that there are some places that may need seasonal leash laws, I strongly feel that most places (if not every place) should be accessible with a leash. I don't know what the problem is with having a dog on a 6-foot lead. In the big picture: How are dogs more disruptive to nature than a line of cars spewing out carbon monoxide and other pollutants? Answer: dogs aren't.

I'd prefer to see the GGNRA be constructive and expand areas for pet owners. For instance, it would be great if an area could be set aside for water skills and water work-an aquatic recreation area for dogs and their owners. Why not close the depressing SF zoo and create an area there? I think the GGNRA could be more constructive: let's remove the invasive species and eucalyptus. Let's plant and restore redwood forests and other native vegetation. Let's clean up the creeks and the streams and the ocean. Let's clean up the trash. Let's groom and maintain hiking trails: for man and for beast.

Believe me, as a taxpayer and voter I am letting my representatives know how I feel about more laws and regulations. I don't like the fact that the 1979 policy is being chipped away at. America has bigger problems on its hands.

Well-behaved dogs should be allowed to accompany their owners in nature.

Sincerely,

WTR, SF and CA taxpayer and proud American citizen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2421	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:40:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2422    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Redwood city, CA 94062

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:47:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please, we take the responsibility to train our dogs to behave. We pick up after them. They cause no harm. In fact they are a delight to nearly every human that comes in contact with them. We can judge very well who is dog skittish and keep our dog at our side until we know if they are or are not. We pose no harm to anyone, we just bring joy.

Please don't take away places where we can roam. Our health depends on it (mine and my dog's)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2423    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:52:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
kathryn geminder

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2424    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:57:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i like to see dogs feel free and alive running around in parks and everywhere, my neighbors dog loves to run around on the street with me and i have alot of fun when we do so, please dont ban dogs off leash

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2425    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 08:59:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco and fully support this plan. Next, is improving awareness and compliance of off leash areas in the Presidio. Recently I walked the mountain lake trail and the road between the old golf lodge and the lake I observed 48 off leash dogs running around, playing, some aggressively. If this is an on leash area it is being totally ignored. This is an issue all over the city. Dog owners seem to think the leash laws dont have to be followed....if as a citizen we say something we are seen as dog haters when we are not. Please approve this, and do the same for the Presidio and the city in general next!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2426    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Tamalpais Conservation Club Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:08:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I favor allowing dogs off leash in designated areas of the GGNRA provided those areas are clearly marked (signs) to forewarn park visitors that unleashed dogs are present. Critical habitat areas should not allow dogs or people. Dogs on leash should be allowed in all other parts of the GGNRA where people are welcome.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2427    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 09:37:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I agree with Michael Lynes' comments in today's Chronicle regarding the GGNRA proposal. It's important to accommodate a wide range of use in these crucial urban wild areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2428    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Gustine, CA 95322  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:02:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

There is not enough coastal area open to dog walking as is, therefore GGNRA should not restrict dog access any more than it already has.

This is not a pristine area. The impact of dog access is insignificant compared past uses by the military.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2429    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:06:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support limiting dog spaces and off leash dogs in the parks. Wildlife and plants need space and a chance to live and flourish. Please do limit the dogs! I have seen them chasing wildlife and birds constantly ever since I have lived in San Francisco (20 years) and have been shocked by the attitude of the owners towards the natural landscape. I see constant degradation of the landscape and the wild life.

Thank you,  
Caroline Ayres  
415-656-6884

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2430    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Ms. Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Susie Wong

**Correspondence ID:** 2431    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
David Press

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2432    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 10:30:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

As a resident of San Francisco and dog owner, I truly value the few parks in the city that are off-leash for dogs. I strongly urge you to allow Fort Funston and the other parks in the GGNRA that are currently off-leash for dogs to remain so. Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely yours,

Richard O'Brien

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2433    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 11:02:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In all areas I remain in favor of access for dogs by leash to the trail head. I am no longer a dog owner, but I favor off leash areas to be maintained as much as possible. Pushing dogs out of GGNRA lands completely is not a solution for the community as a whole as it will overburden county and city parks. Dog owners must be responsible in their duties to other citizens, but this does not mean that they should be categorically banished from the parks. Many dog owners love nature and love hiking,

---

and their dog is the one companion that will do it with them and make them feel safe while out on the trails alone. They deserve to use the parks responsibly.

Two areas that I use frequently I will comment on.

Stinson Beach: Map 2-F Yes/In Favor:

Comment: It shows the alternative for a dog corridor to the north end of the beach - - the corridor should be more generous. This corridor should be provided free of fear or harassment by park officials. It is a long standing solution at Stinson Beach with years of precedent. Dog owners willing comply and move to the north end of the beach. The map should include most of the area directly in front of that parking lot entrance at the north end as the dog corridor.

Oakwood Valley, Alta Trail Map 4-A Yes/In favor:

Comment: This is the best but still unreasonable. The entire area should be voice control since it is all one loop. Having areas where your dog has to be on leash in one spot and then on leash half way in creates artificial areas of conflict and harassment by park officials.

Oakwood Valley and Alta Trail are really two separate areas. I've walked between them - done the 4 mile loop from my house many times and only seen at most one other person between the two areas. The greatest disservice to the OakWood Valley are dog walkers with too many dogs. This trail is often used by older people with older dogs or puppies because of the lack of elevation change and the short distance.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2434	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 11:04:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support continuing to allow dogs off-leash at Muir Beach. Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2435	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Anselmo, CA 94960 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 11:11:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a responsible dog owner in Marin. We care about all our wonderful open space. We pick up after our dog. I support the no action alternative for dog management. There are very few places that one can go in all this wonderful open space and let your dog off leash. Please don't take them away.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2436	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94619-2152 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 11:31:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** I love dogs. I love birds. I use the GGNRA regularly, and I contribute to its conservancy.

We will still have more on-leash dog access and still be the only national park with any off-leash access if the currently proposed regulations are approved.

Any photo of birds at Crissy Field chased by off-leash dogs says it all.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2437	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not block dog owners from 99% o the GGNRA				

Th changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3 to 1 AGAINST the plan

I support the No Action Alternative in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands

SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands

Please keep the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy

The GGNRA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area & as such it requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2438	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 11:46:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and thanks also for the time and energy spent on the various options. I moved to SF in Dec 1983 and have lived here ever since. I initially lived near Sutro Park for two years prior to moving to the Ingleside Terraces, where I've lived for 28 years. I am a registered voter. I cannot speak to the specific needs and challenges of Crissey Field, Fort Miley, Fort Point or Baker Beach. While I have visited each site on occasion, I have not spent enough time at those locations to have anything more than a tourist's appreciation for those sites. I have spent a great deal of time at Ocean Beach. I am a dog owner and thus biased toward greater rather than less freedom for dogs, but I do have concerns about my fellow dog owners in terms of the sometimes lax oversight of feces removal from the beach. I think there is a reasonable expectation among visitors to the beach that dog owners be responsible for their pet's waste removal, and I regret to say that I don't think we've collectively lived up to our end of the deal when it comes to the beach. I would support a requirement that dogs				

---

remain on leash at Ocean Beach, in hopes that greater proximity to their dogs will help all us dog owners do a better job of cleaning up. I also would support on-leash requirements at Sutro Park, where I think visitors have an expectation that they can walk peacefully without worrying (as non-dog owners often do) that they will be accosted by a dog off his leash. On the other hand, I think there is a vastly different expectation of visitors to Fort Funston, and I think dog owners at FF have done a very fine job in terms of waste management. I would not support any changes to the current structure at FF. I have no environmental expertise, so I cannot dispute those who would claim that shorebirds are being unduly disrupted by dogs who chase them. I'm at FF with my 100 pound dog virtually every day that the weather allows, and I have yet to see a dog actually catch one of the birds, although perhaps that does happen and I'm just not aware of it. I have no idea how much dog-chasing of the birds is too much for the good of the birds. Simply put, Fort Funston is heaven on earth for dogs. I also see many young kids with their parents walking around FF, and the expectation of the parents appears to be similar to what mine was when our kids were younger and we went to FF: namely, there will be dogs running around, so we just need to deal with that. And we never had a problem when our kids were small, nor have I seen a problem with dogs and kids. I also have seen a much greater attention to waste management by dog owners at FF than at Ocean Beach. Not sure why that is, but perhaps we have a greater sense of pride of ownership at FF. Thanks again for the opportunity to comment, and please note that I firmly oppose any changes to Fort Funston, but would support on-lease requirements at Ocean Beach and Sutro. I don't have enough experience at the other sites to comment knowledgeably.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2439	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

I am a nine year resident of San Francisco, and what drew me to the area was how dog rights, dog-owner rights, and recreation were all prioritized and balanced. I have lived in Cole Valley and Noe valley, and visit on a weekly basis Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Golden Gate Park. I derive much pleasure from walking with my dog off-leash in the GGNRA, along with my husband and newborn. In fact, this is one of the reasons why we are opting to NOT move into the suburbs with our new baby.

Specifically:

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no

explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Thank you for supporting our rights and balancing the need for true recreation.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2440	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 11:59:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA and has lived in San Francisco for almost 40 years, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many

years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Michael LaBrie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2441	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. It could have a negative impact on pet health & welfare, as the SPCA has warned.				

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979, which is one of the aspects of the Bay Area that make it such an attractive place for active people and dog owners alike to live. Revoking this access would decrease the value of our property (we live in close proximity to one of the GGNRA areas), and is counter to the spirit of the Bay Area a whole.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2442	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 12:10:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	One only has to look at pictures taken of Fort Funston or the Presidio before and after significant dog use to see the impact of off leash dogs. There are holes all over, clearly dug by dogs and native brush torn up all over the place. So while I totally understand the passion for dogs people have in the Bay Area, I think it blinds people to the impact of such a large dog population.				

---

My wife and I hike the trails from Mount Tam to Montara and beyond. In almost every case we encounter off leash dogs, chasing wild life, thrashing through sensitive habitat. Often we see 4 or 5 bags of dog poop on the trail. It seems to be a custom for owners to pick it up but forget to retrieve on the way back. That is both unsightly and unconscionable littering pristine trails. It wins no favor on our part.

Sometimes we see off leash dogs and their owners right next to signs that specifically say no dogs, or dogs on leash. If we mention it we invariable get hostility and bullying in return.

A few days ago a friend logged into Facebook asking how to get skunk off her dog and out of her house. There were a lot of sympathetic replies, but the underlying cause was the fact that she lets her dog off the leash all the time. This is just one of the important reasons to obey to leash laws.

What if your off leash dog encounters a rabid raccoon? What if your dog upsets a mountain lion or a den of coyotes or gets bitten by a rattlesnake? or gets poison oak all over his coat? or brings lyme infested ticks that jump to your children?

There are good reasons to obey leash laws, and no good reasons to bully people who expect that they should be followed.

On a hike to Baker beach the other day I saw no less than 10 dogs off leash in the Presidio and all over the Baker Beach area. My wife and I were having a private conversation about it and one of the dog owners butted in and attempted to provoke an argument on the subject. We weren't even talking to her. This is how deep the sense of entitlement is with dog owners. I told the woman that it was not up to us to argue about it here and that the legislature would make decisions.

On the way back from the hike I stopped to chat with a Park Police officer to inquire about the leash laws. I just wanted to know. He seemed shaken and told me that one part of Baker Beach is off leash and the other is no dogs and that the Presidio is always leash only. The young officer then shared with me that there is an unspoken agreement NOT to enforce leash laws because of the bullying of dog owners. He said they gang up and personally attack him, report him, and accuse him of horrible things that tie him up on court on his off time and that he was frankly powerless to enforce the law.

This is unacceptable. No demographic should be allowed to intimidate rangers, peace officers or other hikers, not ever.

Our opinion is that areas should be clearly marked for off leash, on leash and no dogs and enforcement should be stepped up to firmly establish the habit of obeying the law.

Our family loves animals and has had dogs and other pets all our lives. We are not against dogs or dog ownership, rather we are pro responsible dog ownership. What we are against are weaponized dogs, aggressive dog owners and people who let their animals tear up and pollute our parks like they are entitled to do so.

The park services are always short on funding. Enforcing the leash and no dog areas laws would not only send a clear message to dog owners where and where not to exercise dog privileges, but raise revenue for education, signs and other important programs. Those who scoff the law should be ticketed, fined and people bullying the law should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2443 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** davis, CA 95616  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:15:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** there is such limited space for dogs off leash to enjoy the thousands of miles of ocean coastline in this country. removing even more seems narrow minded and petty, especially petty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2444    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:17:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I regularly use the GGNRA, and I'd like to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. Doesn't the GGNRA stand for RECREATION AREA? The new restrictions will make it close to impossible to enjoy these parks (especially Fort Funston, where I hike with my adorable mini-goldendoodle, Tika, every weekend). Please know that I do this for my own health as well as Tika's.

.

The concerns/objections that many people expressed over the initial plan seem to have been disregarded, as no substantive changes were incorporated into the "revised" plan. In addition, has there been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas?

Sincerely,  
Theresa Ruppe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2445    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:18:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I renew my strenuous objection to this "dog management" plan. The NPS has been deceptive throughout and continues to be so in this "updated" report that fails take into account account thousands of comments adverse to the plan. The 1979 Off-Lease Dog Plan has served everyone's needs and has been validated by a Federal Judget as having been properly implemented. We do not need more restrictions. When the off-lease conversation began in 2000, we were assured that a brief restriction on the cliffs to the immediate west of the paved path would be temporary; this area was never restored. Then dozens of acres of flats above the cliffs and at the far north end of Ft. Funston were fenced, an act the Federal Judge found had no basis in law or fact. None has been restored.

The NPS claims the needs of the snowy plover trump everything, but in 14 years they have not updated their science, even when proved wrong, such as claiming dog shadows frightened the plovers from nesting when the trajectory of the sun makes this impossible. Further, the cliffs on the north end of the

---

park have totally eroded away. Not because of dogs or people, just because of Mother Nature. The park is changing all the time due to weather. Dogs and their owners shouldn't be penalized for that fact.

I can live with the fences, but there is no basis to further restrict off-leash use of Ft. Funston. I favor more widespread publicity of and enforcement of the 1979 Dog Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2446    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:21:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We all love San Francisco and the charm the city has to offer. Over the past few years us locals have seen a change with all the new developments and newcomers to our city. We have embraced these changes however don't take away what we see as our local gems. We are ones who will stand behind our city when the newcomers move onto the next best thing. We know how to be responsible for ourselves and treat our animals like family. Please reconsider this proposal. Our Madison just learned how to swim last month. Don't take that way!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2447    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:33:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Stephanie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2448    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Los Gatos, CA 95032  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,07,2014 12:58:45**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have utilized Chrissy Field & Fort Funston for years with my dogs. Please do not close these wonderful areas for our dogs to be dogs. There are fewer & fewer areas for people & their dogs to roam freely & enjoy the outdoors, don't take that away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2449 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-2836

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:03:50**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2450 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:15:07**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** You should let dogs off leash at parks and beaches because dogs are really happy without their leash. It's like someone holding you by your neck 24/7. It's really uncomfortable. It's not just dogs who need to be free sometimes; some people have birds. Birds need to fly and Excercise or else their wing muscles will be really weak and that won't be good. It's not really a dogs fault if it chases you. You probably provoked it, or maybe it's just playing with you. They won't really attack you unless they're really bad. Even if you did make ban dogs from being off leashed, I'd still let them play freely because that's a really dumb rule.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2451 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Belvedere, CA 94920

United States of America



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:24:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Edgar Peters Bowron and I live in Belvedere, California. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Crissy Field, Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Trail, Muir Beach, and Stinson Beach, for the past thirteen years. I exercise there with my dog off leash and under voice control both for my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I oppose the preferred alternative for these areas because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the 2013 SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area, not a national park. The GGNRA was built and designed for dog walking from its inception, to better the quality of life of San Francisco metropolitan residents by making dog walking a well-established priority. In fact, Congressional reports at the time referred to dog walking specifically as one of the uses for the space when the GGNRA was created.

Moreover, in my experience, many of these areas are utilized primarily by dog walkers and not by visitors without dogs. Take Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Trail, for example. I often make note of the people I meet on the trail and irrespective of day of the week or time of day, approximately only two of every ten visitors are accompanied by a dog. When I count the visitors with and without dogs on the actual beach at Crissy Field, as opposed to the bike and walking path, a similar ratio prevails.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the 2013 SEIS was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the DEIS released in 2011, opposing the proposals in that plan by a margin of 3:1.

Moreover, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The SEIS document admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show how these areas are affected by the presence of dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), and instead cites anecdotal observations made by National Park Service staff. However, such anecdotal claims have no validity and cannot be used to set policy. I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer-reviewed studies (as required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

The SEIS does not provide the results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the "Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA" document on the GGNRA website). You say you received over 4,700 comments, but do not specify how many respondents opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS reads: "NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas (p. 100)." But there's no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3: 1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS. Rather, a community forum or roundtable should be set up to evaluate management going forward, including dog walkers and other GGNRA users.

Instead of curtailing off-leash privileges, the GGNRA could institute a dog "green tag" system - which certifies dogs and their owners to use the area. Irresponsible dog owners should have their privileges

suspended, instead of all people losing access to a particular dog walking area.

In conclusion, I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive- -there is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy as well as off-leash access on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. And, I urge the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Edgar Peters Bowron

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2452    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:30:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off leash play is essential to the human and animal integrity that is so preeminent of San Francisco. This city has a reputation for being home to the most responsible pet owner and most personality-filled dogs. Off leash play is a way for urban dogs AND owner alike to unwind, enjoy nature freely and embrace the plentiful green space that SF offers. Banning off-leash play will compromise the unique charter of our very city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2453    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** WaveWorks Coaching Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:31:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am a responsible dog owner who lives in San Francisco & loves sharing its recreational areas with my dog. She is a well-behaved creature whose joy in running off-leash and free (where allowed) gives me joy & helps me combat depression.

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

Unfortunately, I understand that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. I have also learned that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. It seems to me, as a result of this information, that this plan is ill-considered and should not be adopted as a result.

I'm probably most upset that the GGNRA doesn't seem aligned with its purpose which is to provide a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-

leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please consider the mounting opposition to this plan and re-consider implementing the alternatives currently on the table. There has to be a plan that will work better for both sides.

Sincerely,

Anne Moellering  
9 Coleridge Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2454	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 13:38:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** San Francisco is a wonderfully diverse community and a common thread that brings many of us together is our love and passion for our dogs and responsibly using the beautiful park to exercise ourselves and our dogs. This plan will drastically restrict our opportunity to come together as a community and create a very congested and challenging problem for dog owners to walk our dogs. Almost every dog owner views their dog as a part of their immediate family and stress the importance of keeping them safe and healthy.

It seems like this ban is punishing the many to curb the behavior of the few. I have utilized these parks daily and have seen VERY few irresponsible owners not controlling or picking up after their dogs. There is no way to enforce every rule for every owner but for every one complaint, there are hundreds of positive and valuable interactions that leave this city as a better place to live.

San Francisco is a progressive city that understands the importance of inclusivity and this ban targets dog owners and forces us to choose between our loving family members and the city we call home. We live in such an urban area, backyards are virtually nonexistent, thus our parks are even more valuable to us than citizens that do not have dogs.

On a completely different but related note, as tax payers, we pay incredibly high taxes to live in this city and use of our public parks are part of what we pay for. If we are severely restricted to use what we are paying for, why are we paying for it?

This ban is targeting dog owners as a public nuisance during a time where there are SO many more and bigger issues at hand. There is a large population of homeless people who live in the parks and also have dogs. Why are these vagabonds who do not pay taxes allowed to continue to live in the park but responsible tax paying citizens of the city are being squeezed and targeted with this ban.

I have faith that this ban will be struck down by responsible city officials and passionate owners who desperately need these locations to keep a quality of life that will allow us to continue to live in the city.

Thank you,

Joe Lijek  
Owner of Truman, the Prince of San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2455    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:47:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On June 3, 2013 I was bitten by one of three off leash dogs while walking on a path adjacent to my home in San Rafael. I have used this path several times weekly for 19 years, both with our family dog and in the past few years after our dog died at age 15. After I was bitten on the back of my right leg, I lost my balance and fell. I was taken by ambulance to Kaiser Emergency in San Rafael. It was several weeks before I could resume my daily activities, including driving, pain free. I am of Medicare age.

The dogs in question were running free in a City of San Rafael area known as Jerry Russom Park that merges with Marin County Open Space. The owners were strolling the 3/4 mile path (Old Lucas Valley Road) some distance away while the dogs ran free into the City of San Rafael portion of the path that clearly posts a leash law ordinance.

Please maintain areas in GGNRA that prohibit dogs (Tennessee Valley) and that require dogs to be on leash so that I can have safe places to walk. Even friendly dogs can jump on me and cause me to fall. (I am 100 pounds and 66 years old, five feet tall) Please do not make dogs more important than people. Dog owners may be louder and more vocal than some of the rest of us, but every neighbor who knows my experience has told me of intimidation by off leash dogs and disrespectful dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2456    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:49:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to voice my concern for curtailing dog use of GGNRA areas. There are very few venues left for dogs to enjoy and run off leash. High energy dogs can be walked for miles without really getting the exercise they need. They need space to run and chase, swim and play, Crissy field is a perfect spot as the dogs can swim and swim and fetch balls in the bay. A dog on leash can never do this. I am a regular visitor at Crissy field and Stinson Beach specifically because they are dog friendly outings where they are allowed to run and play with the family. I sincerely hope you are able to work the rules to allow dogs off leash access while keeping the areas open for human visitors and protecting wildlife and habitat. Thank you. Amy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2457    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 13:57:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Responsible off leash controlled dogs should be continued to be allowed in as many areas of the GGNRA as possible. This document only further restricts the few and small remaining areas to dogs and I request this is reconsidered.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2458    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:19:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2459    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Perhaps more education for dog owners, and fines for dogs not under voice control or for not cleaning up could be implemented. But I see no reason to punish the many responsible dog owners with an overly restrictive plan. The GGNRA should be for all the people, especially the local San Francisco residents, a large percentage of whom own dogs.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

---

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Sheila Stuart  
756 12th Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94118

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2460	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Piedmont, CA 94611 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

For many years, my entire family has vacationed at Stinson Beach, a group that has always included our Black Labs. We walk regularly with our dogs in other areas of the GGNRA, so I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me and my family from recreating with my dog for our own health and my dog's health the way we have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo and Marin County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Matt Guidi

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2461	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 14:50:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern, Please reconsider these drastic measures you are about to employ. You must not care about thousands upon thousands of people and dogs				

---

Whose quality of life you will be infringing upon. May mercy find its way  
Into your hearts....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2462    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 14:59:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In response to the Audubon opinion in the SF Chronicle, 2/7/14, by Michael Lynes  
I am so tired of the Audubon Society blaming the dogs for everything. What about the coyotes, raccoons,  
skunks and

crows that eat the eggs of shorebirds in the nesting areas. Should they have leashes? I am a responsible  
dog walker at Baker Beach. We have crows, sea gulls and some sandpipers and NO snowy plovers so  
why must this beach have off leash restrictions?

We clean up the beach daily and help with safety for folks that recreate. I personally know a dog walker  
who saved a life of someone drowning. Naked men are offensive to families and no one cites them. Since  
there are more dogs than children it is unfair that law abiding dog owners get cited as a group to pick on.  
SF can set off fireworks that spew so much detritus into the ocean and beaches (that I personally have  
cleaned up) and that is an environmental hazard that goes unnoticed. Tankers can spill oil which damages  
the shoreline and wildlife. In addition to Fleet Week, those are far more serious issues, not people  
enjoying exercise on the beach with their dogs. During the two year reg negotiations the Audubon people  
derailed any compromise and wanted to put up fences everywhere which I thought was not a good  
solution. They do not want even humans in their so called bird areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2463    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:05:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed on the plans of having to ban off leash walks at Ft. Funston. I am a  
San Francisco Firefighter and Ft. Funston is where I go with my dog to destress. It is where I relax after  
working my shifts and where I get my bearings. Seeing my dog free from a day of being inside makes me  
feel grounded and where my dog is free... Please reconsider making Ft. Funston as a leash FREE for dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2464    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:05:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am a responsible dog owner who lives in San Francisco & loves sharing its recreational areas with my  
dog. He is a well-behaved creature whose joy in running off-leash and free (where allowed) gives me joy

---

& helps me combat depression. I grew up on a ranch in Wyoming, and being at places at Fort Funston where he can run free are the only things that keep me sane in the city, thus truly the only things that keep me here in the city.

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

Unfortunately, I understand that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. I have also learned that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. It seems to me, as a result of this information, that this plan is ill-considered and should not be adopted as a result.

I'm probably most upset that the GGNRA doesn't seem aligned with its purpose which is to provide a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I am not saying every area has to be dog-friendly, but you're thinking of making us leash-up at Fort Funston, are you kidding me? Where else can I go let him run free on the beach?

Please consider the mounting opposition to this plan and re-consider implementing the alternatives currently on the table. There has to be a plan that will work better for both sides.

Sincerely,

Liz Rumsey, 552 Precita Ave., SF, CA 94110

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2465	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 15:20:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern,				

I would just like to take a moment to express my strongest possible disagreement with the proposals to make GGNRA an on-leash only space.

As the owner of two dogs living in San Francisco, these areas are critical areas I need to keep my dogs exercised. A move as radical as this severely restricts how much free-running exercise my beloved dogs can get. this is bad for me, bad for my dogs, and terrible for city parks, which will become overrun with these areas now off limits. And that's just for me, and owner of two dogs. What are the city's dog walkers going to do? In addition to preventing so many wonderful animals from getting good exercise, you'll also be contributing to people losing their jobs.

I have spent years going to Fort Funston, and know it to be a clean, well taken care of area. If certain sections need to be cordoned off, just do that, please, please don't take this great resource away! Find another way to do what you need to do, but this is simply not the answer.



- Ron Mee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2466    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:47:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please, please don't disallow my dog from going to Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. It is the best place and form of exercise for him and we have a great time there. Also, we have never had a problem with people or other dogs because the place is so spread-out. The smaller dog parks are dangerous because they are like prison yards.

Thank you,

John D'Amario

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2467    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 15:52:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jason Woodbury  
Redwood City

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2468    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Eureka, CA 95501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,07,2014 16:05:17**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the the GGNRA's latest dog management plan. I support the 1979 pet policy which was created to ensure recreational off leash dog walking.

The proposed changes to the 1979 pet policy are too restrictive and will drastically limit my ability to exercise at Crissy Field, Fort Funston and Ocean Beach.

The GGNRA should not be aligned with National Parks because it is a RECREATION AREA. The fact that the GGNRA is in a densely populated urban area makes it all the more critical to preserve its recreational uses.

Please expand off leash dog walking in the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2469 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,07,2014 16:35:02**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I can't count the number of times a nice day at Funston has ended with dog feces on the sole of my, or my children's, shoe. Additional packs of dogs led by walkers are almost always roaming the beaches playing with each other with no regard for small children. Several times we've had to physically intervene with dogs before they've run over kids.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2470 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,07,2014 16:53:11**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I want to be able to walk my dogs off leash.

They are the 2 sweetest calmest dogs you'll ever meet. It is essential to their physical and mental well being to get the exercise they can only get from off leash play.

There are already very few places left in the city where this is allowed, so I make a 30 minute trip to Crissy Fields 3 times a week so can they can get this essential exercise.

I have lived in the Sunset area of San Francisco, where I own my house, for over 50 years. I dutifully pay my taxes to the state and the city so that public services such as the park system can survive.

If off leash dog walking is banned in Crissy Fields, I, along with thousands of dog owners, would seriously have to consider moving to a place where off leash dog walking is allowed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2471 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:00:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to oak ridge

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Brandon Hendrickson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2472    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:02:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Susie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2473    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Andreas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2474    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:11:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The Golden Gate National Recreation Area has released a plan to dramatically cut where people can walk with their dogs in San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo counties. I am writing to oppose this plan. Please let us keep walking our dogs, responsibly, in the GGNR.

Thanks,

Martin Sabelli

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2475    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Cave Junction, OR 97523  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:13:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I went to graduate school in SF and I was able to deal with living in a big city with a big dogs because of the wonderful off-leash parks available. Happy dogs need a place to run free especially in the city where they need to be confined most of the time. Dogs improve the quality of life because they make you go outside to walk them so let's keep areas open for creatures to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2476    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:27:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** GGNRA's new proposal is arbitrary and capricious, not based in valid science. It is also an unjustified "taking" of lands given in trust by the City of San Francisco. Is this another egregious example of Federal overreaching? I am requesting this proposal should be immediately reviewed at a higher level and rejected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2477    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:34:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2478    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 17:37:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Mara Klein

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2479	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Millbrae, CA 94030 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 17:40:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please.....let's get real. There is no need to push dogs out of all these places. There is room for all.of us. It is cruel to limit where an and,al can go with their "owner"				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2480	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 17:46:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am opposed to the closing of the beaches to dogs as long as they are on-leash. As long as owners act responsibly in the care of dogs, their droppings, and other behaviors, I can see no valid reason to bar this particular animal from the beaches. After all, it is the human animal that is less likely to behave at its best! ...Respectfully submitted, Shira Marin				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2481	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 17:53:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Annaliese Furnas and I live in the Castro district of San Francisco. I'm disabled, and my therapy dog needs more exercise than I can give him.				

Three years ago, I started sending my dog to Fort Funston with a wonderful dog walker. He's never been happier. I had tried small off-leash parks around the city, but he's a large dog and those parks are too small, and too crowded for him to get the exercise he needs each day.

After going to Fort Funston, he was calmer, happier, and better able to serve as my service dog.

PLEASE don't put the proposed restrictive changes into effect.

â€ I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

---

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â€ I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

â€ I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Annaliese Furnas

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2482	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 17:57:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Melinda Stephenson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2483	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 18:07:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** vast areas of land and the beaches of this beautiful coast are not just for humans to enjoy. Animals, specifically dogs, are a part of our lives and our families. This will be a detriment to the active lifestyles that so many Californians lead. In terms of the health of the animals, it is a proven fact that problems arise with dogs that are cooped up and have no outlet to run free. If this plan is enacted it will be the core reason for a multitude of new problems.

**Correspondence ID:** 2484    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94804  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 18:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kelly J Barkan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2485    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 18:41:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern,

I am very concerned about losing any offleash rights especially at Fort Funston where we have taken our dog many times over the last year. The ability to run with our dog and let her socialize with other dogs in an open and safe environment is especially important in a city like San Francisco where there is not a lot of open space throughout the city. Residents should be able to get to a nearby recreation area without needing to restrict their activities when it is unclear that there is significant environmental impact (based on well-accepted scientific data). Please make sure that there continues to be unabated availability of places where we can take our dog so that she may run and play like the rest of us.

Sincerely,  
MHC  
Potrero Hill, San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2486    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:03:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My dog is never happier and healthier than when she is running after her ball, running and playing with other dogs, jumping into the ocean, and experiencing the other great moments that she can only experience in the great off-leash play areas of Ft Funston, Chrissy Field, Ocean Beach, Baker beach.

I love living in San Francisco because it's such a great inclusive city, a city where everyone can be who they are and live their life to the fullest. That should of course apply to our canine family members as well. The play areas near my home have slowly converted to 'Posted: no dogs' areas - so now the off-leash areas like Stern Grove, Ft Funston, Ocean Beach, etc. are about the only park areas for dogs to play - with each other and with their owners.

Please don't reduce these off-leash areas that are vital for the health and proper socialization and exercise of my dog and thousands like her. Since half the residents of San Francisco have dogs, they're an important part of the fabric of our great city and I speak for them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2487    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:11:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For my husband and I,taking our 19 mo. old cockapoo, Maeby, to Fort Funston is a weekly treat. We love that we are only 10 minutes from our house, but it feels like another world: epic cliffs, beautiful vistas and an abundance of wildlife. Maeby gets so excited to run the beach that she shivers the whole way there and practically bursts out of the car upon our arrival. She loves running down the beach, chasing her toy in the waves and rolling around in the sand. She is normally filthy by the time we leave, but it's well worth the joy it brings us all.

When we have family or friends in town we take them to 'Doggy Heaven' and they always understand what we mean once there. The joy you see in the dogs and their owners cannot be found elsewhere in the Bay Area, let alone the country I believe. Visitors are always quick to exclaim that this is the best thing they did their entire trip and it is the most special part of San Francisco.

Limiting the dogs to leashes at Fort Funston would diminish the purpose and draw of this magical place, which is to be free and natural. I have never once seen a dog out of control, a dog owner littering or people disrespecting the natural environment. Rather, I constantly see dog owners cleaning up after others on the beach and bringing the trash up to the receptacles. We owners are the ones who want to keep this place safe for our dogs and clean for the other wildlife.

I urge you to reconsider leashing our pets and consider other methods. Voice control, trail markers and other guidelines would still allow all to enjoy Fort Funston yet keep the natural habitat safe. Consider this: How would you feel if our National Parks were taken away? Our place to disconnect from the world and experience nature. This is what I feel Fort Funston is to our dogs. This is there place to disconnect quit literally from their leashes and run free as nature intended.

Thank you for listening and taking my thoughts into consideration.

Warm Regards,

Anna Mumm

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2488    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:20:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not move forward with the proposed limitations to off-leash areas. San Franciscans love our dogs, but it's hard for dogs to get enough exercise in a city. Vast off-leash areas are necessary for many dogs, including mine, to get the exercise they (and their human friends) so desperately need! When my sweet sheltie mix does not get sufficient exercise (and multiple on-leash walks per day are not enough, nor are trips to the tiny fenced in dog runs) she becomes a nervous wreck, and she begins annoyance behaviors such as barking.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive and there are no good reasons for these changes. No studies have documented an adverse impact of dogs on the environments in these areas. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences also destroy the wonderful natural beauty of scenic locations such as Crissy Field.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please listen to the public! These changes will be harmful to the health of dogs, and reduce the joy that us humans take in having healthy and happy canine friends. Please keep San Francisco and surrounding areas a welcoming place of natural beauty that we can ALL enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2489    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:22:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Life is stressful enough! Please don't take the enjoyment out off seeing our loving dogs run and enjoy their day at the beach as dogs love.....FREE!

Thank you,

M. I. R.

(A responsible dog owner, as the great majority is)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2490    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:25:40

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Sirs,

Concerning Rancho Corral De Tierra, where I live near Montara. For years and years the community has enjoyed this area as dog-accessible. Very few, if any, problems were reported before NPS took over.

Now NPS is in charge and the community of dog-owners (who are very close to the majority of Montara residents) are all but excluded. Not only that, but NPS is showing an aggressive attitude and the use of potentially lethal force against those dog walkers who dare to use the land in the fashion that they are accustomed to, and have been allowed to, for decades.

These plans are a huge overreach and a draconian burden on all dog-owners, especially those in San Mateo County where so much open land in GGNRA. There is no effort for a fair balance at all; and all the exclusions seem clearly based on politics, not science.

I can only ask that you please please reconsider these plans. Allow more dog walking in GGNRA San Mateo County lands - - most especially in those areas like Rancho Corral De Tierra and Pedro Point Highlands that have been available to dog walkers for generations (and are no small reason why we live here).

I fear what will be in the next plan: Put a fence around it and exclude all humans too, perhaps? No doubt there are elements in the power structure at NPS who would favor that plan too!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2491	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 19:29:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Bruce Cyr

**Correspondence ID:** 2492    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:50:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In a city like San Francisco, where most of us are dwelling in apartment complexes, condos or homes without yards, these public spaces are critical to the health of our families and the canine population.

Dogs need training, socialization, play and love to live happy, healthy lives. With the growing population of more aggressive dogs, like pit bulls, this is even more critical. If aggressive dogs are not socialized and trained properly, they can turn against humans at the least provocation. And, we know how that usually ends.

The neighborhood based off-leash sites in San Francisco have diminished greatly over the past few years and the Golden Gate National Recreation areas are an important part of a healthy city ecosystem.

Please don't eliminate this key resource for our families and our canine companions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2493    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:50:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the GGNRA's plan to restrict dog access to vulnerable bird and wildlife nesting and foraging areas. The birds and wildlife have no voice; they just become extinct as their home is trampled and destroyed. I'm sick and tired of irresponsible dog owners who allow their dogs to litter the beaches and trails with dog shit. They ruin the area for everyone. I hope you do right by the birds and wildlife; their home territories are shrinking. BTW, I own a dog. I don't let her off leash and don't take her to any off leash areas. The one time I did, the place was disgusting. Every couple of feet, I found dog shit among the shrubbery and along the trail. It was truly gross and I left and have never gone back.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2494    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 19:54:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F and support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2495    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:25:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My husband and I are 100% fr the BAN OF DOGS on the sites in your proposal. Bottom line, people let them run around and do not have control of the dogs as much as they think they do. We've had aggressive dogs come to us and the owner(s) refuse to admit the dog(s) are aggressive. We have also witnessed dogs attacking wildlife. The wildlife and trails need our support and care. It's not all about them and their dogs, it's the bigger picture of protecting habitat etc. So you know, I help nonprofits like Animals Legal Defense Fund and In Defense of Animals to name a couple, I'm for the rights of animals and their welfare. However, when it comes to dogs and the beach/trails, it's out of control and we must protect the wildlife's habitat. Don't think that the people are the majority that have written in, they are not. While at Muir Beach, the last two time we went, we had to recuse sick sea bird(s) by calling Marin Humane Society (also a client) so they could take them to WildCare. In the meantime, I had to stay near the birds to keep people's dogs away from the birds. So much for having a good time at the beach. As someone that was born in S. Marin, I respect the land and wildlife. I'm for helping the wildlife thrive and survive. People are the problem, they are narcissists with dogs reeking havoc on the trails and beaches. They go on trails not designated for dogs, they ignore the signs and if you ask any Park Ranger, they become belligerent and sometimes violent when asked to leave. Please do the right thing for the beaches and trails, vote to ban them. It's time to do this now as the population continues to grow and so will the amount of dogs, the destruction will only get worse.

Thank you  
The Polas

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2496	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 20:32:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I regularly play with my dog in the Fort Funston park of the GGNRA.  
I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from playing with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for the past 8 years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Peter Olfe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2497    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 20:45:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am very against this proposed dog management plan. I am a dog owner and also have been a dog walker for the past 10 years. I walk and hike Crissy Field and Baker Beach several times a day. I love and appreciate the opportunity to use these parks for personal enjoyment and for work. I understand the need for protecting the parks, but these parks are used daily by San Francisco and Bay area residents. I even occasionally meet people that have traveled (from other states) with their dogs to be able to experience our offleash parks. This plan will affect the people that actually use and enjoy the parks on a DAILY bases. Reducing the areas where dogs are allowed are only going to consolidate the dog/people use areas and those areas will become overused and damaged. There are more dogs than children in this city and they need the ability to be off leash. The San Franciscan residents that use these parks on a daily bases, have dogs. San Francisco is able to have so many dogs in such a small area because of the ability of being offleash. Dogs get the exercise and socialization they need, reducing problems in the neighborhoods and at the park.

This plan is far too strict and needs to be changed. Think of the people that actually use and love these parks. Who trusts a person that doesn't like dogs anyways?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2498    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fremont, CA 94539  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 21:17:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** California wants to welcome everyone. That has driven property values so high that most of us cannot afford a decent size yard, even with a decent salary. Therefore, we must rely on public land to exercise ourselves and our dogs. We all pay into it, and enough of us have dogs to justify our being able to use it.

I have no children, yet pay excessive taxes and fees to support the public schools. Is it to much to ask that I can use the land that I have paid for to spend time with my dog?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2499    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 21:28:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel that this would be a huge mistake to ban dogs from many of San Francisco's parks. Many local residence enjoy these parks do so only for the reason that it is a beautiful place they can enjoy with their pets.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2500    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 21:46:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ben

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2501    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Animal Communication Plus Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 21:56:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs bring their humans out into open space for walks and relaxation and it is important that the humans get out more in nature. We are shortening our lives working so hard and our animals are helping us get out in Nature. it is SOOOOO important to keep the trails open for the people who are using them. PLEASE do not waste any more time on this, and leave well enough alone. I do not know who has started this, and why, but it does not make sense. Barbara Martin 925-708-1979

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2502    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 22:24:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi there,  
I grew up with dogs and love the dog culture in San Francisco. I hope we can preserve the fun and free spirited parks with room for kids, adults and dogs to run around and play. As long as dogs are behaved and any messes taken care of. I see no need for this restriction.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2503    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 23:13:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am originally from Ohio, and one of the main benefits of living in the Bay Area is access to beautiful park space. Being able to access these parks off-leash with my dog is also a huge benefit that adds to the quality of our life. Most dog owners and walkers respectfully and responsibly use these parks knowing how beneficial off-leash access is. Please do not take this away from the responsible dog owners & walkers in the Bay Area!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2504    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 23:21:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Michael Labrie 47 Powers Ave. SF, CA 94110

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2505    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 23:48:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support well behaved dogs under voice control being able to enjoy GGNP areas that are not environmentally sensitive,.

---



---

**Correspondence ID:** 2506    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 01:41:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs need space to run or else they can get aggressive or cause other problems. And there are a lot of the dogs in this city. Are you sure you want to do this? It is a bad idea. Chrissy frill seems to have struck a nice balance between dogs and nature.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2507    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 01:43:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Limiting the number the number of dogs per walker is important to public safety and, potentially, to protecting the Park against liability. In my extensive experience with dogs (10 years working as both volunteer and staff, particularly at Fort Funston) I find that one aggressive dog can usually be handled by facing it and speaking loudly and authoritatively. However, a large pack (and most dog walkers have 8 or more dogs) may have two or more aggressive dogs, and when that happens they behave like a hunting pack, circling an individual so that only one dog can be faced at a time. Furthermore, a group of dogs will behave far more aggressively than an individual. All of this is in addition to the difficulty of controlling a large group. The current sizes of dogs groups with a single walker make the park experience risky and unpleasant for other users, and frequently for other dog walkers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2508    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 02:03:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner in San Francisco, a responsible dog owner. I am retired, I own my home and I pay property, Federal, and State taxes; I pay a lot of taxes; and I vote. My two small dogs are well behaved both on and off leash. My dogs love people of all stripes, and people of all stripes love my dogs. The three of us are a regular feature in this City. There are far too few areas in this City where my dogs can run free. Dogs need to run free, they n-e-e-d to run free, and the GGNNRA draft dog management plan fails in its responsibility to provide adequate off-leash space.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2509    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 08:57:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** We are frequent visitors to area parks and open space and would like to request that the National Parks Service limit off-leash areas. We would like to feel safe during our visits and not have to worry about whether dogs we encounter are friendly or not. Seeing dogs off-leash in the GGNRA negatively affects our decision to visit the park. We are in favor of Alternative D, the highest overall level of protection for natural and cultural resources and the highest overall level of visitor safety. Protect and ensure a safe environment for everyone.

Suggestion: Can you make the link to this Comments page easier to locate on your website? Currently, it is necessary to follow links or drill down to find the comment page. Perhaps you can make the link stand out somehow with bold text in a different size or color?

Thanks!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2510	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 09:04:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As a resident of San Francisco, off leash play areas are an integral part of the city and the Bay Area's identity. Owning a dog not only provides exercise and other health benefits for the owners, but also teaches children responsibility and care towards other living things, which in turn helps them respect nature.

My family uses Chrissy Field for off leash areas and we hike in other parks as well in San Mateo County. I oppose the plan to close the land to off leash access, but I do support the 1979 Pet Policy WITH off leash access in San Mateo County and on any new, acquired lands.

I lived for eight years in Chicago, where off leash parks are sparse, and the ones that were there were small, jammed under elevated subway train tracks (the EL), and fenced in. What this led to were too many dogs crammed into a small place, resulting in dog fights and in some cases child injuries.

I am especially concerned about the fact that public comment overwhelmingly runs against the new dog management plan and that this is not being taken into consideration. Our parks belong to us. The whole mission of the park system is to preserve the parks "for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations." As I stated previously, families taking out dogs and dogs being walked by responsible professionals is an appropriate use of park lands that enables them to be enjoyed and future generations to learn about parks, the importance of them, and humans' responsibility in the world.

I greatly hope that this management plan is rethought and off leash areas are kept at the current level.

Sincerely,

Larisa Beckwith  
San Francisco, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2511	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,08,2014 09:04:32**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please save us from the off-leash dogs in our parks. It is bad enough that owners let them off-leash in our neighborhoods. Please limit their off-leash areas in the GGNRA by implementing Alternative D! It's a consistent and fair practice. Save the natural environment and provide a better, safer experience for all visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2512 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,08,2014 09:04:49**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The fort funston site is a well managed, well policed dog park enjoyed by residents of its two surrounding counties. It offers a recreational socializing site for dog owners as well as dogs. Owners are able to converse without worry of their dogs being in danger. The wide open space is singular amongst dog parks in california. We do not wish the site carved up into tunnels of overuse for a potential gain in a particular plant species. With that logic we would raze the mission to re-establish the mission blue butterfly in the non-existent watershed.

Leave the fort alone and let dog owners enjoy their only large, worry free park in northern california!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2513 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,08,2014 09:16:08**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We support Alternative D. Off-leash dogs destroy the experience for the rest of us who are either afraid of dogs or want an experience that does not include off-leash dogs. Frankly, most dogs we have come across are not under voice-control especially when in they are with other dogs; they are unpredictable and/or not friendly. Dog owners too are often unfriendly and can be quite belligerent when asked to leash their dogs in on-leash areas. We shouldn't be made to feel unreasonable in requesting that they abide the law. Help!! Please protect us and the environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2514 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,08,2014 09:17:22**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:**

I beg you not to close the Mori Bluff Trail and Upper Mori trail to dogs! I walk my two very well behaved dogs, on leash, on those trails several times a week. You are already closing most of Pacifica off to dog access. Please please please keep these open - - I have walked that loop for years! It is close to my house and I don't want to have to drive to some other place. While I can still walk trails, please keep my favorites open!

**Correspondence ID:** 2515    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 09:21:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Why not charge a permit fee to bring dogs? I would happily pay 100 dollars a year to bring my dogs to GGNRA - - but with the currently level of access. With permits, dog numbers will decrease, and it will raise much needed money for enforcement.

The new proposed plan is still far too restrictive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2516    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 09:22:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Kevin Green

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2517    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Dolores Park Dogs Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 09:47:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please leave the Off Leash areas as they are. If you must change them, add MORE space for off leash exercise and play. According to a study reported by the American Psychological Assoc, people with pets are happier, healthier and better adjusted than those without. Pets and people need exercise to get to or maintain a healthy body and mind. What better exercise than going to the beach

to walk and run around. San Francisco is currently constructing a lot of condos and apartments, many of which will allow pets. City parks are already crowded and the GGNRA areas are a great place to go to lessen the crowds. Please DO NOT take away the off leash areas!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2518    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94705  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 10:00:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are already many limits to off leash walking in the Bay Area. Many dog people must travel to find adequate exercise for their dogs. An un-exercised dog is an unhappy dog and an unhappy dog-owner. From what I have read there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation. Please keep off leash areas open!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2519    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Brisbane, CA 94005  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 10:03:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The parks belong to the people and their best friend, not to elitist bureaucrats. If you can't do your job of managing the parks for the benefit of both humans and dogs on one hand and the resident plants and animals on the other, then we should find those who can.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2520    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Belvedere, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 10:24:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose banning dogs by the National Parks Service. What have dogs done to you to deserve this? This ongoing anti-dog treatment/mentality speaks very badly about the Park Service! What next: deer, rabbits, squirrels, coyotes, skunks, hawks? Have a heart/have a brain.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2521    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 10:27:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We do not approve this plan. Why does it happen that a few inconsiderate dog owners rule??  
These are public lands that we pay for.  
Enough already!

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2522    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 10:31:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA staff,

Thank you for your proposal limiting dog use in the park. The current situation is so unpleasant that we no longer feel safe going there. Our observation is that dog owners do not generally obey posted regulations. When confronted they have offered us excuses (not MY dog) and expletives. Few leash their dogs. The owners' defensiveness is similar to that of the parent of a misbehaving child. No one wants anyone else to discipline their child or point out their neglect of community norms.

When I look at the big picture in this way I conclude that the proposed rules do not go far enough. Abuses will continue under this plan.

Nothing will work but fencing off areas for dogs to play in. I hope your proposal is merely a first step in limiting dogs in our parks.

Lisa Doyen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2523    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 10:44:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am increasingly uncomfortable about the anti-dog sentiment in Marin. My dog has a lot of energy and needs to run off leash. I am becoming more paranoid about walking with her in Marin. I urge you to stop the off-leash progression and allow the remaining trails and beaches to be free for dogs to run.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2524    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 10:44:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

As a responsible dog owner, I rely on the open spaces to keep my loving dog healthy and active. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2525    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Sri Artham

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2526    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94147  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 11:02:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

The reasons prompting these new restrictions have not been clearly articulated which leads one to believe it's based on a very small contingent of people who are vehemently opposed to dogs in general. Let us remember the GGNRA was created for recreation, for all residents to enjoy the public lands and should not discriminate against dog owners. Even though I haven't found the reasons for these restrictions I'm assuming it's the fear for public safety but I've certainly ran into more angry people than angry dogs!

Furthermore, if these restrictions are imposed it will certainly lead to overcrowding in the remaining areas allowing the current dog polices, which by no means preferred by anyone.

I don't believe these "cause/effects" have been thoroughly examined and I urge the GGNRA to re-examine all the rsasons to impose these restrictions.

Best Regards.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2527    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 11:03:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,

Lindy Flemming

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2528 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 11:06:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am not a dog owner, but hope to be one day here in San Francisco, and I think it's cruel to dogs and their owners to not allow adequate public spaces for dogs to run free without need of a leash. I think harm only comes from eliminating public space for dogs sans leash. I would be another unhappy San Franciscan if law were to eliminate 90 percent of dog friendly public space. We and our dogs are the public. Please keep our public space for dogs as is! Carolyn McCarthy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2529 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mountain View, CA 94086  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 11:47:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Maintaining our heritage of high visitation to places like Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Muir Beach, Baker Beach, etc. for recreation; outweighs the benefits of converting these areas into new, highly protected habitats for coastal plants and wildlife.

As these areas have long been multi-use, wildlife has become adjusted to human behavior. The more sensitive areas are rarely used. The path of human/dog use is quite predictable. Especially in Fort Funston, which is the best off-leash for dogs available, since there are only two entrances/exits due to the cliffs, it is



the safest place to teach a dog about being under control off leash. This is when you know a dog can really be obedient, when there is no boundary. This benefits the dogs behavior everywhere else, as he is more obedient there also.

As for other GGNRA locations, the NPS needs to provide substantial scientific evidence and measurements, instead of just speculation and exaggeration, before discouraging people from continuing our heritage of walking dogs in these areas. These same DEIS criteria for adverse impact levels would easily exclude all humans from the park without any evidence of real degradations to the environment. This DEIS could just replace "dog" with "human" and the arguments would be virtually the same except "humans" have a greater adverse impact because of the larger visitation counts. Believe it or not, humans are natural born predators, and the GGNRA law enforcement data proves humans have been known to attack each other, go off-trail into closed areas, and disturb wildlife. Plus, humans, like dogs, have been known to make noise, litter, dig in the sand, splatter sand, bump into other people, walk around the batteries, trample hiking trail beds, produce garbage, find and report injured wildlife, pee on the bushes, injure themselves while exercising, etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2530    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 11:59:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a responsible and considerate dog-owner in San Francisco for over 10 years. My dogs & I have enjoyed the many outdoor areas this city provides to dog owners. Over the years I have spend many many hours at Chrissy Field and the East Beach areas, sharing the space harmoniously with other dog-owners. The impact of dogs to these areas is non-existent. So I have to ask - why is GGNRA & NPS trying to enforce such harsh restrictions on a major section of the population of the Bay Area. What is driving these changes? It's not evident from the documents. I strongly object to the changes being proposed. If implemented, they will have great adverse effects on the small areas being permitted for dog use. SF is known for it's open-mindedness and acceptance. This plan is in direct conflict with what The City of San Francisco stands for. People will stop coming to SF and pet-owners will be forced to move elsewhere. The many small businesses that have started to support our pet population will suffer and, most likely many of them will fail - that's not what this country is about. GGNRA & NPS should not implement this plan - there is little or no benefit for the Bay Area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2531    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Richmond, CA 94801  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 12:03:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am asking you to support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2532    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94401  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Linda Johnson and I am a tax paying dog owner who frequents fort Funston with my lab mix, Odie. Odie was a shelter dog on death row in the Central Valley who was saved by the SFSPCA then adopted by me. He had clearly been abused when I got him and had no socialization skills with humans or dogs. He would cower and plaster himself to my legs when around other humans or canines. I began taking him for weekly visits to Fort Funston to socialize him and the result was nothing short of miraculous. His first day there he stared at the ocean in awe off leash for a full ten minutes, clearly never having seen such a body of water before. He remained off-leash on every visit, allowing him to gradually explore his surroundings and other dogs at his own pace. At the same time he was learning how to enjoy life, I was in the middle of a failing marriage and spent a lot of time walking the beach and trails of Fort Funston sorting things out and increasing my mental and physical health as I faced this looming stressor. Being able to heal alongside Odie was an amazing gift - and to do it unfettered (off leash) in such a beautiful place gave us both the strength, health, and hope to start over and leave the past behind as we moved into our new future. This recovery was largely the result of times spent off leash at Fort Funston. It was a unique opportunity for me and Odie to bond and appreciate the beauty life has to offer despite past disappointments. Please PLEASE listen to those who oppose your plan. The value of spending time with one's best friend off leash in nature without breaking any laws is crucial to human and canine health and wellness. I am a psychotherapist by trade and can testify to the power of both animal assisted therapy and nature's positive impact on those who suffer. And we all suffer at some point in life. So I ask you for personal reasons and compassion for humans and all living beings to reconsider your position. Odie and his canine friends have left very small footprints on the environment compared to humans, yourselves included. You cannot deny this fact. So please do not fight to restrict access to the tiny amount of open space we currently have to enjoy with our best friends. You will be making a HUGE mistake and hurting many people and their dogs. Following are other points I fully endorse. Thank you for reading this letter.

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No

evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2533    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Doggie Do Right Dog Training Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 12:19:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

\*\*\*\*\*

Letter #2

Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from

---

recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2534	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Kathy Reichardt

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2535	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 12:25:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Monica Dinsmore

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2536	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Granada, CA 94018 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Homeowner Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 12:27:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

I am a resident of El Granada and my property is adjacent to the Rancho open space. We have owned the property for 18 years, and one of our primary reasons for purchasing it and building our home here was the open space and the ability to enjoy it for recreation with our children and our dogs. We love the fact that many neighbors and visitors also walk their dogs (on and off leash) on the trail that runs just behind our home.

I am very concerned that the Preferred Alternative in the recent Dog Management Plan calls for such limited dog access to this beautiful land. The GGNRA by its name is clearly a National Recreation Area, and the SEIS needs to give more emphasis to its recreational nature. People who live at and visit the coastside need areas to recreate, including with their dogs, and a National Recreation Area should provide this.

For decades, people have been enjoying the land with their dogs, and we have been good stewards of the land. It is a rare and beautiful area. It seems very strange to me that our government would come in and restrict our usage of it in the name of preserving it. We have been using it with our dogs AND preserving it for many years.

My "preferred alternative" for Rancho is Alternative A, the "No Action" alternative, with the addition of two off-leash dog walking areas, one near Montara and the other near El Granada, as referenced in Bill Bechtel's letter. Dogs would be allowed on-leash throughout the remainder of Rancho as indicated in Alternative A in the SEIS.

Please consider the input of all the good people in favor of allowing dogs on the Rancho.

Thank you,  
Kirsten Jaeb

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2537	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 12:40:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have heard that there are more dogs than children in San Francisco. We happen to have both. It means a lot to us that our weekends can involve fun, leash free field trips to these areas. They are also part of what makes our week possible, as they allow our dog to get enough exercise that we can work and not worry about him.

There are plenty of places around here where the dog cannot go off leash or is not permitted. I would argue that there is enough space to make everyone happy - please leave what off leash dog space still exists alone.

We have never had any issue with our dog or any others in these areas and have been probably hundreds of times. Changing the rules feels like it would be changing part of the San Francisco character that we love. It feels unnecessary. Please don't do it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2538    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 12:53:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean and NPS planning staff:

I walk with my dog regularly - -daily, even- - in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/SEIS. It is incredibly restrictive, far too much, and if codified will prevent me from recreating with my dog (for my own well being, and the health of my dog) in GGNRA.

I'm familiar with the previous iteration of the plan. The new plan was changed in any legitimate fashion to reflect the inordinate number of concerns and objections in response to the prior plan. Additionally, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as I understand it this is required by law) that supports such a restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA seems to have lost its foresight: GGNRA is a RECREATION AREA effectively within a densely populated, urban population center. GGNRA is not Wilderness. The pet policy from 1979 needs to be codified such that access for humans and their dogs is maintained, and not restricted.

Sincerely,  
Seth Green  
San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2539    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 12:57:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the large restrictions that are planned for off-leash dog areas especially at Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and Fort Funston.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2540    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 12:58:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please leave beaches available for off-leash dog use. Many of us have active but very well behaved dogs and use the beaches happily for recreation. I understand that not all beach-goers appreciate dogs, but so many Marin families have dogs and it is already so restricted where they can be off leash. There should be some designated beaches where off leash is acceptable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2541    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 13:29:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am completely shocked over the proposed ban on allowing dogs to run and play fetch in many areas of San Francisco. San Francisco has long had a reputation for being a dog-friendly city. It seems that more and more action is being taken to curb this freedom and restrict dog-owners. As a populace we are responsible for the lives of our domesticated animals. To deny them the ability to roam and play is inhumane and not necessary. San Franciscans have existed without such a ban for a very long time and there is no reason for one now. Please stop the discrimination.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2542    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 13:31:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I recently moved to the Bay Area drawn by the incredible resources and natural beauty. I love being outdoors, hiking and picnicking. My experience outdoors includes, whenever and wherever possible, being with my dog. Having my dog as a walking/hiking companion is extremely important to me. The dog provides me encouragement to walk farther and faster than I might if walking alone. We love exploring together, partners in fitness and in health. As a woman walking alone, having a dog by my side increases my sense of safety. Frankly, I think I would not walk even half as often if I did not have my dog with me. Walk with friends, you suggest? I have found that my friends are often not available for a long hike when I am, and many are not willing to walk the same distance or at the same pace...but my dog is always ready and willing to be my companion.

I believe that dogs should be allowed on all of the Recreation area trails. Off leash areas are a treasure. Watching my dog racing and playing with other dogs brings a smile to my face - and to the faces of others lucky enough to be part of the action. Dog lovers and walkers are healthier and happier for a good reason.

I recommend keeping all of the current off leashes sites. In fact, it would be great if these areas were expanded.

When dogs are in areas which require a leash, I believe that they should be well-behaved and under close control. This is important for the safety and comfort of everyone. I have no objections to requiring 6' leashes for walking in areas that have heavy pedestrian traffic. I pride myself in having a dog that is well-mannered and friendly. Many, many non-dog owners stop to chat with my dog and me when we are out on the trails together. Clearly they have no objection to sharing the beauty of the outdoors. In fact, I can't help but wonder who actually does object. I have never heard anyone complain about sharing the outdoors with a well-behaved dog and its owner.

I cannot see any possible reason for excluding dogs from the GGN recreational sites. I STRONGLY object to the suggestions for eliminating off leash areas and restricting on leash trail access. WHY? I don't see how this policy change is helping anyone and it is significantly restricting the enjoyment of thousands and thousands of residents and visitors to the SF Bay area and your recreational sites. I am sorely disappointed that these changes are seriously being considered. To repeat, I object to the proposed changes.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2543	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94610 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 14:08:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean:				

I am a frequent visitor to the GGNRA, and I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. Additionally, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people (including myself) in response to the first plan. There has not been a single peer-reviewed, site specific study that supports such drastic restrictions in dog-friendly areas.

It is very important to the health of me and my dog to have access to off-leash dog friendly areas. I have been recreating in these areas for the past 12 years, since moving to the Bay area.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy plus off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose any fences to delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2544	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 14:11:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

With the ever increasing number of dogs in the county (ie. residents love their dogs and seek services and trails for them), the more you limit access the more problems and congestion there will be on the miniscule number of remaining trails.

Please realize the detrimental impact this will cause!! It should be expanded as the need is increasing not decreasing!!  
Sheri

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2545	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a conscientious, responsible and mindful canine Advocate and Guardian, who regularly enjoys outings with my dogs in the GGNRA, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan ... which definitively does NOT take dogs into account.

The draft proposal is extensively too restrictive and will prevent me - - as well as a majority of many others - - living in this urban setting from recreating, exercising and experiencing "the outdoors" with my dogs. It disregards a means for myself and others to continue to attend to all of Our collective health in the manner we have responsibly done so on GGNRA properties for many, many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (AS REQUIRED BY LAW) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly/open-space areas.

Evidently, the GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for densely populated, urban areas. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

A policy that must be formalized in support of off-leash areas in the entirety of the San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo Counties; and, inclusive in this process is that of the/any new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Madeleine V. Salada, R.N.  
Health Care Advocate and Facilitator

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2546    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 14:55:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kevin Miller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2547    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 15:04:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Oakwood Valley Trail and Rodeo Beach Loop. Off-leash exercise is critical to his health and happiness.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2548    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 15:20:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please retain the pet rules/laws from 1979. This proposal is unnecessary and nobody should be wasting time over this. It is fine the way it is.  
Thanks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2549    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Macario Dagdagan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2550    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 15:36:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Craig S. MacKenna  
431 Pennsylvania Avenue #4  
San Francisco, CA 94107

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2551	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 16:28:18
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2552	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 16:40:27
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Just wanted to say I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service plan for banning off leash dog walking in Rancho tierra here in Montara. I have lived here over 20 years, walked dogs all over Montara, off leash and on. I do not think your statements that the wildlife would be affected is correct, or well researched. I also understand the Golden Gate National Recreation area in the Bay Area, and here in Montara, is for all people to enjoy, including dog walkers, and by banning us, you are violating your mandate, and imposing arbitrary regulations without considering the very people who pay
------------------------	--

for the parks, and your salary. Please reconsider this ban.  
Tom Moore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2553    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94949  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 16:40:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and Oakwood valley trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2554    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 16:50:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

For the past 18 years, I have walked my dogs (off leash) nearly EVERY DAY at either the Presidio, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Pacifica or Chrissy Field. I walk for my health and my sanity, and it benefits my pets in the same way. In all that time, I witness our human population of San Franciscans and tourists co-existing with off leash dogs in the most natural of ways. As a matter of fact, it is what most people find "charming" about our great city.

Almost every dog owner is conscientious about picking up after our pets, and I can attest that if we see someone not taking care, we demand that they clean up or we do it ourselves. We appreciate the great privilege we have and insure that we take the responsibility that goes along with it.

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

---

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Dogs and humans have been co-existing happily on these lands - and should continue to be able to without ugly fences and other unsightly methods.

Sincerely,

Jane CotÃ©- Cook & Chris Cook  
Calvin & Riley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2555	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 16:54:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley, Muir Beach, the Miwok trail, the costal trail , the Rhubarb trail, and the alta trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% othe Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Walking my dog, especially off leash is very important to me. It is important for dogs socializing and exercising and also for my own great enjoyment. I have been a hiker for many years and before I had my dog(two years ago) I had access to many, many other trails, which I miss very much. Now I am restricted to a handful of trails. There are many dogs in Marin. People in Sonoma county have literally , no place to walk their dogs off leash and so they travel down here. We in Marin, treasure our natural beauty and hiking trails and access for our 100,000 plus dogs. Also, dogs on leash at a beach is really absurd. That is why, at every beach I've been to people break that rule, because it is impossible or pointless to have a dog

onleash, trying to play with waves other dogs etc. These things are important to us and I see no compelling reason to deny us our enjoyment, because you people want the "regulations" to be the same in all of your areas, so that your staff is less confused(that seems to be your reasoning).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2556    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 17:06:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why are the dog owners who train their dogs and pick up after them and have no history of any problems punished because a few dog owners cannot be responsible?  
You are punishing the many because of the irresponsibility of the few.

This truly does not make sense. Fine the irresponsible few, make it financially punishing for them to not pay attention to the rules. We can help you...  
but don't punish us.

Shawn McMillan  
San Anselmo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2557    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Walnut Creek, CA 94597  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 17:09:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

I support fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make park visitors and families feel safe and welcome.

The GGNRA should do what is necessary if pet owners are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

John Weerts

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2558    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,08,2014 17:24:19**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a tax payer I believe children and families have a right to enjoy the parks. I'm writing to express my support to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement.

Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been abused by dog walkers who think they have the right to let their dogs run free over the rights of people who would like to use these public areas. I do not like strange dogs of varies sizes running up, jumping on, sniffing me. On one occasion a dog stole a sandwich from my young son, I have seen children playing soccer step in dog poop bc many dog owners are irresponsible. Because of this, please enforce new rules that will make all public areas safe for more than just dog owners and their dogs.. I do not support off-leash areas .

Sincerely,  
Laura Milvy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2559 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,08,2014 17:29:56**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** GGNRA is way out of line trying to eliminate dogs from the park areas where they have been welcome for so long.

The argument that the parkland is for people not animals is crazy...it's for people and the majority of people have dogs. Even if it were a smaller segment, accommodating them is clearly the way to go.

What's the argument against? Hard to know the intent, but none of the arguments I've heard hold water. Dogs are clearly not the problem and most (almost ALL) dog owners are not either. So why not wake up and address whatever REAL problems exist and not just outlaw dogs against the wishes of MOST of the people who use the parks. Certainly dogs can't be allowed in every area without infringing on the wishes of the FEW who hate dogs, but that still leaves a LOT of areas they should and can be allowed in.

I firmly oppose all of these new restrictions.

Why would you want so many people to hate GGNRA and it's employees???

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2560 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,08,2014 17:50:34**Correspondence Type:** Web Form



**Correspondence:** I think taking off leash area away at ft. Funston goes against the spirit in which these land were given to the NPS

We need this space and take care of it and are mostly responsible dog owners. I do not feel strongly about Chrissy field since it is a multi use area. But ft funston iss not traditionally a tourist area. And I still think it very unfair that a ocean a beach was taken away as well.

Most dog people are strong environmentalists and wildlife and bird lovers but this city has a large population of dog owners who need to get out and walk their dogs.

I am 65 and for me and many older folks getting down to the beach at ft. Funston is a hardship so I need more space up above to walk.

Thnk you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2561 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** El Granada, CA 94018  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 17:58:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Continued policies regarding Rancho Corral de Tierra makes land use more restrictive than use prior to GGNR acquisition and continues to negatively impact the residences of Montara and surrounding areas, along with their companion animals.

The No Action Alternative needs additional provisions to allow off-leash dog walking in the the areas near Montara and El Granada where the practice has been going on for decades.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2562 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 17:58:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** During the more than 25 years I have lived in San Francisco I've experienced and enjoyed the freedom and diversity evinced in the city's intelligent decision to allow dogs to run free in appropriate settings, especially on the beaches. In all this time I've never seen any problems arising from this enlightened policy. Some problems call for regulation. The present situation is not a problem, and requires no subtraction from our liberty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2563 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2564	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 18:10:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Upper and Lower Mori Point:				

1) PLEASE keep on leash dog access on Upper Mori trail to Sweeny Ridge: I have a back issue which prevents me from running and briskly walking up the steep upper Mori trail has a level of difficulty that I need to maintain my health and is one of the only exercises of this intensity that I can do with my back condition. Hiking these trails is so important to me that I purchased my house in Pacifica to live next to Mori point trail. These hikes have maintained my back health and helped reduce my high blood pressure and stress level. This is a wide trail with very few hikers - and those that I do encounter usually also have a dog. In urban areas, an important reason to conserve of open space is to provide residents like me a place to hike/exercise.

2) PLEASE keep on leash dog access on the wide but steep trails near Mori point: While my usual hike with my dog (on leash) is upper Mori trail to Sweeny Ridge, at times when it has been very rainy this trail is too muddy and slippery to use safely, so I then like to hike to Mori Point. This access is very important to my health as I have a back issue which prevents running but briskly hiking up bootlegger stairs and the upper trails of Mori provide me much needed exercise (only speed walking on the flat coastal trail next Mori point does not supply the same level of intensity).

3) Enforce leash laws and do not punish considerate dog walkers: I observe off leash dogs at Mori point frequently and as an 'on leash' dog walker, I find these loose dogs can sometimes be scary and sometimes go off trail which I agree could hurt surrounding wildlife. I have never seen a park ranger in this area enforce the leash laws. It does not seem fair to take access away from these trails for considerate dog walkers that keep their dogs on the trail and on leash and who pickup after them. Why not instead post signs reminding people about leash laws and then enforce them?

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

5) Keep access for those who are willing to pay a dog usage fee: A usage fee to take a dog on-leash on the upper Mori and Sweeny ridge trails could help pay for more fencing, signs, additional trash cans and more law enforcement. Having to buy a license to use certain trails could keep the number of dogs down but enable those who really need or love using the trails to have access.

6) I will not hesitate to contact my elected officials, protest, and even take legal action (as I feel this will lower my property value) if on-leash dog access to upper Mori trail is restricted.

Thank you for your attention.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2565	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 18:22:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement. It is too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties since September. I recently moved back to the Bay Area from Washington state and was happy this time to bring a furry friend only to find out the Bay Area is becoming much less welcoming to dogs than when I lived here in the 1990s through 2008.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I moved to Tiburon this time to be able to access more of what the GGNRA has to offer. I am a responsible dog owner in addition to the many others I meet but realize there are exceptions... just as there are exceptions to good families enjoying the beach with a few who don't pick up after themselves or leave dirty diapers about, just as there are exceptions to hikers and bikers who stay on trails ensuring the fragile ecosystem is protected vs the few who feel carving out a new trail is more important, just as there are mostly good surfers who heed the speed limit vs the few who rip through the parking area on to their next adventure. Ticket those who don't comply with the rules, don't fence anyone in and destroy this wonderful open area and let all enjoy this special place that inspires us. Educate vs restrict, promote enjoyment and inspiration that connects all to this wonderful planet vs creating a recreation area to be enjoyed by few.

Sincerely,  
Karen Loida

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2566    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me, my dog, and friends from enjoying the very trails we have hiked

on for many years and prevent us from enjoying the beautiful beaches

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. It feels as if they are discriminating against those of us who have well-behaved dogs. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Caroline Palmer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2567	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 18:41:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

Please do not make changes that will prevent dogs under voice control from enjoying the GGNRA off-leash. I have been taking our dog to Fort Funston for the last few years regularly, and it provides incomparable health benefits for myself and my pet. Most of the alternatives under consideration that will make changes to the current policy are overly restrictive. Even Alternative F in Fort Funston extends leash areas to trails (but oddly, not to off-trail areas).

If you have properly surveyed the area over time, you will know that dogs are typically well behaved and under good voice control of owners and dog walkers, that owners pick up dog waste, and that dogs love these parks! There are very limited alternatives for urban dwellers to properly exercise their dogs.

I also note in the latest draft of the plan that there are citations to publications that support the general theory that dogs can harm vegetation, yet I did not see an indication that the actual adverse impact of dogs off-leash in these specific parks has been quantified. This is disappointing since it seems to be used as a basis for action throughout much of the document.

I also oppose the use of fences as it will decrease the natural beauty of the parks for all visitors, including those without dogs.

Thank you for considering my input,

Daniel

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2568	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	South San Francisco, CA 94080 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 18:41:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is my opinion the current status of any and all dog access shall remain unchanged; that is to say any further ordinance, statute, or regulation(s) being considered by the GGNRA (or any other regulatory body) will pose undue hardship to me and the citizenry at large. Open, dog-friendly space is becoming ever more limited in the San Francisco Bay Area; therefore, we the people rely on areas like Fort Funston and Sweeney Ridge (to name a few) to maintain the well-being of our dogs and ourselves. We dog owners are the proprietors and stewards of the land in question. It is my opinion our rights for our dogs to access these lands in a good faith, safe, and respectful manner shall not be further infringed.

Thank you,  
Scott Kent

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2569    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 19:15:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** PLEASE, PLEASE .... do not close anymore trails, walks or beaches to the dogs off leash or on leash. There is limited off leash areas in the GGNRA for dogs and there owners. We are a respectful group who pick up after their dogs and enjoy spending time with other people/dogs. There are lots of areas for hikers, horses and bikers.

I hear you are interested in closing more trails. Please DO NOT close more trails. Actually, it would be nice if you can consider opening more trails.

I know it's important to protect the vegetation and I don't think the dogs contribute to this problem as much as the bikers and hikers that go off trails. There are much more people hiking and bikers using GGNRA than people walking with dogs.

Dog owners tend to be more respectful of preserving the land and picking up after their dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2570    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sunnyvale, CA 94086  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 19:18:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I just heard about the massive reduction in off leash areas for our dogs. As an owner of 3 we'll- behaved dogs, I am very concerned about any reductions in natural exercise areas.

Please don't all this to happen. It will have horrible consequences.

Sincerely,  
Diana

**Correspondence ID:** 2571    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94801  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

If I wanted to live somewhere where the government controlled my behavior I would move to China. These are public lands and they should be used how the public wants them used. Live free or die.

Sincerely,

Howard Peters

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2572    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Resident and Dog Lover in the United States of America Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 19:25:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is a terrible idea; please take another look at it and see how it affects ordinary citizens with multiple dogs, not just those dog-walkers being targeted. Since when do we prevent anyone from going into our national parks with their animals?!

Dgs are, of course, much more attracted to parks and long walks or runs than my pet cats. But I'm hoping to find a dog soon, and I certainly want to enable him or her to enjoy the great outdoors as much as my husband and I do too. We presently have just two cats, and they're not good candidates for park-walking, for obvious reasons such as not being able to take commands, not staying near us when they wander into the woods, etc.

I am certain this entire course of action is intended to target the "dog-walkers" who take 10 or 15 animals wherever they can, as often as they can. Taking care of peoples' dogs is hard work; if a good run is what helps all the animals stay calmer and more comfortable until their people come home from work is a very good thing. This will affect adversely those people unable to get whatever "licenses" they must obtain or "fees-per-dog" they must pay for park-walking. This in turn will hamper working people's ability to make certain their dogs are safe inside their homes or apartments all day, where they might bark and annoy neighbors or do personal damage to personal premises- -because it may become financially impossible

---

to pay the cost of those walkers' licenses, etc.

If you must track this activity to assign damage, annoyance or financial responsibility to injury or damage to SOMEONE, then ticket dog-walkers who don't pick up after their charges or those who take on or don't properly supervise closely enough their "clients." Please don't close public facilities to ordinary people with their ordinary pets. That will take more patrolling and licensing and oversight than it's worth and just increase layers of bureaucracy: which we hardly need!

THIS IS NOT THE KIND OF PROBLEM THAT REQUIRES SUCH DRASTIC SOLUTIONS; it's like killing a fly with an elephant gun.

Please, let's get real about dogs, humans and the great outdoors.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2573	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94112 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 20:12:23
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I urge you not to restrict the current dog walking areas in the GGNRA. I am a San Francisco resident and go to Fort Funston every week because I can walk my dog off leash there. Along with me hundreds of other people are benefiting from being able to walk their dogs off leash at Fort Funston. There are over 100,000 dogs in San Francisco and they need exercise. If off leash walking was restricted in Fort Funston and other GGNRA locations it would cause thousands of people to take their dogs to city parks instead. City parks don't have the capacity for this. The GGNRA now occupies all of San Francisco's coastline land. It is vital that the GGNRA take into consideration the needs of the residents of San Francisco and it's parks. The mayor of San Francisco, several of the Board of Supervisor members and Nancy Pelosi all support continuing the 1979 dog walking policy. I urge you to take into consideration all of our needs and desires.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2574	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 20:12:58
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** Thank you for making a plan that protects wildlife and allows people to enjoy more of the GGNRA without worrying about dogs. In particular, the elderly and frail need a connection to nature, which is so richly and locally provided by GGNRA. However, senior citizens often become fearful of off-leash dogs to the point that they can no longer enjoy spending time in nature, observing the natural flora and fauna.

The proposed dog management plan will help GGNRA manage recreation and natural resources and if anything, more restrictions on dogs and more importantly, enforcement of restrictions, is needed. It will be important to make sure everyone knows what the rules are, where dogs are allowed and where leashes are needed. It's also important not to undermine the plan by failing to communicate with dog owners in the GGNRA, especially when they are oblivious to the rules. Early in the program, dog owners should be warned, but if there is continued disregard for nature and fellow citizens, then fines and other enforcement are warranted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2575    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 20:20:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why is our government wasting our money on developing plans to deprive us of our off-leash/recreation areas? I'm totally opposed to the "preferred alternative"!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2576    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Piedmont, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 20:31:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** One of the common photos showing a "beautiful life" is of a dog running on a beach. Now, especially for us in California, that picture is becoming more and more of a rarity. I've been upset at the California State Park System for their ridiculous rules against dogs for years. These rules kept our family from visiting and using the state parks for the entire 12 years we had our dog, who recently passed away. It made no sense to us to go for a hike or camp and not include our four-legged family member.

I grew up having dogs, but the rules weren't so strict and anti-dog in those days. Our most recent dog was a beautiful Australian Shepherd who needed to run for her health and well-being. She didn't like dog parks because of the big dogs that would chase her and jump on her...that wasn't her thing. She only wanted to be with us. She never chased wildlife, or barked a lot, or jumped on people, and she never ever, in her 12 years, bit anyone or anything. And, as dog owners, we trained our dog well and always, ALWAYS picked up after her. And yet we found it more and more difficult to find places for our dog to run. Our dog, being a herder by nature, was also much better off-leash than on. Off-leash she would stay right at our heels (didn't have to train her to do that, it was natural for her), but on-leash she either pulled ahead or would try and herd us and end up tripping everyone. But, at least we could take her places with us; leaving her behind was painful for her and us.

When you take away our public open spaces from dogs, you are probably also taking those places away from dog owners, and making a dog's life a lot less healthy. So, why are you considering banning all these areas from dogs? Because they chase wildlife? Some may, but not all. And, so do children. Should we ban children from beaches? And, we all know that teenagers can do some pretty stupid things on occasion. Maybe they should be banned. But, in the end, it is actually the adult or parent who is in charge. Why, instead, don't we ban adults that don't watch their children or dogs? After all, there are only bad dog owners, not bad dogs.

As a dog owner (which I hope to be again someday), and as a responsible parent of two grown boys, I don't think it is fair that all of us with dogs should suffer due to some irresponsible dog owners. I wouldn't mind paying for a special license in order to take my dog to the beach. This license could be revoked if my dog behaved badly or bit someone, and I could get fined if I didn't pick up after my dog...just like littering. The revenue from the license could help pay for enforcement and other necessary dog amenities.

I also realize that, as a national park, you are responsible for protecting the environment and the wildlife.

---



However, the wonderful thing about a beach is how it rejuvenates and cleanses itself constantly. How perfect a place for kids and dogs to run and play! But, there is the issue of the wildlife. Snowy Plovers and other birds like to nest on beaches. But, they don't do it all the time. My in-laws used to live in Huntington Beach, and their beaches would put temporary fences around the nesting areas when they were needed. Why can't you do this? Please don't put up fences for the dogs to stay within...that would be horrible. Small fenced-in dog parks may work for some dogs, but not all; and not for larger dogs, or shy, people-oriented dogs like ours.

I care deeply for the birds and wildlife, and I hate it when owners don't watch their dogs or pick up after them (and I feel the same about parents!). But, dog owners are part of the public that owns these parks. I realize how difficult it is to manage these beautiful beaches for all of its different users, and I don't envy you this job. These beaches where you want to ban dogs are next to urban areas and need to be available for those kinds of uses. A dog NEEDS off-leash time on a beach or large open space, because a dog NEEDS to run. Walking on leash is fine some of the time, and maybe all that is necessary for some breed of dogs, but most need to really run...and they can't do that on a leash. Make dog owners more responsible, and let us try and work together so everyone can use the parks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2577	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 21:12:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and will prevent dog owners from recreating with their pets - for their own health and the health of the animals - the way they have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jay MIner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2578	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94710 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 21:37:26				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs have become an integral part of many families, with whom they should have the right to exercise and recreate. There are so many amazing dogs and incredibly responsible dog parents, it would be very sad if they were penalized and could no longer go to the parks they've been frequenting since the original pet policy was set in 1979. Is there truly a reason compelling enough to deny our canine citizens their most basic need?

Please continue to support the important role dogs play in making SO many people's lives better, as well as the critical importance that exercise plays in ensuring dogs remain good citizens. As Cesar Milan says, dogs primary need is "exercise" followed by "discipline & affection." If we continue to limit the places people can enjoy time outdoors in nature with their dogs (which is where dogs should be as much as possible), the harder it will be for people to provide their dogs with the exercise required to keep them from developing behavioral problems. I know I and all my responsible pet owning friends would be glad to follow regulations that keep other animals safe or environments as pristine as possible. We just have to ensure that we don't go so far with this that we and our canine companions suffer.

There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.

If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

Please, support as much off-leash access for our animal companions as possible! Thank you for your consideration & empathy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2579    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94710  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 21:39:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Areas where our dogs have been welcome to walk or play off-leash for decades could be severely cut or banned outright under the revised GGNRA dog plan. The new rules would affect off-leash as well as on-leash access at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Muir Beach, Rancho Corral de Tierra on the slopes of Montara, and many other parklands.

The San Francisco City Council recently unanimously passed a resolution objecting to the GGNRA plan, which prompted the head of the Sierra Club to say that SF is pandering to a small group of dog extremists.

However, we believe that as responsible citizens, we must be realistic and fore-thinking about how to accommodate more than 100,000 local dogs in a city with limited space.

There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

We are not suggesting unlimited dog walking access, and we advocate responsible dog ownership in all GGNRA lands. But there is no credible reason to deny fair and reasonable access for both on- and off-leash dog walking that has taken place on GGNRA land for more than 50 years.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2580	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 21:43:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Studies show the majority of people respond positively to dogs. They relieve stress, lighten moods, and make people smile.				

The vast majority of pet owners and pets are harmonious and it would be better to increase licensing fees to fund better pet policing than to restrict pets from certain areas.

Come on: cell phone picture message tip line. There's no reason for a wholesale ban on pets.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2581	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 21:58:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed limiting of park areas for off-leash dogs in the San Francisco Bay Area. This is a region that has always been unusually friendly to dogs and dog owners, and there is no sound reason to curb the freedom- -respectfully and responsibly adhered to- -enjoyed by pooches and their companions who only wish for them to have room to roam among like-minded pets and their owners. Please do not take steps to irreparably change one of the best aspects of living in this area. Please continue to value dogs and their owners. Please believe in our ability to properly look after our pets in public spaces.				

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Steven Jenkins  
San Francisco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2582	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 22:09:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

Sincerely,  
Ellen & J.P. Scanlon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2583    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,08,2014 22:33:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a new dog owner in San Francisco, for many months, I have been looking forward with expectant pride to taking our new family member on unleashed romps through the many beautiful recreation areas our city has to offer. I often brag to my friends from the east coast about how dog-friendly our city is, and indeed it is one of my favorite things about the bay area that we can travel with our beloved companions to so many places here.

Since we brought home our dog, my boyfriend and I have come to view to the long walks we go on with him as the highlight of each week. Finding new places to introduce him to has allowed us to become acquainted with parts of San Francisco we had never seen before, including Fort Funston (!), and it has made our experience as residents so much richer. Furthermore, the 45 minute to 1.5 hour off-leash walks we take with him several times a week have also been great for our health, and we have been especially grateful for having an impetus to see the ocean on a regular basis.

While keeping our dog on leash wouldn't prohibit us from continuing these activities, I don't have the words to express the difference between bringing our dog to an enclosed area where he's forced to interact with other dogs versus the ability to explore and play freely together in an open space. There is nothing like the pleasure of seeing him trot ahead sniffing eagerly then come bounding back at my call.

To quote the poet Mary Oliver (who I generally don't care for, except I do think she has some wise things to say about dogs):

"I want to extol not the sweetness nor the placidity of the dog, but the wilderness out of which he cannot step entirely, and from which we benefit. For wilderness is our first home too, and in our wild ride into modernity with all its concerns and problems we need also all the good attachments to that origin that we can keep or restore. Dog is one of the messengers of that rich and still magical first world. The dog would remind us of the pleasures of the body with its graceful physicality, and the acuity and rapture of the senses, and the beauty of [Fort Funston's] forest and ocean and rain and our own breath. There is not a dog that romps and runs but we learn from him.

The other dog- -the one that all its life walks leashed and obedient down the sidewalk- -is what a chair is to a tree. It is a possession only, the ornament of a human life. Such dogs can remind us of nothing large

or noble or mysterious or lost. They cannot make us sweeter or more kind.

Only unleashed dogs can do that. They are a kind of poetry themselves when they are devoted not only to us but to the wet night, to the moon and the rabbit-smell in the grass and their own bodies leaping forward."

Please continue allowing me and my dog to be together in the larger natural world. The GGNRA's decision will have a profound impact on our lives- -and we are only one pair of so many!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2584    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san leandro, CA 94578  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 22:40:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Very dissappointed in further restictions proposed to off leash areas for dogs. Segregated areas are much smarter than all out bans. Dogs need to run and can work out all their energy in open areas. These are open areas that should be enjoyed by all - not just by those that what to impose their vision of open space on all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2585    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 22:45:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I walk my dogs on the fire road on Mt. Tamalpais and at Muir Beach and Stinson Beach. They are always under control. The GGNRA should retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy. I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2586    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,08,2014 23:07:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a regular user of multiple GGNRA, I am appalled at the restrictive rules being considered for dogs in the recreation area. I take my dog with me for companionship and mutual exercise as we explore the paths in the GGNRA. I do not understand in any way the restrictive rule changes that have been suggested. I have been on the trails at many sites in the GGNRA and have never witnessed any issues with dogs. I have seen nothing to justify the proposed changes. It certainly seems reasonable to have some areas restricted to dogs on leash only. The key to such regulations is enforcement. The current fine for having your dog off leash in a leash only area is sufficiently high to be a deterrent to rule breakers, however, as best I can see, the rule is rarely enforced. If the rule were enforced regularly, rule breaking would cease.

With all state parks and all parks in San Mateo County closed to dogs, again with no justification, inadequate open space is available to those of us who enjoy exercising with our dogs. The suggestion that

allowing dogs on leash in parking lots only as one solution, clearly indicates that those making the rules have no idea of what is appropriate for dogs and dog owners.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2587	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,08,2014 23:27:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 8, 2014				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Miranda Ruenroeng and I currently am a resident of San Mateo. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Mori Point, Sweeney Ridge, Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Lands End, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, and dog-friendly trails in the Marin Headlands (Coastal Trail and the Wolf Ridge Loop) since moving to the Bay Area in 2009. I exercise in these beautiful outdoor recreational spaces with my dog Osby, either on-leash (at Sweeney Ridge and Mori Point) or off-leash and under voice control, for my own health and the health of my pet as well. As a Muir Woods Annual Pass holder and a member of the Marine Mammal Center, I cherish and respect our local natural resources.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Mori Point, Sweeney Ridge, Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Lands End, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, and trails in the Marin Headlands because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. I would like it on record that I adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad idea that will unfairly limit access, and severely restrict outdoor exercise options, for responsible Bay Area pet owners and their companion animals. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of wildlife. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy, PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan simply does not reflect democratic change, as it was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in opposition of the original plan by a margin of 3:1. What the citizens of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describes how these spaces will be managed as RECREATION AREAS, which is what the lands are mandated to be (Golden Gate National RECREATION AREA), as opposed to a National Park, which clearly is inappropriate for lands within a crowded urban setting.

And finally, I would like to express what a drastic, negative impact the planned restrictions would impose on my family and our lives. My dog and I currently exercise together in GGNRA spaces at least three days each week, and we log more exercise mileage on GGNRA lands than anywhere else, including residential areas and other local open spaces. Additionally, on weekends my husband, Stephen, often joins our dog and me on outings to GGNRA lands, where we enjoy valuable family time together outdoors. In fact, we hold these places so dear that we have chosen family photos of us (our dog included) at GGNRA sites for our holiday cards every year since moving to the Bay Area.

As I've already stated, spending as much time as possible outdoors with my dog in the public spaces within the GGNRA has been a part of my weekly routine since we arrived at our first apartment in San

Francisco in 2009. In the past few months, however, access to these open lands has become even more precious, as my dog was diagnosed with advanced cancer in 2013. Walking the trails and running on the beaches of GGNRA spaces has had a materially positive effect on my dog's battle with cancer and my ability to have joy with him and with my spouse during what has been a very difficult time for our family. In short, we treasure the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas and feel that access to these recreational lands, for our entire family, is an integral part of what makes our lives in the Bay Area so fulfilling.

Sincerely,

Miranda and Stephen Ruenroeng

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2588	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 00:43:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am grateful for the attempt to find balance within the parks. The parks have become less of a respite from dense city living, and have become overrun with professional off leash dog walkers. The parks have become trashed by dog filth and dog bags, noisy from yelling dog walkers, and devoid of remaining biodiversity.				

Thank you for helping to find a fair balance. Providing any off leash areas for walkers is more than what most areas in such urban environments offer. City park dog runs and designated off leash areas as a small portion of the various park lands is so reasonable and fair! Thank you for taking on this difficult issue.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2589	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	SaveOffLeash.com Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 02:06:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Increased usage over time was anticipated when this National Recreation Area was created. The House Report No 92-1391 made clear that the GGNRA would be confronted with problems in San Francisco that would require careful planning because of the high volume year-round visitation:				

"As a national urban recreation area, this new component of the national park system will be confronted with problems which do not frequently occur at other national park and recreation areas. Great numbers of people can be expected to use the area-particularly those portions located in San Francisco County."  
(pg. 11)

\*\*\*\*\*

. In October, 1977, Rolf Diamont, GGNRA "Environmental Coordinator" prepared a memo proposing a "Draft Dog Policy for San Francisco Unit." His memo enumerated the following guidelines:

1. "No regulation, verbal or written, should be attempted that cannot be reasonably and consistently administered."
2. "Dog regulations should be different for different areas of the park reflecting public needs and attitudes as well as urban geography and our capabilities."

3. "When we discourage or restrict dogs in any area, whenever possible, an alternative site where dogs are allowed should be suggested.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2590    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Woodside, CA 94082  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 05:41:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider the dog ban. Dog ownership has increased tremendously and they are an important fixture in many people's lives. It is sad that dogs cannot accompany their owners to recreational and outdoor activities. The exercise for both humans and dogs is mandatory.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2591    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 09:01:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

As a big dog owner (I have owned Rottweilers, Malamutes and now Bernese Mtns Dogs) I visit Fort Funston or Crissy Field on a regular basis and almost always with my kids. These are great locations to let my dogs off leash to run, roam and play with other dogs. Over the last 10 plus years, and maybe I'm the exception, my dogs have never been in a fight, my kids have never been bitten, and on a rare occasion someone has missed picking up after their dog. Yes there are a few dog parks in my general neighborhood, but its so nice to get the kids out to the beach to explore, let the dogs run, and just enjoy what these beautiful areas have to offer without having to worry about further restrictions limiting dog access.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

Lane Welton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2592    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 09:08:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not close these locations to dogs. There are very few places we can take our companion dogs and MOST dog owners are responsible. Keep some space available to dogs and their owners. You can enact laws that ticket owners whose dogs are not under control or you can enact a

---



requirement that dogs need to be certified in some way as friendly and manageable, but please do not close off all spaces where we can romp and have fun. Families have plenty of places they can go if they want to avoid dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2593    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 09:15:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The current dog management plan is too restrictive. The San Francisco properties that are part of GGNRA are embedded in an urban center. Dog walkers need and value open space to walk with their pets and to allow them to run. I frequently take my dog to Baker Beach, and it is an ideal place for off lease running. The plan as drafted would have significant, adverse impact on many dog owners, without sufficient justification or adequate alternatives. Please significantly change your plan to retain the current areas for on- and off-lease dog activities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2594    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 09:20:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that the parks should provide a safe environment for all of its users. The US Parks are NOT A DOG PARK. Dog feces on beach are a serious health hazard (and disgusting), especially at the beach where children and adults are barefoot. Additionally dogs are a hazard to wild life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2595    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 09:27:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Redwood Park in the East Bay Regional Park System and Carmel Beach (Carmel, CA) are very good examples that off-leash can work. It is important for dogs to have the freedom to run, play, and socialize. I understand that there are sensitive areas that need to be protected, but there also needs to be areas where the millions of dog owners, who are responsible, can enjoy the outdoors with their loved ones (dogs!).

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2596    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 09:37:55

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Hi. I am Michael Feranchak. I live in San Francisco and I'm calling because I'm upset about a proposal by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to severely limit dogs and off-leash dog walking in Ft. Funston, Crissy Field and other parks.

Just about one in every three households in San Francisco has a dog, and this is going to dramatically impact San Franciscans. It is also going to impact city parks, because if this proposal passes hundreds upon hundreds of people and their dogs are going to flood places like Maclaren Park and Golden Gate Park.

This issue is being portrayed by the GGNRA as people who have dogs versus environmentalists. I am an environmentalist and a dog owner and I'm certain we can protect the environment AND allow off-leash dogs in the GGNRA. The vast majority of the GGNRA is already closed off to dogs. It's important to remember that the GGNRA is not a pristine wilderness area - it's a recreation area in an urban environment - so it needs to allow for recreation that is balanced with the protection of indigenous species and plants.

Please reconsider for me and my dog.

Thank You,

Michael P Feranchak  
and Max

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2597    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 09:39:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Taking with public space within the city limits is wrong. removing what has been for years access to all of San Francisco's residence two and four-legged is wrong. breaking up families telling them they cannot go there with their other part of the families is allowed is also wrong. this whole concept of eminent domain by the federal government in the city is wrong!

The land if the free doesn't seem so free with this ill attempt to ban beach acces to the family dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2598    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 09:48:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First, I would like to express my gratitude that the Corral de Tierra property has been saved from development. I have lived in Montara for thirty one years and have watched various owners try to build on it. I am extremely pleased that is no longer an option.

In the thirty one years I have lived here I have always have had a dog. I have been walking in the field all those years with my dog. With the help of the Montara Dog Group, I have become a better dog owner.

---

The community that has been built here is very extraordinary. We clean up after our dogs and other dogs. We have respect for each other on the trail. Most of the dogs do much better together when they are off leash. When I see a dog who is on leash or a person walking without a dog I always ask them if they would like me to leash my dogs. This method seems to work well here. We need to have some areas that are open to off leash dogs.

The GGNRA is supposed to be about recreation. For many of us dog walking is our recreation. Watching my dogs run and frolic with other dogs is pure joy to me.

Please leave many open for off leash dog walking. My dogs and I both thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2599	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94707 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 09:52:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My husband and I take our wonderful dog to Crissy Field every other weekend. It brings so much joy not just to our dog, Jackson, but to us as well. We've made a ritual out of our Crissy Field journeys. We get our coffees from the Beach Hut Cafe, let our dog have a blast for an hour, and then we go to North Beach for some pizza. Not only is it healthy for us, it's healthy for San Francisco's economy. I know we are not the only couple that comes from out of town to enjoy Crissy Field. If it gets taken away, it will be a detriment for dogs, dog lovers, and San Francisco's economy.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2600	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 09:59:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please let my dog run free! He loves to fetch, and I love him. If we make dog ownership in sf more difficult, people may stop adopting them from the spca. then we have a bigger problem on our hands.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2601	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome

---

My dogs love coming to GGNRA areas, especially Crissy Fields, Fort Funston, and Ocean Beach. It gives them the opportunity to run around, meet other dogs, and have a wonderful day playing. It would be a huge dis-service to the public, especially animal lovers, to limit their changes to enjoy our beautiful city with their pets. Please don't make our city unfriendly to dogs and animal lovers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2602    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Campbell, CA 95008  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 10:02:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My husband and I live in Campbell which is not very off leash friendly. Sure there are a few "dog parks" that are a small patch of AstroTurf surrounded by fencing that we can take our dogs to, but they know it's not the real deal. Although we are surrounded by beautiful hills with miles of hiking trails, only a few even allow dogs, none permit our dogs to feel the freedom of being off leash. Because of limited resources in our area, we take our dogs up to the city at least once a month so they can run free and we can reinforce their off leash voice control training. We make a day of it. We meet up with friends and enjoy long walks along Fort Funston or whichever other fun park is close by the friend we are visiting that day. After the dogs have had their fun, my husband and I go out to eat at a local restaurant. Because the city is welcoming to our "fur children" we spend a lot of time up there with friends and we are also stimulating the economy by eating and shopping there. I'm not sure how often we would make it up there if it wasn't a place for our whole family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2603    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 10:08:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Daniel Balderas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2604    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 10:18:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs are not the problem!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Littering young adults in Dolores Park is the local problem! Partiers on the hill leaving their trash behind. Don't criminalize free dog runs!!!! Get more trash cans in that park!!!! Have police awareness and non-littering awareness Patrols!

do your job!

and don't criminalize dog owners!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2605    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 10:33:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is so important that dogs get adequate exercise - walking beside their owners It is critical that we have areas in the city to let them do so! isn't enough - they need to run to stay fit!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2606    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Greenbrae, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas and on new lands

that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Dee Lawrence

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2607	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 10:40:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Then, this study fails to present hard data backing their recommendations, fails to provide any impact analysis of their recommendations, and fails to adhere to the existing 1979 court rulings. All of their options, including No Change actually reduce off-leash rights from the current conditions. No options were considered for expanding off-leash areas, which arguably could have greater positive effects.

The NPS repeatedly makes the mistake of prioritizing GGNRA lands for conservancy over recreation, and often arguing that all of the other NPS lands do not allow off-leash areas. That misses critical points including in this unique circumstance:

- " these are national recreation areas,
- " national recreation areas are not all managed by NPS, so should not be limited by NPS rules,
- " the City of San Francisco gave lands to GGNRA under the condition that these lands would be used for recreation, and
- " these parks are uniquely within an urban area so should not be treated with same rules as say Yosemite.

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

This GGNRA Dog Plan will have enormous detrimental effect on one of the most unique, forward thinking and treasured cities in the world.

Bay Area resident and voter

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2608	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Martinez, CA 94553 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Sincerely,  
Lisa Muller

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2609	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 10:51:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep dogs off Baker Beach, especially the southern portion, whether they be off- or on-leash.				

I run at Baker Beach. The sand near the cliffs is strewn with dog poop - it is disgusting. I'd like to have a dog-free place to jog where I don't have to worry about stepping in poop or being molested by someone's misbehaving pet.

I've also seen wildlife molested at Baker Beach, and I suspect it was done by dogs, though I am not sure of that: mussels are removed from the cliffs at the far south end and strewn on the sand, sometimes as far north as the creek.

I support any efforts to restrict dogs from any or all parts of the GGNRA.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2610	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 11:08:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep the GGNRA open to ALL! Individuals, families and their four-legged family members deserve the right to access public land as much as everyone else!				

Reducing access this to proposed exorbitant degree is punishing a quite large sector of the Bay Area population, and limiting access to public land that can only be described as grossly prejudiced.

Before ANY action is taken, the people DEMAND a broad spectrum of surveys to be taken at the actual land which is being proposed to be pet-limited. Each and every person who is taking advantage of the GGNRA over a period of time should be given a say in this process!

Without this equitable due process, the proposal is simply non-ethical.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2611	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Vallejo, CA 94591 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 11:17:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposal is too restrictive. I lived 20 years in SF and enjoyed the off leash areas of Fort Funston and Bernal Hill. These off leash areas should be enjoyed by people AND their dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2612    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Vacaville, CA 95688  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 11:18:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am so disappointed. One of the many things that make SF such a special city is their "dog friendly" environment. My son lives in SF and when I visit him my heart is warmed by all the dogs being walked, dogs playing off-leash in parks, water bowls outside of businesses, dog-friendly restaurant patios. This past Monday my son invited me (and my dog) to walk along the beach at Crissy field. What a wonderful experience that was! On a Monday morning, we saw several dog walks . . . with 8 to 10 dogs and all their 'doggy gear'. What a wonderful service to residents of SF! I think how a community treats its animals is a reflection on the the heart of that community. Please don't restrict dog park areas in or around SF.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2613    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 11:29:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Headland and frequently walk alone and having my dog with me provides peace of mind and safety while enjoying the outdoors by myself.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2614    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Phil Herlth

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2615    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 11:54:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

Dog walking is one of the few recreational past times open to all ages, for older dog owners off leash is hugely important to be able to fully exercise our dogs. Last year my mother broke her arm in a fall, off leash enabled her to continue walking Wellington which she would not have been able to do on leash. We have invested time and money training our dog so that he is always under voice control.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

In years of walking my dog in the GGNRA the only times I have had concerns for my safety have been from other people rather than dogs.

Finally as an owner of a market research consultancy I have concerns about the objectivity and quality of the "visitor surveys" that were undertaken 2008 and 2011. Both the sample and the methodology appear to be flawed and therefore subject to bias.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2616    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 11:57:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Not allowing dogs in Rancho is unfair. Keep Rancho open to dogs.

I have lived in El Granada for 40 years. All of the 40 years, I have hiked in the hills of Montara or El Granada daily with the companionship of my dog. I have never had any problems. Now that GGNRA has taken ownership of Rancho, we have to keep submitting forms pleading with GGNRA to allow us the chance to continue hiking with our dogs on Rancho land. Not allowing dogs off-leash in Rancho is unfair. Keep Rancho open to dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2617    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the "preferred alternative" described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who commented on the first plan. In addition, not a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA was set up as a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area. A high percentage of Bay Area households have dogs, and responsible dog owners exercise their dogs every day. Certain GGNRA trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. I strongly support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2618    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 12:36:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I walk my dog on Ocean Beach on a regular basis. My dog does not disturb anyone and she is always under my control. I clean the dog poop. The rules if any, should simply enforce stiff penalties for not cleaning after the pet. But to ban dogs from the beach is patently unfair. I walk on the beach as opposed to fire trails, because there are no ticks on the beach, and because I enjoy this activity with my dog. The dogs need exercise, they need to run around, and it is inhumane not to let the dogs on the beach. This is overreaching by the government.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2619    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 12:45:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner myself, and one frequents the national recreation areas like ocean beach on a regular basis, I want offer the following recommendations: Please allow the dogs on the beach, but enforce strict penalties against people who fail to clean up after the pets or control their pets. Install doggie poop bags at the beach entrances, and put up warning signs for non compliance. While this may not solve the problem completely, it will serve to address the concerns posed by non-dog or even responsible dog owners, regarding this issue. The solution is not to ban an activity, but encourage responsible behavior. This should at least be attempted on a trial basis before an outright ban on dogs is initiated. thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2620    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2621    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 13:05:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Hello!

I am writing in support of the Dog Management plan and any further efforts to better control dog recreational activities in the GGNRA.

I used to work as a naturalist and science educator at Fort Funston, one of the most popular dog parks of the GGNRA. There I took under-served youth from low income neighborhoods on nature hikes so they could learn about San Francisco's natural history, geology as well as observe native wildlife.

Many of these students come from neighborhoods where they've experienced trauma in the form of aggression or attacks by dogs. I was appalled at how many rude and harassing comments I received from dog walkers who got angry when I asked them to keep their animals on leash around my student groups. Dogs jumped on my students, knocked them over and ate pieces of their lunch right out of their hands.

Moreover, Fort Funston was littered with dog feces and dog walkers who could not "voice control" the 10-15 dogs they would walk at one time. This is a safety hazard for anyone who is trying to enjoy a park and doesn't want to play with dogs and/or has an allergy or intense fear of them.

I continue to enjoy the GGNRA and still get questioned when I walk through Fort Funston, "where is your dog?" I constantly remind people that this park is for everyone, not just dog walkers.

Please continue to preserve the GGNRA for ALL park visitors, especially those who want to enjoy these parks beauty without being harassed by dogs, their feces and the irresponsible owners who don't know how to control their animals.

Thank you,  
Thea Zajac

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2622	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 13:06:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I totally agree and fully support with dog restrictionist GGNRA.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2623	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 13:06:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to preface my below comment with something about myself. I have taken college environmental studies, ecology, botany, biology, and written a paper on and done hundred of hours of volunteer work for habitat restoration of the Mission Blue Butterfly here in the Bay Area. My cousin is a retired ranger, his brother VP of California Division of Forestry. I grew up in the outdoors, a Boy Scout (completing my eagle scout requirements) and have great respect for our environment. In addition my grandfather was mayor of Oakland for 10 years and I grew up in a political atmosphere. I believe with my upbringing and education I bring a somewhat unique perspective to the proposal.				

---

I advocate a fair and balanced approach to use of land, both for the environment and recreation, but the current trail regulations and all of the proposals on the table are not reflective of the diverse population in the Bay Area and what is needed. There needs to be a greater balance of spaces for everyone's enjoyment while maintaining adequate space for the surrounding wildlife. It is the Golden Gate National RECREATION Area in an urban setting. It is not a national preserve or park and should follow a different guideline than other areas.

There are no off leash areas in San Mateo County within the GGNRA at all, yet 40% of the population has at least one dog. Every county other than San Mateo has large amounts of off leash areas within the Bay Area. Currently there is a large amount of non-compliance in the area due to this heavy handed approach, this will only get worse with any of the proposals. I know from past experience with the Boy Scouts in maintenance and creation of trails, that when you have overly heavy trail regulation people lose respect for the authority and do not follow any of the rules. However if you allowed space and trails for everyone, people will be much more compliant, people will be happier and the environment will be happier. Right now a dog owner either needs to break the law or drive a considerable distance, which is also poor for the environment. This then concentrates people into one area, typically Fort Funston, which creates over use in that area and increased conflict. So thusly, you have people walking their dogs off leash in the whole of the system currently with little care for the environment and those that don't break the law are concentrated into a small area. This is not how I learned best practices of trail management, nor is it beneficial to the environment or citizens of the community.

Each space should have areas for each demographic. Some area of no dogs at all, some on leash only, and areas of off leash. Keeping people local within their area. The amount of compliance will be high, people will have greater respect for the laws, they will have a more vested interest in the upkeep, and most will also take a more active roll in the environment. It is a win, win.

Look at Pulgas Ridge Open Space Preserve. It contains the only off leash hiking trail system within San Mateo County. Within the space there are no dog areas, on leash areas, and off leash areas. The compliance is high and conflict is low, everyone has a place to go. However it is quite a drive for the coastal communities and is generally only used by people local to that area. We need more local areas like this.

Much of the land in San Mateo County in the GGNRA is abandoned military and filled with old bunkers and concrete, not suitable for any habitat restoration.

I will take Milagra Ridge as an example, as it is out of my back yard. Though this proposal can be applied to any area easily. The upper part of Milagra Ridge has a well done and active restoration. The lupin and thus the Mission Blue Butterfly has made a substantial rebound. However that only applies to the top of the ridge. The lower area (western side below the overlook) is littered with old concrete, bunkers, military debris, and evasive species. The western side of the ridge is also fairly unused other than by dog walkers from the surrounding area.

In the upper area of Milagra Ridge, I suggest keeping on leash only to Milagra Ridge Road and Fire Road on the upper section and the North Spur, everything else no dogs at all. Then the lower, most western side below the overlook and below the cable fence, dogs off leash. This keeps the dogs in an area where there will be little impact and limits traffic in the areas of the restoration.

A win, win for everyone and the environment.

This is the approach that needs to be taken system wide. Not increased laws that will only raise the amount conflict.

None of the proposals are adequate for the community or environment. A balance is what is needed and it does not appear that there is any move toward that direction with the current proposals.

**Correspondence ID:** 2624    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 13:08:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Regarding proposed restrictions on dogs at Ocean Beach SF. I am strongly opposed to restricting access for dogs.

I have been a regular user of Ocean Beach for over 24 years. In that time I have observed a dramatic increase in the amount of users, a significant proportion of those are people who bring their dogs. Some of these park users are people who have chosen to live near the beach order to be able to walk with their dogs. There are many cold and foggy days when the only park users are surfers, joggers and dog walkers.

Ocean Beach is urbanized and the idea that banning dogs from most of the beach will somehow return it to a state of wilderness is misplaced. Ocean Beach has already "gone to the dogs" figuratively speaking. More accurately it is the growing population of the Bay Area that has led more people to use the beach. It is urban open space with a long history of development and use. It is not another Yellowstone Park or National Capital.

The only conflicts I have directly observed is dogs and birds. Studies were done and restrictions were put in place. I make a point myself to educate dog owners if I see their dogs disturbing any of the local wildlife. I do not hesitate to speak with them.

Please don't restrict dog access at Ocean Beach any further.

Regards,

Matt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2625    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pinole, CA 94564  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 13:11:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
E. Cieslak

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2626    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 13:14:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** What a shame you're considering removing 90 percent of the off leash dog areas from the San Francisco area. Having such areas to enjoy and exercise my beloved 14 year old Weimaraner is one of the things I cherish about San Francisco. I keep a photo of my dog during an incredibly happy moment at Crissy Field on my desk. An off leach beach is Disneyland for dogs.

I hope this plan does not happen. It would be a loss of freedoms for me and my four legged companion. Everyone loses.

Most Sincerely,

Scott Fairbanks  
San Francisco CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2627    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 13:22:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a taxpayer enjoying the bay area, I would be very upset to have the right to walk my dog in the few areas that are left.  
I support the various programs for areas taken from off leash for dogs, given to sports fields for children. For those of us enjoying the beauty we live here for, it would be a disaster to take that away. Not fair to the animals and their owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2628    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sacramento, CA 95865  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 13:27:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support this plan which grants space to dogs and dog owners as well as other citizens who want to go out in nature without interacting with dogs. Everyone needs space to take a walk.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2629    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 13:32:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have a 3 year old rescued pointer who requires exercise everyday and I use the a variety of parks, predominantly Fort Fungston. It would be cruel to my dog if she were unable to exercise and I have used Fort Fungston for her and my previous dog (I had her for 13 yeras).

I am responsible and pick up not only her waste, but other dogs AND people litter which is more abundant than from dogs.

Please do not close the few parks left where dogs that require long runs can do so!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2630    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 13:33:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow for continued off leash areas at great parks like Chrissy and ft funston. It is one of the things that makes sf so great. It would be a horrible shame to force leash rules in these beautiful places where our dog can have some real freedom to run. Dog areas Re alreDy so limited for off leash. It would make things difficult for my family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2631    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 13:35:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have been an SF resident for 11 years and have utilized dog friendly parks and beaches with my two dogs during this time. As our city continues to be recognized as a very dog friendly city - more so than children in many respects - I find it extremely important we continue to maintain, not restrict, these dog friendly areas. I strongly encourage our NPS to maintain, if not increase, the areas permitted for dog use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2632    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Palo Alto, CA 94304  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 13:39:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---



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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Christina Velasco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2633	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Menlo Park, CA 94025 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Foster home for Norcal Weimaraner Rescue Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a foster family for the Norcal Weimaraner Rescue who walks regularly with our foster dogs in the GGNRA, Im writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with our fosters for my own health and our foster dogs health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. We rely on these spaces to help rehabilitate some of our foster dogs. We walked and swam a severely injured Weimaraner named Hero who had been abandoned by his family after being hit by a car. After the initial wounds healed, we took Hero for regular swims at Fort Funston. Hero made a 100% recovery and was later adopted by a police officer.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Erin Drake

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2634	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

Im writing to express my strong opposition of GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

I regularly take my dog to many of the areas affected by this plan (Stinson beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Marin Headlands etc). This plan is way too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying outdoor activities with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Further, dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979 and should remain accessible for responsible dog owners to enjoy.

Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,

Bo Sharpe  
Sausalito Resident

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2635    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is my second statement opposing the NPS plan to close down access on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to off-leash dog recreation.

The NPS/GGNRA new version of its proposed "dog management plan" would be a disaster for Marin County residents.

It would take away hiking trails, fire roads and beaches that have been used by people and their dogs for at least a half a century. The owners of more than an estimated 60,000 dogs would be left with virtually no place to go for off-leash recreation.

One of the main reasons people move to Marin is because it is so friendly to both children and dogs and because of its close proximity to a multitude of trails and beaches. Many of us jog the trails with our dogs or pack up the kids and dog for a day at the beach. Single women feel safer hiking with a canine

---

companion and dogs get the elderly out of the house socializing on trails.

The GGNRA plan would take away an important part of traditionally dog-friendly Marin's soul by putting a choke collar on man's best friend.

The fact is, there is no justifiable reason for these proposed changes. As it stands now, 99 percent of the GGNRA is already off limits to dogs. If the dog management plan goes through, there would not be a single trail in the entire 80,000 acres where dogs and their owners could enjoy an off-leash experience. In Marin, off leash dog walking would be banned on all 38 trails. Only five of those trails would even allow leashed dogs. Funneling all dogs onto just five trails is irresponsible and reckless. The only off-leash area in all of Marin County would be a remote stretch of Rodeo Beach, which is only accessible by car. Dog owners, who normally walk or drive a short distance to their trails, would be forced into cars to drive miles away in order to exercise their pets.

Imagine living in Muir Beach and having to drive 15 miles in order to do something you normally do right outside your back door. How many cars will this put on our already congested roadways and how much more pollution will this cause? Tam Junction simply cannot handle any more unnecessary cars trips.

The GGNRA has spent millions of our tax dollars compiling a 2,400-page report full of anecdotal evidence and skewed scientific reporting telling us what dogs "could" and "might" do, but have failed to include what impacts closing down these areas would have on surrounding neighborhoods. The fact is, if the dog plan gets approved, local parks and trails would be overwhelmed with dog walkers kicked off their favorite trails.

The Marin Humane Society adamantly opposes the plan because they know how important off leash play is for the health and behavior of dogs and their humans.

"As animal shelters across the country work to save animal lives and create homes for thousands of homeless animals, what a shame that now responsible dog guardians will be scrambling to find a proper place to spend off-leash time with their animal companions on our public land," said Captain Cindy Machado, the director of animal services for the Marin Humane Society. "The GGNRA spaces in Marin aren't just places to congregate, they are places to be active by hiking, walking, enjoying the beauty of our natural spaces and spending quality time with our animal companions who share the same enjoyment when they are with us."

Closing down these trails is a betrayal of public trust and the spirit of the GGNRA's enabling legislation. I vehemently oppose the GGNRA proposed preferred plan.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2636	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 14:02:14
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm incredibly disappointed to hear of your proposal to significantly restrict and deny dog owners the freedom to run their dogs off their leashes and play fetch. I'm not a dog owner myself but enjoy watching the dogs and their owners enjoy the spaces with us.
------------------------	--

Please reconsider this unnecessary decision.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2637	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Olivehurst, CA 95961 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

---

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 14:08:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** What's the problem with dogs being allowed to run on the beaches? I understand that it is mandatory if the dog goes to the bathroom the owner is supposed to pick it up. I do know some don't do that but with all the uproar of cruelty to animals, I would think this is being cruel. It is depriving them of their freedom to run and get their exercise. I see nothing wrong with them being on the beach as long as they are with their owners and watched. I'm sure there are worse things than dogs who roam the beaches. So, I protest against closing these areas for dogs. If they aren't allowed on the beach, maybe you or whoever is protesting this should put up a fence along some of the beach areas for them to run and enjoy. There are worse things to worry about than protesting the dogs on the beach. I pray that the dog lovers win on this one and you protesters find something worth while to work on, like drugs and corruption of our country.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2638    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** DotGreen Foundation Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 14:12:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please DO NOT impose tight Dog use restrictions in the GGNRA and public lands.

Pet ownership and dog companions are a tremendous necessity for human and therefor community health in urban environments. This plan undermines the natural and fundamental needs people have for pet companionship. The GGNRA exists for Public Use for PUBLIC BENEFIT. Restricting pets, restricts access for people....and that is bad practice for public lands and forward thinking communities.

I don't even have a dog, and I love the GGNRA, and I am an environmentalist interested in preserving nature and wild life habitat. It is because of my interests in a freener and more sustainable and healthy future for people and planet that I am against this proposed restriction.

PERSONAL EXAMPLE: I grew up riding the GGNRA with a horse, and parents allowed us to ride alone because one of the girls had a dog following us everywhere for safety. The dog would have warned us of danger, scared away predators, or gone for help if something would have happened. This would not be possible if dogs are not allowed to accompany their owners. Because of pets, horses and dogs, I was able to explore and experience and understand the wild open space lands of Marin County all through my formative years. I am now a dedicated environmentalist because of it. If Marin County open space was not available to me, I would be a different person. Instead, I have raised four children who have explored these lands with me their whole lives and now they too treasure and frequent the GGNRA; hiking and surfing.

Allowing people to experience the open space gives back to the future as citizens pass down values and understanding of the importance of Nature to the next generation. Preventing people from learning and understanding nature, will lead to creating entire generations of people who don't know and don't care about it these lands. When people don't know...they don't care! Who then will protect the GGNRA, and other important open spaces - and all that is dear and important for the environment on this planet?

It starts here, please do not restrict people and their companions (dogs) from enjoying and learning about the public park lands, instead you are in a position to keep it open and available so as many people as possible will fall in love with the outdoors, and will care for our parks and open spaces...the health of the community today, and the continuation of the public park lands in the future depend on it.

Sincerely,

Annalisa Roger,  
Resident of Marin County  
Founder, Director DotGreenFoundation.org

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2639    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 14:20:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't add any more restrictions to limit dog access to Federal land. There are already so few places we can take dogs. Before I got a dog I regularly hiked in Point Reyes National Seashore and the Marin Headlands. Now that I have a dog, I am forced to seek alternate locations where I can take my pup. It is becoming more and more difficult to find spaces that allow dogs. I am a responsible dog owner and just a few weeks ago went to the fabulous Muir beach. The non-dogs owners already have the vast majority of open land and trails in the Bay Area to themselves, please don't take away what little we have left. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2640    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley , CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 14:37:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2641    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 14:38:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a resident of Montara and a dog owner, I have visited several properties now managed by the GGNRA - Rancho Corral de Tierra (Rancho) , Mori Point, Fort Funston and Crissy Field. I have observed that there is a real community of dog owners who frequent these parks. Most of the dog owners are very responsible custodians of the park and their dogs are well behaved. The current draft proposal contends that the opposite is the case and that dogs and their owners need to be banned from GGNRA properties. There are precious few places where one can currently walk a dog off lead in San Mateo and San Francisco Counties. The fact that the GGNRA wants to take away several existing dog friendly venues is disturbing. There are already plenty of places for those who do not enjoy the company of canines to visit and enjoy the outdoors without having to deal with dogs. Maintaining dog friendly parks and preserving the environment do not have to be mutually exclusive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2642    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Novato, CA 94949  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 14:51:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in Marin and we have been walking our dogs for many years here, without negative incidents of any kind. It had been my experience that the vast majority of dog owners are very responsible.

This plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2643    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Santa Cruz, CA 95062  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Live Oak Off Leash Advocates Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 15:04:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Marion Morris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2644    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 15:08:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA -

Ft Funston and other off-leash dog areas must remain open for recreational use - - including off-leash dogs.

The plan as stated is restrictive, does not support the recreational use of OUR land and puts a tremendous burden on city parks.

Ft Funston is a lovely place BECAUSE of the dogs there, not in spite of them. This cold, foggy, windy place would see few visitors w/out the dog users and many women who run there on weekend mornings do so because of the SAFETY that comes with dog users out and about.

Crissy Field and Baker Beach are more used than other areas by a mix of people and dogs - and this is what makes these areas wonderful! If you must, for the sake of non-dog owners, restrict dogs on these beaches, maybe you can do it at certain, heavy use hours (between 10am and 3pm for example).

I do hope any revisions to the plan are in tune with RECREATION and the people in this wonderful city and not simply the decision of an organization that seems to be out of touch with its original charter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2645    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 15:15:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've been a Montara resident for 17 years. The area now known as Rancho Corral de Tierra has been an important part of our community for as long as I can remember. I've walked my dogs off leash in the area behind Farallone View Elementary School since 1998. I have never witnessed a serious altercation between dogs and humans in the hundreds of walks I've taken. Equestrians, bicyclists, runners, hikers and dog walkers have co-existed peacefully for years. I do not understand the need to change the off-leash policy. I often walk in the mornings and afternoons and rarely see anyone except fellow dog walkers, most of them locals. We are a respectful bunch and leash our dogs when we approach people without dogs. We pick up our dog waste and help maintain the trails. We have been active in supporting first Peninsula Open Space Trust and now GGNRA to preserve open space on the coast. I know that dogs can disrupt the wildlife in the area, but dogs have been part of the area for decades so this is not something new to the area. As a long term supporter of The Nature Conservancy, I know that some land needs to be set aside with minimum impact from humans and there animals. This is not the case in

---

Rancho Corral de Tierra in my opinion. This land borders densely populated areas near San Francisco and the peninsula and it needs to be preserved for all users. Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2646    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 15:16:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The mission of the National Park Service is "...to promote and regulate the use of the...national parks...which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." National Park Service Organic Act, 16 U.S.C.1.

To that end, I very much appreciate that you are working to reduce and control the impact of dogs in the GGNRA, our limited and therefore precious natural environments that have been set aside to preserve our national wildlife flora and fauna, so that our generation and future generations will have the opportunity in an ever-increasingly urban, developed environment to experience and appreciate wildlife in its natural setting.

There are many of us, including many responsible dog owners, who are in favor of restricting dogs off leash as well as banning dogs completely from some natural areas within the GGNRA. I liken the irresponsible dog owners to people who think they should have a right to smoke anywhere, anytime, not respecting the rights of those who want a clean, smoke-free environment. When I go to the San Francisco Bay shore and want to observe the shorebirds in their natural habitat, I am dismayed by unleashed dogs who come bounding along, chasing shorebirds and scaring others off. After all, it's their natural habitat, not the dog's. Dogs have owners to feed and protect them. Wildlife needs your protection to thrive.

As a wildlife supporter, I of course would like to see even stricter regulations for dogs than those being proposed, but I strongly urge you not to weaken your proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2647    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** MONTARA, CA 94037-0522  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 15:18:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA (specifically Rancho Corral de Tierra in Montara), I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on this property for many, many years.

This property was saved from development by some of the very people who may soon be asked to leave (or worse) if they bring their dog. It's clear their voices are not being considered or heard. Though dog



walkers, horses, hikers and mountain bikers have peacefully coexisted on this land for many years, we now are being threatened with government oversight that doesn't represent the needs of many. In my opinion, GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose in regard to this area (and others within the GGNRA): these lands were set aside to be a RECREATION AREA for ALL to use and enjoy. Though I agree that the dog mgmt policy needs to be formalized in some way, but dogs and responsible dog owners should be allowed to continue this co-existence. I urge you to support off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. Dog owners have rights too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2648    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 15:20:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was just wondering where are we going to walk our dogs off-leash if this passes. If everyone has to go to the small, enclosed off-leash areas around the city, then one is asking for an awful amount of trouble...both between dogs and owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2649    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** MILL VALLEY, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying the GGNRA with my family the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

The GGNRA was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

We love the GGNRA and want to share its beauty with our whole family, including our pets. A huge percentage of people who live in this area have dogs and derive a great deal of health, happiness and well being from being able to enjoy nature with them. Isn't this the purpose of a recreation area? Please don't take away this basic freedom from us.

Thank you,  
Tracy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2650    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,09,2014 15:32:51**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed regulations are too severe. We live in an urban area. These parks are heavily used and enjoyed by people and dogs like. A simple solution for Crissy Field is - no dogs on the beach closest to the parking area. Then dogs off leash in the area after the channel and over the bridge. As for Stinson Beach- it works well as it is -accommodating both-beach area off limits for dogs and clearly marked area for dogs off leash. As for Fort Funston- it should be open for all activities including off leash dogs. It is one of the best treasures of living in the SF Bay Area. Walking my dog off leash on the GGNRA beaches is my favorite past-time. Please consider the rights of dog owners in your decision. If the beaches are closed to dogs it will be very hard to enforce. You will have to hire many law enforcement folks to chase down us dog lovers. Please be rational, fair and mindful of the will of the people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2651 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Dublin, CA 94568  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
E Hackett

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2652 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,09,2014 15:53:55**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** GGNR was setup as a recreation area - - recreation in these areas should NOT be limited it should be inclusive and include off leash areas for dogs - - MOST especially in urban areas where it is difficult to find any open green areas. I am a strong advocate for responsible dog ownership, and would rather see tough sanctions on dog owners who do not cleanup after their pets, or owners/dog walkers that cannot manage the number of dogs in their care - - BUT why penalize the majority of dog owners who are responsible not only to their dogs, but to the environment and recreation areas that we visit.

GGRNA should not be able to restrict access without factual data to backup the restriction of access to

GGRA - - for more than 50 years this area has been made available for on/off leash access; why should this change now? It should not be opinion, it should be supported with data.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2653    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** private homeowner, single dog owner Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I regularly take my ONE dog, who needs LOTS of daily OFF LEASH exercise to many GGNRA trails and beaches in Southern Marin. If I could not walk my dog off leash on these trails, I would no longer visit the parks. If you move forward with Alternative F, I WILL ASK FOR AN ANNUAL TAX REFUND FOR LOSS OF REASONABLE USE OF LOCAL GGNRA PARKS (and I imagine many of my friends will do the same).

Local Remington and Mill Valley dog parks have poor access, inadequate parking, and are too close to local schools, which will present a danger to Marin's children if these inadequate dog parks are overrun with dogs at their entrances and exits.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies to support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2654    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 16:05:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not support any restriction to existing off leash areas with the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas - - I oppose the GGNRA's dog plan.

It makes no sense to further restrict areas that allow off/on leash access for dogs. There is already limited access to parks that allow dogs off/on leash to further restrict would result in overcrowding and more issues in the existing areas that are available.

I support responsible dog ownership - - but why limit areas that have been accessible for off/on leash dog walking since 1979.

PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE GGNRA's DOG PLAN.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2655    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Grass Valley, CA 95949  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 16:06:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is a travesty to wildlife and their shrinking habitat that dogs are allowed to roam at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Dogs on leash areas are a farce. A large proportion of dog owners let their canines run free no matter what the rules are. Leash compliance on Ocean Beach is less than 30%! A secure fenced area is where dogs should go to play so that dogs do not have the chance kill, maim, chase, or otherwise harass birds, wildlife and unsuspecting humans. The hard-wired canine instinct is to seek, chase, and kill prey.

There are other users of GGNRA besides dog owners and dogs, many of whom want to enjoy our National Park without the disturbance of somebodys barking dog running down birds. Many people visit GGNRA to picnic, hike, walk, view wildlife, and simply enjoy nature and the beauty of the ocean. GGNRA is the only national park with off-leash zones. Un-leashed dogs and wildlife are not compatible and should be kept physically separated in our national parks.

The following excerpts are quoted directly from the NPS strategic plan: (My comment is in parentheses.)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Since our 1916 creation, the National Park Service has preserved many of Americas finest treasures and made them accessible to millions of visitors. (Dogs are not the visitors the NPS is referring to, by any stretch of the rules. - my comment)

Parks show us wonders, both natural and historical, that grace our lives and provide us cherished experiences.

Category I goals - Preserve Park Resources - reflect the NPS 1916 Organic Act to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein.

Category II goals - Provide for the Public Enjoyment and Visitor Experience of Parks - reflect the NPS Organic Act mandate to provide for the enjoyment of the [resources] in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

#### MISSION STATEMENT

The National Park Service preserves unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. The Park Service cooperates with partners to extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation throughout this country and the world.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

GGNRA has gone too far accommodating dogs and their humans. Please use diligence and common sense to protect our wildlife and peaceful beaches. Please use the NPS goals and mission statement to safeguard our natural resources, not trample and abuse them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2656    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 16:11:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** San Mateo County will have no off leash sites if this plan goes through. That is tragic for both the dogs under our care and the humans who walk them. The dog owners who walk their pets in off leash areas are responsible, pick up the waste and make sure their dogs are under control and are well socialized before they let their dogs off leash. There are very few episodes of dog aggression on the current off leash areas.

I myself have a Bouvier who is a service dog as well as a pet. He requires a lot of exercise and if there are no off leash sites I would have a difficult time managing the 35-60 minutes of intense exercise per day that he requires. He is actually too big to exercise in the the relatively small dog park in Half Moon Bay. He brings such joy and love to the humans he works with in a clinic that I work at that patients would not be able to benefit from his well exercised and gentle presence were it not for his exercise program. I live on the coast and the off leash areas would all be gone.

Please allow responsible owners the ability to manage their own and their pets exercise needs in a responsible and joyful way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2657    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 16:12:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my strong opposition to the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I am a 10-year resident in San Francisco and have owned a dog the entire time. As a dog owner who not only regularly uses the GGNRA regularly with my dog, I am a dog owner who based my home purchase on the proximity to Ocean Beach for the use with my dog!

It would be a devastating loss to dog owners to not have these areas for off leash enjoyment. For the past 10-years of regular use, I have noticed that often times the majority of people using these areas have dogs. By restricting these areas to dogs, you immediately are crippling the use of these areas for the 50% o homes in SF that have dogs. I know from experience that any time I leave the house to enjoy the outdoors, I have my dog. If my dog isn't allowed to enjoy these areas with me, I won't get to enjoy them either. We will be forced to go to small, cramped dog parks that, if this law passes, will be completely overcrowded. I believe you have to keep in mind the importance of a dog needing space to be a dog. Having a Labrador Retriever, I know that he needs the open space and off leash water area to do what is ingrained in him. If you have a large population of dogs that are not allowed to be a true dog and enjoy this open space, you will have a large population of extremely frustrated dogs that could lead to aggressive behavioral problems.

Please consider the large population of owners that this will effect, and please consider the damage that this may have on the dogs that RELY on these areas to be the dogs they are meant to be.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2658    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dog walking:

I am a 5 year part time resident of San Francisco. I have owned 1-3 dogs for the past 25 years. My greatest joy in life is waking up every morning to take my dogs for a run or walk OFF-LEASH on TRAILS. Dog walking all started in Illinois when I was 10 year old. It has continued daily since then. But this joy is under prosecution. Every year I have to fight for my right to walk my dogs. I have to fight for my right to own dogs. I am asking you not to go through with these restrictions in the GGNRA. Let us continue to take our dogs out on trails; hikes that take over an hour to complete. I want to be able to get away from the traffic, the concrete, people and be out in nature every day. I own dogs so I have to go out every day. I will not go out if I cant walk the dogs. If I am stuck in a fenced in area to play fetch I will not go there. I will only go where I can hike. A small fenced area to play fetch with my dogs is not healthy. There is no data that allowing people on trails is bad for the environment, and if it is bad its because there are too many dogs. That means we need MORE AREA to go and not less.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

This is not a new problem, nor a California problem. In Illinois they went from the whole city being off-leash to only in parks, to nowhere can dogs be off leash and not allowed in parks at all. What good does this do? It allowed the city to spend loads of money mowing grass that no one uses. In the end the only solution was for a club to be formed to buy 100 acres outside of the city for off leash hiking for dogs. If you do not own a car, you cannot go there. It is a miserable situation. In California there is no land to buy. What people have done is to give the Land to GGNRA so that people will always be able to go hiking; **HIKING WITH THEIR DOGS**. New areas added such as Rancho Corral Di Tierra where people have walked for years should be all off leash just as they were before GGNRA got a hold of them. It is a disgrace to the California that any decision is made that limits people from exercising. In an age where we want to fight obesity, why are you putting forth a plan that will encourage it? Be the first to make dog hiking, and dog ownership a thing of pride!

This plan will not allow dog walking on any trails. Dog owners are not going to drive to these parks and play fetch with their dogs in a tiny fenced area and then go for a hike without them. what they will do is find a place to hike with their dogs. The only place they will be able to go in San Francisco county will be McLaren Park. How will 3000/dogs a day impact that tiny 30 acres? We need more areas not less. If an are is over used, then you need a plan to rotate acreage. You need a system like in skin resorts of hard, easy, moderate places, you need to teach people what works and doesn't work for hiking. Keeping dogs off trails is NOT the answer.

The only joy I find in life now is walking trails with my dogs everyday, rain or shine. There were 50 cars at Fort Funston in the middle of the storms this weekend. That totals over 50 people an hour out walking with their dogs on a bad day. On a good day I bet there were 10 fold more. If you go ahead with this plan you will have those people (like me) inside being miserable. You will have more dogs in the pounds as people cant find a place to walk them. You will have more people break laws in order to find some sort of pleasure in this miserable society and economy. Going to these parks with your dog is the only thing many of us can afford. Rents take 50-70% o your income with no relief in sight. Instead of enjoying my time, I have to fight to be allowed to just go walking on trails in the wilderness. I am a single lady. I want

my dogs with me! Please let me stop fighting and make these parks forever Leash Free!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2659    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Campbell, CA 95008  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 16:45:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
April Bednarz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2660    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 16:46:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm not a dog owner but I support off leash areas for dogs  
I've never seen an incident that would cause me to  
believe that off leash is a bad idea  
I think that dogs need this outlet  
Especially city dogs who live mostly indoors or with limited  
Yard space.

---

Thank you  
Marcie Martins

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2661	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Granada, CA 94018 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 16:47:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Feb 9, 2014				

Sherron Bullens  
643 Ferdinand Ave  
El Granada CA 94018

Mr. Frank Dean,  
General Superintendant  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco CA 94123-0022

Dear Superintendant Dean,

I am writing to comment on the proposed plan for usage of the Rancho Corral de Tierra area handed over to Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) by Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST) in 2011.

I have lived in San Mateo county since 1975 and El Granada since 1999. I bought my home in El Granada (and tolerate a lengthy commute every weekday) specifically and solely for the proximity to areas where I could hike with my dogs. I have enjoyed hiking with dogs in the area behind El Granada regularly since I moved in, continuing in the traditional use of that land that has gone on for decades, and likely since the time of human inhabitation of the area. Like most of my neighbors, I am a responsible dog owner. I pick up and carry out feces. I do not allow my dogs to disturb habitat, chase animals. Dogs have no greater impact on the environment than, for instance, a child would, and certainly less impact than a bicycle would.

Because I love the land behind our town, I have taken it upon myself to help protect and maintain the area. I never hike without a large garbage bag, and I pick up all garbage I see - which, at times, has been a whole lot and necessitated several trips for removal. Several of my dog-walking neighbors do the same thing. There are others who hike with pruners and shovels and work to maintain the patency of the trails. The people of this area greatly value the Rancho land and take care of it voluntarily.

I am an environmentalist. I contribute time and money to many national and international associations dedicated to preserving wildlife and the environment, such as the Cornell Laboratory of Ornithology, Sierra Club, Audubon Society, World Wildlife Fund, National Wildlife Association, Nature Conservancy, and Zero Population Growth. I contributed regularly to POST to specifically aide in the preservation of our little area of Rancho. Hiking with dogs is not antithetical to caring about the environment. Clearly, many very avid and contributory environmentalists are dog owners.

I am dumbfounded that the preferred plan (Alternative B) that GGNRA proposes for Rancho is to completely prevent off-leash dog walking and severely limit access even for leashed dogs. This is so out



of alignment with my experience of the current and historical usage of this land, as well as with my observations of lack of environmental impact of dogs, that I wonder if there is some unknown, malevolent motivation behind the proposal. What could possibly cause the GGNRA, part of our government - which is supposed to be by and for the people - to wish to completely change the way the local people enjoy public land? Why would a governmental body move to reduce the property value of citizens who have lived here for decades? Why would GGNRA risk alienating all the volunteers who have worked for years to keep Rancho clean and safe, providing this rare bit of natural habitat for the native wildlife? Why would GGNRA discriminate against citizens who wish to hike in this beautiful territory with their families, when their family members, in part or in whole, are composed of dogs? This is not responsible government. This is oppression, discrimination, and thoughtlessness. Proceeding with Alternative B will bring you ill will, passive resistance, legal action, and trouble and heartache for years to come.

Mr. Dean, I urge you to consider Alternative A - the usage plan which would continue to allow responsible dog owners to hike with their dogs on leash in all parts of Rancho, and even off-leash in specific areas behind Montara and El Granada. This is exactly how people are currently using this land. This will not cause the loss of goodwill and cooperation of the locals. You will retain your volunteer garbage collectors, trail custodians, and stewards of the environment. You will ensure that the people and dogs of San Mateo County have someplace to go to get fresh air and exercise and contribute to the general health of the populace. You will be maintaining the wonderful aura that permeates this wild territory. As a government employee, you will be accurately representing the local peoples' will - truly governing by and for the people.

Thank you for allowing me to comment on GGNRA proposals for Rancho Corral de Tierra. If you have questions, or would wish to more fully understand my position, I provide my telephone numbers and email address below and invite you to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sherron Bullens  
650-712-8927 home  
415-827-6908 cell  
plateletgirl@me.com

cc: Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, Congresswoman Jackie Speier, Honorable Sally Jewell, Supervisor Don Horsley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2662	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 16:48:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** They came for the dogs, and I said nothing. They came for the horses and the mountain bikes, and I said nothing. They came for me, and there was no one else on the trails to object! This is what your GGNRA Dog Management Plan amounts to and we know it. A growing number of us see what you are attempting and will resist. We've been discussing this at Tamalpais High School in class.

The mandate of the National Parks, including the special region that is the GGNRA (meant to be an urban refuge, thank you, Congressman Phil Burton), is to provide citizens and visitors access to our natural

---

world that we may profit from increased health and grow in stewardship through a deep connection to the fundamental value of it. Public lands and National Parks are "America's Best Idea" only if they are accessible to and valued in perpetuity by the masses. Disenfranchising people now from public land will produce generations who care less for it, and this serves no entities except perhaps a few short-sighted bureaucrats and their elitist supporters in positions of authority right now.

John Bell, 18 yr old Marin Science student.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2663	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Granada, CA 94018				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I am contacting you with my views to continue to allow trail access to dogs (both on leach and off leach) even though I am not a dog owner. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent residents of San Mateo and San Francisco county from recreating with their dogs as has been the practice for many years. It especially concerns me that the GGNRA is proposing to eliminate land access for people with dogs without any solid science to support that position. It also concerns me that further public support for additional GGNRA lands (vs. local control) will be lessened if GGNRA policies are perceived to be arbitrary, unreasonable and lead to an unjustified loss of green space access for the dog owners in the affected areas.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Dan Bernstein

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2664	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 16:51:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We absolutely need space in our vast outdoors for us to walk with our pets. It is the safest place for both to walk and pets are proven to improve the health and wellness of all who they				

---

interact with, so this is a public health and wellness issue. We can all share this beautiful space with whomever needs and wants to use it. It is public land and it should be available to ALL of us to use and share...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2665    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 16:54:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the open space available for off leash dog walks.

Humans are already in control of this land, and it is well used.

There are plenty of opportunities for wild animals.

Not so many for human companions.

It's important to have the dog friendly space!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2666    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 16:58:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** being able to take our dog with us into parks off leash is crucial to his health. We live in a small apartment and it wouldn't be a healthy environment if we couldn't take him on long hikes, runs and walks off leash in the parks and open spaces.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2667    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 17:08:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I did not grow up in a family with dogs. In fact, for most of my life in San Jose, I was scared of them. I would be annoyed when there was poop in the park or in lawns on our street and I'd run away if one came towards me. It wasn't until I moved to San Francisco in 2007 that I realized the dogs here were different. They were friendlier, happier- they played more with other dogs and they weren't as ferocious seeming as dogs back home.

My fiancée (who grew up with dogs) explained to me that dogs in our city are different from dogs in suburban areas because of the awesome open areas we have for them to explore and play with each other, which makes them more socialized. From Crissy Field to Fort Funston to Alamo Square, these places not only offer dogs a ton of exercise after being cooped up in an apartment all day, but it is at those places that they learning how to behave & play with other dogs and mind people.

It is important that dogs get enough exercise & expel their energy, so that they are tired in the evenings and don't cause havoc indoors. Back in San Jose, there were zero dog parks & it was rare that these dogs got to play in open areas with each other. Folks either kept their dogs just in their backyards and/or walked them around the neighborhood while tugging back on leashes when other dogs and people were

near, creating more fear & perpetuating any tension which is then picked up by the dogs, making them more uneasy.

In 2009, I finally caved and my fiancée & I got my first dog- a half huskey/half shiba inu puppy named Kuma. I was nervous that I wouldn't know how to take care of him, that I would be an awful mom, and I was so over-protective of him with other dogs. The first time I let him off leash at Alamo Square, I screamed every time a big dog would run towards him. After a while and after many tips from other dog owners, I realized the difference between dogs playing & fighting, and saw for myself how amazing a couple hours playing with other dogs and swimming at Crissy Field would tire out this energetic puppy (enough to where we could go out to dinner and come home without worry that he tore apart our living room).

I am a full believer that these open areas, and the freedom we as dog owners have there to let our dogs run around, are the reason that dogs in our city are so well-behaved. Even now when we go back to San Jose, there is clear difference in behavior of dogs there vs. here (there is only 1 dog park nearest to the level we have available here (Campbell), yet that is still leash only aside from a small gated area).

Please, please, PLEASE do not restrict these areas for us owners and for our beloved dogs. They provide an enormous value in the relief they offer at the end of tough work days and too-short weekends. These places are a vital part of what makes our city thrive and also so enviable to visitors with dogs of their own and limiting them would be doing a great disservice to our city.

PS: I've heard that there are more dogs in the city now than children. This may not be the case in other cities, however we all know that SF has never been one to follow the pack. Given the exodus of families for more affordable housing, I'm seeing this more and more. Please consider the impact this will create in OUR city before going through with this

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2668	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 17:10:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jeff

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2669    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Mateo , CA 94402  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 17:26:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am an owner of a Portuguese Water Dog and have been for 11 years. I am a responsible pet owner in everything from vaccine shots to picking up after my dog. I have several friends with dogs who are also responsible dog owners. In fact the significant majority of dog owners I know are very responsible about their dogs. So I am urging the National Park Service to continue to allow dogs in the parks either on leash or off leash. I feel strongly that there are not enough off leash areas in the greater Bay Area and would like to see more rather than less. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2670    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 17:54:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner in Mill Valley. My dog is my sidekick. She brings me joy and calm. The GGNRA is an area we like to play and exercise. I keep her on trail, respect other people using the area, and clean up after ourselves. We need open space for the dogs to run! Please do not take that away from us!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2671    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 18:05:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have learned of the poorly planned GGNRA "Preferred Alternative" and oppose it completely for several reasons.

I have been a San Francisco voter since I moved here in 1987. I vote in every election, and I vote for every office and for every measure. I pay attention to which politicians support the programs I approve of, and it makes a difference in how I vote.

My partner and I walk our dog very responsibly, using especially Crissy Field, Fort Funston (where my partner served in the Coast Guard), and Ocean Beach.

First, as to the PA plan itself, it restricts dog walking far too much. I see no justification for the changes. We have a perfectly good policy established in 1979 which should now be formalized, and extended to the new GGNRA areas in San Mateo County.

Fences around off-leash areas are unnecessary, unsightly and off-putting. Are dogs and their humans a virus we need to quarantine?

---

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

Second, procedurally, this attempt by the GGNRA to change the leash status is arbitrary, undemocratic, and very poorly researched. Persons from all stakeholder groups should be represented honestly in an open and participatory process.

The GGNRA has clearly failed at being able to do that, as it is my understanding that the new plan did not respond in any significant way to thousands of people's substantive concerns and objections about the first plan. There have not been any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies-which the law requires-to support the sweeping changes proposed.

The GGNRA seems to have forgotten its purpose and mandate. It was established to be a recreational area for a densely populated, urban environment. I'm sure they are not petty bureaucrats making decisions without consulting the constituency the GGNRA was established to serve, but this PA this makes it seem as if they were. Americans and Californians do not conduct public business in this way.

Sincerely,

Steven A. Armstrong, M.A., M.A. Hum., M.Div.  
1254 18th Ave Apt 2  
San Francisco CA 94122

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2672    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Los Angeles, CA 90045  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 18:05:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs need open spaces as much as people do, if not more.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2673    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 18:14:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a senior citizen who does not have a dog but I go to Fort Funston every morning and I can tell you that offleash dogs are not a problem out there. People walking their dogs make the park safer for everyone because they are out 24/7, rain or shine. The dogs do less damage than people and the weather. Less than 1% o GGNRA land is currently offleash friendly and I do not understand your position that drastically reducing that 1% urther is "balanced". I also do not understand your position that areas you control such as Fort Funston should be treated as if they were true wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite. In case you haven't noticed, a place like Fort Funston abuts a densely populated urban area and is no more a true wilderness area than my backyard. I consider myself an avid environmentalist but also a realist. 1% i not balanced. Your preferred option is not balanced. You should be adding more offleash areas, not doing away with them. That would be at least heading in the direction of being balanced. I ask that you do not restrict offleash recreation. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2674    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 18:21:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having moved to San Francisco 3 years ago from Colorado we were so excited to find all of the excellent off-leash dog walking options here in the city for our 7 year old samoyed. He is an active dog and is well behaved off-leash, as are most of the dogs we encounter on GGNRA land. We live in the Presidio and regularly use both Crissy Field and Baker Beach for exercise and dog socialization. These are very valuable areas to us as responsible dog owners living in the city of San Francisco. Please do not take away these highly valued off-leash locations - with the large population of dogs living in the city, this would put immense pressure on the few off-leash city parks that would be left to accommodate us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2675    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** American Canyon, CA 94503

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** American Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 18:24:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is an absolute ABUSE OF POWER on the part the those elected officials of the park system, especially, Marin County against people who love dogs and who love to share the beautiful open spaces where they can play and walk with their companions. You are trying to shut down any open space, no matter how big or small, where people can be free with their dogs.

At the end of Center Street, in Novato, CA. there is a fire road and walking trail, hills to climb, it's wonderful for dogs to play off leash. I agree, the person whose dog it is should carry a leash at all times, but NOT to keep the dog on it the whole time.

Within the last couple of months, State Police, Police, Troopers, whomever you want to call them have been "ambushing" dog walkers, and giving them \$200 tickets for having their dog off leash and not on the fire trail.

By "ambushing" them, I mean that the "law enforcement persons" sit in their vehicles watching the walking trails. As soon as they see a dog off the leash, they drive down, walk up and hand the person a \$200 ticket.

A friend of mine, saw the law enforcement people down below them, so they turned around and headed back up the hill. The law enforcement people saw them and drove down the fire trail. Meanwhile, the friend doubled back, and was sitting in their car, starting it, when the law enforcement persons argued with them. THIS IS HARASSMENT AND ABUSE OF POWER.

People are becoming AFRAID of "law enforcement" in the open fields. Law enforcement is there to protect people. What are these "law enforcement" people protecting people out in open fields, on rainy days, early mornings (when many dog walkers walk) or in the early evening, again, when many people come home from work, need to unwind and want to be with their best friends or companions- their dogs. They sit there for a couple hours at a time and especially on holidays. "Law enforcement" costs tax payers very much money....to PROTECT them, not HARASS and INTIMIDATE dog lovers.

I have walked those hills for over four (4) years now, and now I am afraid.

This is happening now in Novato, CA. and probably other places in Marin County.

I do not live over in Marine, but I drive over to be with family and walk our dogs together. I will continue to support the COMMON PEOPLE who have children, dogs and like to enjoy the country and it's freedom, without HARASSMENT. INTIMIDATION, and the ABUSE OF POWER by Mayors, City Council Members, Park Officials and Law Enforcement.

Sincerely, Lynn A Thayer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2676	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 18:26:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2677	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 18:33:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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



The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

ME AND MY DOGS LOVE FORT FUNSTON - ALOT - AND CRISSY FIELD, AS WELL.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2678	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Granada, CA 94018 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Karen Dittrich

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2679	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Seattle, WA 90221 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 18:48:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Testing.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2680	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 18:53:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My whole household is disturbed by the proposed changes to dog walking in GGNRA areas specially Fort Funston and Mori Point. As responsible dog owners, we have abided by the rules for over 35 years. We are frustrated and upset that GGNRA is again restricting what is a recreation activity for us and others. My mother is 84 years old. Walking her dogs after her stroke and the death of her husband is what has kept her healthy and fit. She broke into tears hearing that there would be more restriction. She would just like to peacefully walk her dogs.

First,

â€ Fort Funston has had off lease dog access for over 35 years. We have enjoyed going there through our lives. We went there before GGNRA had it. Each time there is an agreement; GGNRA goes on the attack to restrict access even more. As others have opined,

"it has been a colossal waste of time and money, and a hardship for the citizens because not only are we battling for our right to access, we are also paying for both sides of the debate. It was at the conclusion of the latest legal battle wherein Federal Judge William Alsup reinstated the 1979 Pet Policy, over the objections of the GGNR A/NPS/DOI that a statement was made by the Judge that became the impetus for initiation of the planned changes in Dog Management in 2006".

Second:

â€ Mori Point- the proposed restrictions are ridiculous. As a family who lives right next door to Mori point we cannot understand why can no longer walk our leashed dogs in all areas. We control them, and pick up after them. Mori point is a recent acquisition to GGNRA. This was made possible by citizens like my mother, husband and myself who donated to the Land Trust to purchase it. I never thought that we would be so restricted. Should we not have donated? You have to wonder. GGNRA has done wonderful improvements to Mori Point. But does it need to include such sweeping restrictions. We like to climb to the top and watch the sunset and get a good cardio for us and our leashed dogs. Why restrict it. We stay on the path and do not disturb the plants of animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2681 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Glen Ellen, CA 95442  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 18:59:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Recreation - -- includes our dogs. Just as t here are irresponsible dog walkers, there are irresponsible hikers ... should be ban all use of our our National Recreational areas. People are not aware of what is happening - - bring this before the public and you wouldn't dare pass these restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2682 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland , CA 94609  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 19:00:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please leave GGNRA open for off-leash play for dogs! That's the whole reason I visit your parks and I wouldn't come without my dogs.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2683    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Ewa Beach, HI 96706-6070  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 19:07:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 01/26/14. Support The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan

[This constituent weighed in at POPVOX. com but chose not to leave a personal comment and is not expecting a response. See <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>. Contact [info@popvox.com](mailto:info@popvox.com) with delivery concerns.]

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2684    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Piedmont, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 19:19:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support setting aside some significant portion of the SF beaches for off leash dog use. Certainly not the entire beach nor park should allow Off leash but considering the population that the park serves it ought to be a major piece, say 30 percent. That would balance park user needs and resource protection.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2685    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 19:34:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

Sincerely,  
Monica Darcq

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2686    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939-2142  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Angela Osborne and my husband Dan and I live in Larkspur, Marin County. We have lived here for 14 years and for the past 6 years, have enjoyed walking our dog in areas around Marin and San Francisco including Rodeo Beach, the Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach, Muir Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Baker Beach and Chrissy Field.

We exercise in these areas with our dog off leash and under voice control for both our own health as well as the health of our dog. We are also avid hikers and cyclists. Like many people who come to Marin County, my husband and I moved here to be close to nature and pursue a healthy, outdoor lifestyle. Our dog has played an instrumental part in getting us out into that wonderful Marin environment.

My husband and I are writing to let you know that we strongly OPPOSE Alternative F, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, we SUPPORT Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

With its plan, the GGNRA appears to have lost sight of its original purpose. The GGNRA is not a national park. It was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely populated urban area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite and therefore requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

As Marin residents, my husband and I rely upon and enjoy its open space. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the GGNRA. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

Local residents have fought hard for many decades to create and preserve the vast tracts of open space that contribute so much to the views and the outdoor lifestyle cherished by most who live here. Access for all users, including people and their dogs, was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. It needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in all three areas - San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo County - and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA's plan would only allow for more restrictions and does not provide for opening up more areas for dog recreation. This is a fundamentally unfair process to set up and lacks justification. It is also extremely worrying, as it does not factor in any growth or change in the urban population. Marin has the most people it has ever had living in its borders and more than twice as many dogs as school children. This reflects the recently released U.S. Pet Ownership & Demographics Sourcebook from American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) that reveals that more than 50% of California households own a dog.

The GGNRA plan would seriously restrict dog walking in that less than half (7) of the 22 areas in the three counties would allow off leash dog walking. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes

---

in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored. A significant number of comments submitted in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's current dog plan. This is very worrying.

There is inadequate factual basis in the current plan for the proposed changes. The GGNRA claims it is responding to what it said were rising complaints from park visitors and park officers, yet it has failed to provide current data to back up that claim. We walk our dog in these areas and have rarely seen any altercations other than minor (and natural) dog-on-dog interactions.

The new plan does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. The public and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors requested this analysis in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, albeit much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The GGNRA has not adequately studied the dispersion effect of its plan on local communities, neighborhoods and residential areas. These include parking, traffic congestion, driving patterns and increased miles traveled to reach dog-friendly areas.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on 100% compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if it deems park users are in non-compliance. It reserves the right to restrict further dog walking if there are unspecified "violations" or "impacts" in the future. The plan makes inconsistent assumptions and is arbitrary.

My husband and I would like it on record that we adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad and costly idea that will make all people, with or without dogs, feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of the very wildlife the GGNRA claims it seeks to protect.

There hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports the proposed drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. Dogs and their walkers are not going off trail so how many dogs are in fact leaving these trails and invading critical wildlife habitat? The GGNRA should take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis, provide the data and stop speaking hypothetically. We would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer-reviewed studies before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan has not been modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.

Given 99% of the GGNRA is already off-limits to dogs, it is hugely discriminating to seek a plan that reduces that 1% any further. At a time when restaurants, shops and other local businesses are providing access, water and treats for dogs, the GGNRA's plan to restrict them shows how out of touch it is with both its mission, purpose and a significant segment of the society it was formed to serve.

What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describes how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be. A proper forum should be set up to review recreation management and should include dog walkers and other park users such as cyclists, equestrians, hikers, and surfers and sail boarders. This type of committee would be valuable for the GGNRA in order to hear directly from their users and to engender their support in maintaining the GGNRA lands through

volunteer opportunities supporting collective access.

The restrictions in Marin County are extremely far-reaching to the point of leaving practically no areas for off-leash dog recreation and many areas off limits all together. Marin is the hardest hit by the GGNRA preferred alternative as it would eliminate off leash dog walking at Muir Beach, all trails at Homestead Valley, Marin Headlands and Oakwood Valley. There is no factual basis to support this. The only off leash area in Marin would be a remote stretch of Rodeo Beach. The closure of these areas will place a huge burden on other open space lands in Marin, causing overcrowding in what few dog parks remain.

In San Francisco County, the GGNRA's proposed alternative is extremely restrictive for off and on leash dog walking in areas that my husband and I currently enjoy walking with our dog including Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Land's End, Baker Beach and Chrissy Field. Approximately 75% of dog walking access in San Francisco will be eliminated if the GGNRA preferred alternative is adopted.

With the harsh restrictions in both Marin and San Francisco County, we will be forced to travel further and further to find outdoor recreational areas to enjoy with our dog. In short, the GGNRA preferred plan would severely impede our ability to enjoy the Marin and Bay Area lifestyle that originally brought us to the area. The GGNRA plan does not simply limit dogs. It limits all that is wonderful about the Marin County and Bay Area lifestyle, culture and community.

Sincerely,  
Angela & Daniel Osborne

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2687	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 19:46:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F. Please keep freedom for dogs and dog owners to enjoy Golden Gate National Recreation Areas as they are, with limited access on and off leash. Dogs are a huge part of our culture and families, and this must be considered when these are public spaces.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2688	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 20:13:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern, I just wanted to say that I support the dog management plan for several reasons. I support the goal of restoring the coastal habitat for all creatures, and I find that at several coastal spots the number of dogs- often with professional dog walkers- is so immense that I feel like I am walking through a dog bathroom on my way to the beach. I hope that they still have a spot within SF to go off leash, but I do feel that space should be far more restricted than it is now. I love dogs but I also love nature and the sea- I would like to enjoy the latter, and have it managed for future generations and for its ecosystem.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2689	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 20:14:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

On another note, I'm an NYC transplant and the pet policies and other personal freedoms that the Bay area offers are just some of the factors that made me want to move here. Increasing rules and regulation over what's been in place for decades now does nothing but spoil the atmosphere of a great city and make it homogenous. If non compliance of the current rules is a major issue the revenue that could be generated from increased enforcement and ticketing far out weighs an all out ban.

Another alternative.. make pet owners register their dogs to access these areas. Maintain the current laws but ask people to pay an annual registration that include a tag for the dogs collar. We do this in NYC and revenue goes towards the maintenance of pet oriented facilities.

There are better alternatives to a ban. We should be reducing access at all beyond the current laws.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2690    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Montara Dog Group Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 20:15:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Because we live so close to Rancho Corral de Tierra we have a unique perspective. When we wash our dishes we can see the entire Rancho meadow all the way to Montara mountain. We can see it from our living room. We can see it from our bedroom. We can actually see virtually every owner and dog out our windows all day long. Which brings us to an invitation to any GGNRA ranger or executive who believes this area is now or somehow will be in the future overrun with frothing, wild, insolent canines who will threaten everything from the speeding mountain cyclists to the plopping horses to the rare San Francisco Garter snake. Wait a second, now that you mention it, it does seem like every time our dog Vinny goes for a walk he brings home one of those snakes. Of course we tell him not too, but he just can't help himself. And he always runs way off the trail and tramples sensitive habitat, it makes us sick. And the birds he kills. He's a blood thirsty uncontrollable beast. Forgive us, we digress. Come on over. Have a cup of tea. Watch out our window. Maybe wash a dirty dish or two. Hang out all day. You won't see more than fifteen or twenty docile dogs the whole time you're here, trotting down the trails, minding their own business, jumping for joy. It's a pretty simple picture of human and dog, getting some exercise.

Sincerely,

Arthur Hofmayer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2691    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 20:28:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Directors:

I have several short comments that I hope you will hear.

First, after 20 years of taking dogs to walk, run, and play at Fort Funston, Rodeo Beach, Chrissy Field, and Muir Beach, I will tell you that we are THE most self-policing/self-monitoring group using any of those open spaces, save for the horse people who also share the space.

Humans, on the other hand, who come for recreation, make a huge amount of trash, which is left not only in the trash bins, but all over the beach. I find bottles, toys, pieces of broken things, along with an array of food packaging. They start fires, let their kids run and scream, chasing birds and climbing all over the cliffs, and after all that, leave garbage on the beach. When the clean-up crews come for clean-up days, they do NOT report dog walking leftovers, but human leftovers- -GALORE!!!

Dog people pick up their poop, do not allow their dogs to chase wildlife, and add only the dog poop bags to the trash bins. When someone misses a poop, another walker invariably lets them know.

Almost all dog people prevent their dogs from chasing or in any way intimidating birds or other animals. Since dog people are gone by sunset, the little animals who live in these areas are then free to come out and live their nocturnal lives. People who come to these areas for human recreation or party purposes, on the other hand, come in at all hours of the night, leaving trash, tents, human feces, etc. I have come across all these things time and time again around the trails at Fort Funston. Never are they dog people. Humans do not police each other- -they are passive and pretty much ignore the trashy habits of each other.

By and large, dog people in the Bay Area are smart, conscientious, and hold high standards for keeping their walking areas clean and free of anything that may ruin the aesthetic or environmental quality of their dog run areas. They are very harsh with any dog people who don't adhere to those standards.

I am an animal advocate, not just a dog advocate. I am one of thousands of Bay Area dog people who strictly disallows my or anyone's dogs to harm any plant or animal out at these wonderful places.

Dogs must have open space to play and run. As long as humans and horses go without leashes, dogs also deserve that same feeling of freedom to sniff and fetch and play with each other.

Please do not make these arbitrary rules against our dogs. Our dogs are our families. They are a big part of the joy of Bay Area outdoor life.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2692    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 20:45:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner who uses GGNRA almost daily for hikes and trail runs with my dog, Bear I am writing in plea to please consider keeping the current dog friendly areas of GGNRA open to dogs. It would be devastating for dog owners, dog walkers and dogs not to be able to use these areas anymore and I feel that 99% o dog owners are extremely responsible and leave GGNRA as they found it without polluting, bothering wildlife or causing havoc on the terrain. Thank you for consideration.  
Christine Vose

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2693    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 20:51:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** IF a change is needed: Perhaps "time-sharing" Crissy Field beaches with dogs and owners would work...maybe by limiting dog walkers with multiple animals to part of the day.

I have never observed any difficulties of any kind with the situation AS IS...nor in any other GGNRA site. The beach is immaculate, the people and dogs are friendly and the wildlife is protected.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2694    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 20:52:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,  
This is my second letter concerning the proposed plan for the GGNRA by the NPS. My family and I moved to Mill Valley 6 years ago. While searching for a place to call home in the Bay area, it quickly became apparant that Marin County was the place for us. The biggest attraction was definitely the open space of the GGNRA. We live for outdoor recreation, including hiking, biking, running and beach combing. The GGNRA has provided a sanctuary daily for my entire family, including our dog. Every day we look forward to our trek into the wilderness area with our furry friend. It is as crucial for my dog to be able to go and run as it is for myself. I cannot think of a better place to exercise my companion than the open spaces and beach. I feel allowing a dog to run keeps them fit, happy and well balanced.

When I heard that the NPS was revising its plan for these areas I was initially excited. Mistakenly, I thought they were surely going to expand the areas available to dogs, and in fact link a series of trails so one might be able to actually make an entire loop. I can't fathom the reasoning that has gone into the proposed plan, and for whom it has been made. Surely, it isn't for the daily users like myself, who can walk with my K-9 companion from my home to the trails. I see my friends and neighbors daily, also with

their dogs, out enjoying the refuge of the wilderness. In my view, the GGNRA was set aside for just these kind of activities. Closing the beach and trails to dogs is nonsensical, both for the dogs and their owners. I can find no reason that the GGNRA in its entirety, isn't open to people with their pets. I think all of the trails can be shared by all users.

Thank you for your time. If there is a vote on these issues, please vote no for restricting access to owners with their dogs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2695	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mountain View, CA 94043 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and dogs running in closed fenced areas are more likely to get aggressive.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I have been a San Francisco resident for years and have used all the off leash areas with my dogs for the past 25 years. I now live down the peninsula and travel monthly to SF for its dogfriendly parks and beaches. Please don't take this away.

Sincerely,

Helena Eckerberg

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2696	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 20:56:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep the off-leash parks for our dogs! We regularly use Fort Funston and Stern Grove for our great Lab - Ricky.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2697	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

This is my second statement opposing the NPS plan to close down access on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to off-leash dog recreation.

The NPS/GGNRA new version of its proposed "dog management plan" would be a disaster for Marin County residents.

It would take away hiking trails, fire roads and beaches that have been used by people and their dogs for at least a half a century. The owners of more than an estimated 60,000 dogs would be left with virtually no place to go for off-leash recreation.

One of the main reasons people move to Marin is because it is so friendly to both children and dogs and because of its close proximity to a multitude of trails and beaches. Many of us jog the trails with our dogs or pack up the kids and dog for a day at the beach. Because I frequently walk with my dog alone on the GGNRA trails, my dog provides protection for me should there be anyone threatening me and my safety. I would not feel safe walking alone without my dog, and I often do not have the luxury to find an available friend to hike with me when I am available.

The GGNRA plan would take away an important part of traditionally dog-friendly Marin's soul by putting a choke collar on man's best friend.

The fact is, there is no justifiable reason for these proposed changes. As it stands now, 99 percent of the GGNRA is already off limits to dogs. If the dog management plan goes through, there would not be a single trail in the entire 80,000 acres where dogs and their owners could enjoy an off-leash experience. In Marin, off leash dog walking would be banned on all 38 trails. Only five of those trials would even allow leashed dogs. Funneling all dogs onto just five trails is irresponsible and reckless. The only off-leash area in all of Marin County would be a remote stretch of Rodeo Beach, which is only accessible by car. Dog owners, who normally walk or drive a short distance to their trails, would be forced into cars to drive miles away in order to exercise their pets. In particular, I would be forced to get in my car and drive miles away to walk with my dog, whereas now, I do not need to use the car at all. I simply walk from my house to the trails. Certainly, Marin does not need this added congestion and pollution, which this new law would force upon us.

Imagine living in Muir Beach and having to drive 15 miles in order to do something you normally do right outside your back door. How many cars will this put on our already congested roadways and how much more pollution will this cause? Tam Junction simply cannot handle any more unnecessary cars trips.

The GGNRA has spent millions of our tax dollars compiling a 2,400-page report full of anecdotal evidence and skewed scientific reporting telling us what dogs "could" and "might" do, but have failed to include what impacts closing down these areas would have on surrounding neighborhoods. The fact is, if the dog plan gets approved, local parks and trails would be overwhelmed with dog walkers kicked off their favorite trails.

The Marin Humane Society adamantly opposes the plan because they know how important off leash play is for the health and behavior of dogs and their humans.

"As animal shelters across the country work to save animal lives and create homes for thousands of homeless animals, what a shame that now responsible dog guardians will be scrambling to find a proper place to spend off-leash time with their animal companions on our public land," said Captain Cindy Machado, the director of animal services for the Marin Humane Society. "The GGNRA spaces in Marin aren't just places to congregate, they are places to be active by hiking, walking, enjoying the beauty of our natural spaces and spending quality time with our animal companions who share the same enjoyment when they are with us."

Closing down these trails is a betrayal of public trust and the spirit of the GGNRA's enabling legislation. We vehemently oppose the GGNRA proposed preferred plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2698    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Kalama, WA 98625  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 21:19:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The GGNRA, by its own rules, must conduct site-specific, peer-reviewed studies as the foundation for any policy changes intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The GGNRA acknowledges the required studies do not exist. This renders the proposed policy changes arbitrary and capricious, and as such they are unlawful and cannot be implemented. The ORIGINAL 1979 Pet Policy should be reinstated per the 2005 Federal Court decision because all closures since then have not been based upon site specific, peer-reviewed studies as the law requires. For lands added after the drafting of the original 1979 Pet Policy, DOI policy requires historical usage be maintained. Any changes would have to be justified by the requisite site-specific, peer-reviewed studies followed by a formal rulemaking process.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2699    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 21:22:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My family and I love our dog so much. He is a big part of our family. We take him on walks up to buena vista, and fort funston. We walk him off leash every day. I would not like it if my dog could not be off leash. And he would not like it either.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2700    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94063  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,09,2014 21:40:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Michaela Coan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2701    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Leandro, CA 94577  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 21:51:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service -

I am writing to you to ask you to reconsider turning even more of our beautiful beaches into anti-dog areas. My dogs have enjoyed spending time at many of these beaches for the last 10 years. Spending time with them at these beautiful places is a big part reason we moved to this area. There are already plenty beaches in the area that do not allow dogs. I certainly respect this, however the beaches that allow dogs are so few and between already that I would not know where to be able to enjoy this beautiful scenery with my four-legged companions should these beaches go away. As owners of well behaved dogs, where would you suggest we should be taking them instead? Let's please keep this area progressive and welcoming to man's best friend. This is what makes the Bay Area great.

Regards,

Elke O'Neill

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2702    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 21:54:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in this county for 34 years. One of my favorite things to do in life is walk with my dog or dogs either on the beaches (Muir, Stinson, Rodeo etc.) that we all get to enjoy or in the hills by my home and walk the trails everyday. I cannot imagine life without this. To take away this privilege away would be a SIN!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2703    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,09,2014 22:04:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Every Saturday and Sunday of each week I take my dog PJ to Chrissy field to run, swim and play with me and other dogs and get good and tired to boot. I feel that these outings are as beneficial to him as they are

---

me. I don't know what we would do without access to such a beautiful and valuable resource literally in our back yard!. I practice good dog owner manners ie; pickup his poop and other dog's as well, keeping a watchful eye to insure my dog's safety as well as the safety of other dogs and people enjoying the park as they rightfully should be able to.

Chrissy field, Fort Funston and many the off leash areas are an amazing resource for everyone, but especially for urban dog owners that meet so many challenges in the city to safely exercise our dogs. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Lisa davidson Wissink

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2704	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 22:38:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Robyn Moss

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2705	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 23:25:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the new preferred alternative. This is a fair and balanced plan that takes various groups into account.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2706	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,09,2014 23:39:13**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I am in favor of restricting dog access in the GGNRA.

As an everyday walker/jogger in beautiful Pacifica for the last 35 years, I have seen a marked increase in the number of dogs on the trails of Mori Point and Rockaway, as well as the beaches of Linda Mar and Sharp Park. That means there are many more off-leash dogs chasing the birds, even in the areas that are considered nesting places for our little snowy plovers. It also means that every time I am out enjoying nature, I expect to be pounced on by an unleashed bounding dog. Big and small- -dogs act as if they can do whatever they want. Even if leashed, the handler seems to assume their dog is harmless. Or I hear the familiar words, "don't worry, he won't bite, he's friendly." That time, when the handler tried to call his dog back, that bull terrier ignored him and jumped on me- -twice! So much for voice control. How on earth am I supposed to act normal (and not scared) when I am absolutely petrified that I will get bitten? Whenever I go for a jog in the GGNRA, I know I will have to stop in my tracks and walk quietly and carefully past every dog so as to avoid him/her growling or chasing me because I am jogging. Why am I and the birds subjected to stressful situations whenever we are in nature? Especially, in an area that is designated protected government space.

And the mess that those dogs leave. Okay, so the mindful handlers always clean up after their pets. So why is there so much poop fouling the beaches and our shoes. Not so much fun for families when they are out enjoying the great outdoors. I see parents/nannies with toddlers on the shore at Crissy Field and some are on constant alert because of the many unleashed dogs cavorting nearby. Cannot even sit on the grass without worrying about some sort of residue left over from Fido.

I hope there will be additional and tighter restrictions on dogs in the GGNRA. The more GGNRA allows dogs access to park lands, more people will go to the breeders and pet stores to buy dogs. After all, now there is a great place to walk them. Right? If access is denied or curbed, there might be fewer new dog owners because people won't want to walk their dogs- -on a leash- -in their neighborhood. Nor will they want to clean up all that poop in their own backyard. Which is how it used to be way before the park lands opened up to people.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2707	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san mateo, CA 94403				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,09,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please, we love running on the beach.....it is healthy for our minds and bodies....my old bones can't take hard impact and sand is forgiving....wouldn't be the same without my companions.

Sincerely,

Laura Scott, Magnet (Australian Shephard)  
and Harley (Mutt)

Thank you for your support.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2708	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fairfield, CA 94533 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:12:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2709	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---



**Address:** Hayward , CA 94541  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Sincerely, Michelle Quenneville

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2710    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014-1119  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Ocean Beach Dog Walkers Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Letter for 2014 SEIS NPS/GGNRA Dog Management Plan Febuary 10, 2014

To the Honorable Judge Lee  
CC to GGNRA Superintendent Frank Dean  
Ft. Mason, San Francisco California

From Thomas Roop  
315 Irvington St.  
Daly City CA 94014

Honorable Judge Lee,

One could say that while you have three dogs that you and your dogs take up to much real estate, while those of us with one dog leave less of a carbon foot print on the eco-system and you would probably have the same negative reaction we get from folks like yourself who have not done your research, just like the NPS/GGNRA only have one Peer Review . This Peer Review showed that dogs are not the Snowy Plovers enemy. There have been no Peer Reviews that are mandated by law before the NPS/GGNRA can allow the public to view their planed change of rules that will have a major ripple efect on local dog parks.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Go To (Where is the Peer Review) on Ocean Beach Dog to learn More.  
<http://oceanbeachdog2.home.mindspring.com/id32.html>

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

On the San Francisco Coast there was a Pet Policy put together in 1979 that Dog Guardians and other Stake Holders put together on this side of the Bay. We have Off Leash Dog Walking due to the insight of Judge Alsup who declared the 1979 Pet Policy to be the law of the land while the GGNRA was ordered to properly seek the comment of the public. In 2011 after the DEIS DMP was released and the NPS/GGNRA received over 4700 comments against there DEIS DMP, the GGNRA made a few very minor changes and put the nearly identical plan out as the SEIS DMP on Sept. 6, 2013 with out any kind of Site Specific Scientific Peer Review Studies that are required by Law. This is something the NPS/GGNRA has skipped in their zeal to disregard the public input.

\*\*\*\*\*

There are Resolutions against the SEIS DMP by the City and County of San Francisco Board of Supervisors along with Mayor Lee's objection to this DMP plan. Instead of increasing the amount of land for all recreation including that of Dog Walking as Congress warned the GGNRA about increasing urban population growth in their enabling act which created the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in 1972. The NPS/GGNRA has chosen to shrink the area where once again this is being done at the peril of the of Voice Controlled-Off Leash Dog Walking

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

This NPS/GGNRA 2011/DEIS & 2014/SEIS Dog Management Plan; has been a waste of Two million tax payer's dollar's to create this DMP and 2.5 million a year to run this plan which was not needed, had they ( The NPS/GGNRA) followed the rules in the Original 1979 Pet Policy!

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

Think about what is going on here , the GGNRA has 80,000 acres and only (one percent 1%) s land is dedicated for off leash dog walking with voice control and owner must have a leash for each dog. The current NPS/GGNRA 2014 SEIS will take away 90% o 1% tg Guardians and their four pawed pals have to recreate...

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

Our Dog Goldie loves to go to Fort Funston just as we love to take her there. Goldie and I socialize with other Dog Walkers and their Dogs which besides the social benefits, this makes for a mellow, less aggressive dog... More importantly the dogs like Goldie who are rescued instead of being executed because of the large amount of dogs that come out of puppy mills . Of these puppies, as many as 64% oe dogs two and under are surrendered to The Pound. The Pound and Dog Rescue Groups are the last hope of placing these dogs who breathe and smell the same air as us and have their own personality's; they have feelings of Joy/Happiness and sadness which makes them a Family Member.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

I was Born and Raised in San Francisco I have lived in Daly City for 41 years and used to hike with friends in the late 50's around Fort Funston / Battery Davis and take the Sky Tram from the Observation Deck where the Giant Camera is to Point Lobos and hike around that area before Sutro's was a ruin's...Back then when friend's would hike up on San Bruno Mt. one of the guys had a small Collie named Mittsy and she would be with us for hours off leash. Today due to massive development the only land left are these park lands that we all agree on one point and that is no development. The 2014 SEIS DMP was DOA when introduce this past September and must be thrown out and The Original 1979 Pet Policy to be introduced as a section seven rule-making resolution....

Tom & Goldie (14)

Members of Ocean Beach Dog at Fort Funston :

<http://oceanbeachdog2.home.mindspring.com/id31.html>

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2711    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 04:07:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This supplements my prior comments provided electronically and at public meetings regarding the Draft Dog Management Plan. I am 100% i favor of Alternative A and absolutely against any change to the existing off-leash dog walking included in the 1979 Pet Policy. As I understand it, when our Bay Area cities turned over the vast majority of our parkland to the Federal government to create the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), you promised to maintain recreational use as it existed before the property transfer. This promise was codified in the 1979 Pet Policy. All Alternatives (other than Alternative A) relies on studies that do not pass peer review and ignore the peer-reviewed study that concludes dogs are not hurting wildlife in our parks. Any change to the 1979 Pet Policy is unjustified and improper.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2712    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94121

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 06:05:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2713    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 06:19:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not take away the off leash areas at Fort Funston; especially the beach areas. We love taking our dog there.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2714    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 07:53:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Please keep the Mori Point Bluff Trail and the Sweeney Ridge trail from the community college open! I use these with my dogs a lot.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2715    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 08:34:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a responsible owner of two dogs. We walk them and always follow current rules. They need to be able to run as well as walk. We take them to The dog side of Stinson Beach, Chrissy Field and Rodeo Beach so that they can run off leash. . When we hike with them we have them on leash.

Please keep those areas open for dogs off lease. Dogs that do not get enough exercise become restless.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2716    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Amy Davis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2717    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 09:11:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I want to thank you for your consideration for those of us who are NOT dog owners. It is important to preserve and maintain other uses of parks by limiting off-leash dog use. It is also important to take into account the environmental consequences of off-leash dog use. Please stay strong in limiting off-leash dog use and in enforcing such limits.  
thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2718    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Villa Grande, CA 95486  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 09:24:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent visitor to San Francisco who travels more than 2.5 hours to reach the City, I can't tell you how important it is to have places to run my dog when I arrive over the Golden Gate Bridge. The ability to run the dog not only helps her, but is important to insure she is calm in her encounters throughout the day. Crissy Field is a unique treasure for dog owners. Thanks so much for maintain this site for dogs.

Roberto Esteves

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2719    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 09:26:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am zealously opposed to the GGNRA's Dog Management Plan in San Francisco. The parks that we take the dogs to will either be closed to dogs off leash, or prohibit dogs completely. 90 percent of the parks we frequent will be affected. This plan is drastic and unrealistic. San Francisco and the Bay area has always been very dog friendly. This plan is not taking into consideration that the people that use these national recreation lands on a daily bases, do so with their dogs. Please do not limit the ability to use these parks as much as anyone else!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2720    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 09:29:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't own a dog, but I absolutely love seeing them run around the few open spaces available to them currently in San Francisco. Please maintain open space for dogs!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2721    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 09:46:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs have a right to run free in San Francisco. Dog owners for the most part are respectful and abide by existing laws. Enforce existing laws rather than punishing all of us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2722    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 09:47:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative E provides the most well balanced approach of all interested parties and I recommend that plan be adopted.

FREE THE DOGS!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2723    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 09:52:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Ft. Funston is presently being used in its very best capacity right now by serving all of the people of San Francisco and southern cities to walk their dogs off leash. The land is not good for anything else. The pet policy in place is working just fine and was put in place by forward thinking people who understood the burden on our city parks. That pet policy was one of the smartest things San Francisco has done.

Changing it would be short sighted and just plain dumb. Please listen to the people - we've been fighting this change now for many years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2724    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 09:55:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jeff Chebul

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2725	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Walnut Creek, CA 94598 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Mrs. Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 09:59:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Letter #2				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,Elizabeth Salmon-Omski

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2726	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 10:01:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Please consider the thousands of people who have rescued pets and need a place for them to go. With so few trails and beaches that allow off-leash now, how could you even consider taking this away? Everybody deserves the right to this beautiful place we live, and 99% of dog owners are respectful about cleaning up after their dogs and keeping them off of sensitive land. Please, please don't do this to those of us who have committed a portion of their life to rescuing dogs!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2727    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 10:11:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have seen in Marin that the fewer areas allowed for off-leash dog walking, the more impacted those areas become, the more the complaints, and the cycle increases speed. Dogs bring great joy to a huge portion of the Bay area population, specifically because the kind of people who choose to live here in the first place are those who love the outdoors and animals; half the reason to have a dog is because it pulls you out to nature. We also have children, and appreciate that dogs can disturb people and cause damage.

The answer is not to ban off-leash, but limit it a bit more by section of beach or trail, and in some places perhaps by the time of day (such as not on Sundays from 10-5, when the beach may be most crowded.)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2728    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** DALY CITY, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 10:12:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2729    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 10:17:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I was living on the coast in San Mateo County for years and years before the NPS came in and bought up Mori Point, Rancho in Montara and Pedro Point Highlands.

For years and years my family and I walked our dogs on and off leash in these and many other areas. All without any incident.

Now the NPS swoops in and BANS ALL OFF-LEASH dog walking in San Mateo County. This is on lands with a very long history of reasonable and accepted public dog use.

Where is the science for this decision? The rationale? The logic? There seems to be plenty of strong-arm politics in the latest proposals, but basically zero consideration of science or the public access.

The one other place in San Mateo County of walk off-leash (Esplanade Beach in Pacifica) is now almost permanently inaccessible due to cliff erosion. Hence the NPS decides now is the right time to ban off leash walking everywhere else too?!

Please take another look at how incredibly oppressive and restrictive the "preferred" plan is for the huge numbers of dog owners in San Mateo County.

I favor alternative A: No action. At least until a **\*\*reasonable\*\*** alternative is proposed by the NPS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2730    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 10:28:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog out on hikes throughout Marin County. She is under voice control and is actually better off leash than on. I have also noticed this with the other dogs we run into. They become more aggressive on leash with each other than if they are off. I also believe it is safer for the walker to have the dog off leash, especially on single track trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2731    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Erin Keller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2732    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 10:46:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

I have lived in San Francisco for over 15 years and have used the GGNRA both before and after having a dog. I go to Chrissy Field and Fort Funston twice a week and that is one of my main reason I live in the area. The ability to meet others, enjoy the outdoors and bond with my pet. The RECREATION AREA is meant to citizens of this area, several of which use the area for for dog walking only. If this was taken away, I would seriously consider moving out of the area. I hope this is not taken away.

Sincerely,  
Doug Bentz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2733    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 11:13:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2734	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 11:16:33
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2735	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2736    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 11:21:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

In looking at the POLICY ON THE ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF (NATIONAL) RECREATION AREAS, the #1 point is to provide investment in outdoor recreation that is more clearly responsive to RECREATION DEMAND than other investments that are based primarily upon considerations of preserving unique natural or historical resources, the need to develop and conserve public lands and forests, or the requirements of major water resource development undertakings.

The recreation demand for local citizens comes from dog owners - over 50% of San Francisco residents have dogs. While you reference point #3 in your study, there is not mention on point #1. Please consider this motivation of the establishment of Recreation Areas in your analysis.

The system of National Recreation Areas should:

- 1) Provide for Federal investment in outdoor recreation that is more clearly responsive to recreation demand than other investments that are based primarily upon considerations of preserving unique natural or historical resources, the need to develop and conserve public lands and forests, or the requirements of major water resource development undertakings;
  - 2) Be areas which have natural endowments that are well above the ordinary in quality and recreation appeal, being of lesser significance than the unique scenic and historic elements of the National Park System, but affording a quality of recreation experience which transcends that normally associated with areas provided by State and local governments;
  - 3) Be consistent with Federal programs relating to national parks, national forests, public lands, fish and wildlife, water resource development, grants for urban open space, recreation programs on private agricultural lands, and programs for financial assistance to States in providing recreation opportunity.
-

Thanks,  
Doug Bentz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2737    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 11:23:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The GGNRA purpose was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you,

Joan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2738    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 11:23:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing to oppose the Preferred Alternative of the Draft Dog Management Plan as it in no way allows for sufficient space for dog owners in GGNRA lands to walk their dogs, either off leash or on. Scientific studies do not back up the extremely restrictive measures that have been adopted in this alternative. I have been walking with my dog at Fort Funston in San Francisco, Mori Point in San Mateo County, and Oak Valley Trail in Marin County for many years, and am completely dismayed as to why this activity will be so greatly curtailed in the future if this plan is adopted.

I have not been silent on this issue until now. Over the years, I have participated in the planning process for the Dog Management Plan, have testified at many meetings about it, sat on the rule making committee, and written many comments letters. During this entire process I feel my point of view, as well as those of tens of thousands of other dog owners, have been completely ignored by the GGNRA.

Less than one percent of GGNRA lands are currently open for dog walking, and the plan will reduce this pathetically small amount of land open for this activity to the point of absurdity. For instance, the Preferred Alternative allows for no off leash dog walking on GGNRA lands in San Mateo County at all. That is only one example of the complete inadequacy of the plan. There are many more.

The GGNRA totally ignores the fact that dog walking is an extremely popular recreational activity in the highly urbanized Bay Area, one that numerous residents partake in. The closing of more GGNRA lands to dog owners will force them to walk their dogs only in park lands managed by cities and counties, making these areas unacceptably crowded and difficult to manage. This is surely unacceptable for local jurisdictions, many of which were the grantors of the land GGNRA currently manages!

---

I implore you to reject the Preferred Alternative of the Dog Management Plan and go back to the drawing board to develop a more scientifically valid plan, one that considers dog owners legitimate users of GGNRA lands.

Thank you,

Carol Arnold

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2739    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 11:25:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLease consider that most dog owners and especially those that are dog walkers/while folks are at work, are very paying attention and picking up after and being good citizens with their pets. Consider the consequences if there are so few off lease options for all of us good pet owners...please and thank youy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2740    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 11:27:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2741    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 11:28:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to muir beach and the coastal trail.

---

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2742    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir/Madam,

I wanted to write to you as I heard about the terrible plan to cut the available areas of national parks by up to 90% for dog owners. As a dog owner and outdoor enthusiast I strongly oppose these plans.

I come from the UK and having moved to California I already feel like the off-leash laws are overly restrictive. What you're planning to do will mean that I will not be able to enjoy the great California countryside. To that point what is the point of even living in California???

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Kind Regards,  
Symon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2743    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 11:48:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It's my understanding that you're considering closing Ft. Funston and other parks to off-leash dog walking. They are some of the few places left to walk dogs off-leash and really let them have a good time. I use these facilities often and it would really impact my family and my dog if they were made on-leash places.

If there is more information that I can provide, please let me know and thanks,

- Rob Sherwood

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2744	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Moss Beach, CA 94038 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 11:49:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Two Whom It May Concern:				

We live within a half mile of Rancho Corral del Tierra (now part of GGNRA) and it is a fabulous resource for members of our community. Personal dog walking on-leash by local residents is a significant part of the foot traffic in the area, along with hikers, bikers and horse riding. The fact that all these users coexist happily, in a location that is just a stones throw from San Francisco, is one of the main aspects of Rancho and the GGNRA that I love. I have never - - not once - - had a bad experience related to dogs in the GGNRA, either when walking or running with my own dogs or when encountering other people with dogs. I have never encountered a loose dog without an owner or seen any negative effect of the policy of allowing dogs on leash in this part of the GGNRA.

On the contrary, I have seen so many wonderful positive effects. People and their dogs getting out into the countryside - - getting exercises, enjoying and appreciating the outdoors, seeing the beautiful mountain vistas, and looking out over the Pacific ocean. Running and walking your dog only on streets is not especially fun, it's not as healthy as the variety of terrain provided in a park like Rancho, and frankly, in an area that is as rural as the Moss Beach / Montara / El Granada area, it's pretty hard to get a real workout without simply running laps on the streets. (And running on PCH is hardly enjoyable and barely safe.) Almost every time we have visitors here the first thing I do is drive them up to Rancho and show them around. It's a fabulous resource of which we are all immensely appreciative and proud.

Part of what makes Rancho such an important part of the Coastsides experience is its low-key regulation. Protection and safety are important, of course, but the fact that people can responsibly take their dogs (or bikes, or horses, or just themselves) out into what is essentially a community resource is a gigantic value. It improves the quality of life and at the same time provides a clear base of citizens who love and appreciate and want to take care of this amazing resource. Eliminating or significantly restricting the access of dogs to Rancho will significantly reduce my interest - - or at least my practical ability - - to use and appreciate the area. I'm sure the same is true for many others. We're a dog-friendly and dog-loving community. If our dogs are suddenly unwelcome in a geographic feature that literally dominates our landscape, we will simply not use it very much. That would be a huge waste and would alienate so many people.

Please don't restrict the freedom of citizens to responsibly take their dogs into Rancho Corral del Tierra!

Sincerely,

Peter A. H. Peterson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2745	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 11:55:21				

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in support of the draft dog plan for the GGNRA. While I have met nice dogs who are under control, While walking, I have been rushed at by unknown dogs, which can be frightening, especially for children. The dog owners, when they show up on the trail, often just laugh.

I think this is a balanced plan that allows responsible dog owners to enjoy the outdoors with their pets, and yet protects wildlife. San Francisco and its environs is unique in being a city that has such access to wild places, and where one can view wildlife, especially the birds of the Pacific flyway. Let's protect the natural beauty and wildlife that we have.

Please support the GGNRA dog plan.

Anna Korn  
Berkeley CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2746 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** berkeley, CA 94707  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 11:59:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am heartened by the willingness of the NPS to devise regulations on rights of dogs in GGNRA that will allow other species their 'rights' also. I have often witnessed off-leash dogs running vigorously through areas that are vital habitat for wild species. It is wonderful to see dogs in unrestrained motion, as I know from years of living with dogs, but owners who do not restrain their dogs in designated areas, where other species strive to survive, are denying those creatures their livelihood.

I hope that the regulations will be enforced when adopted: there are, alas, some dog owners who do not feel bound by regulations which they perceive as infringement on their dogs' entitlement to full freedom. On beaches where dogs are not leashed, though required, I have been knocked down by racing dogs, had food snatched from my hand, have been peed\* on while sitting and watching waves and birds. I have seen owners urge their racing dogs (Limantour) to chase into four flocks of 800 resting shorebirds and cheer their ability scatter them.

\*On one occasion, I spoke to park personnel shortly afterwards, and was told that dogs are territorial and acted badly sometimes....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2747 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 12:11:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have worked as a naturalist/program coordinator at the Environmental Science Center (ESC) at Fort Funston for the past 6 years. Every year we host approximately 50 classes from within the San Francisco Unified School District for our overnight program which includes a 2-3 hour walk around Fort Funston on the 1st day and a hike down to the beach on the 2nd day. On numerous walks

---

with our students we have been literally overrun by dogs. Many dog walkers come to Fort Funston with 10-15 dogs per person and most of the time all of these dogs are off leash and not on voice command. Many times dogs have scared our students literally running up to them or running them over. While its true that some of these times the owners/walkers are aware of the situation and try to call their dogs off, most of the times the dogs just don't listen. More often than not the owner/walker is nowhere in sight and so we are left with screaming and scared students and a dog or dogs that won't leave us alone. I've never been quite sure of the dog rules here at Fort Funston. How many dogs can one person be responsible for ? Clearly we can all agree that most people do not have control of 12 dogs with voice command. If dogs are off leash do they have to be trained well enough to listen to their owners/walkers ?

Another huge issue is that there are dog owners and dog walkers that don't pick up after their dogs. Some don't pick it up and others leave the plastic bags full of dog poop on the trails. My students and I have stepped in dog poop on numerous occasions which could have been prevented.

I work with students at many of the parks in the city and Fort Funston feels more like a dog park than a national recreation area. In fact I can honestly say that I would never just walk around Fort Funston with friends or have a picnic here or bring people from out of town here. I don't think Fort Funston is for people that don't have dogs or don't have a hang glider which is too bad because its such a beautiful place and should be a place for anyone to enjoy.

In the end I think we can make new rules and regulations but if there is no one there to enforce it and no real consequences nothing changes. There should be clear areas where off leash is okay and also areas where dogs must be on leash (no exceptions) so that this park can be used by the many different people that live here with or without dogs. The sensitive areas here should be protected from dogs as well.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2748	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Vallejo, CA 94591				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like a dog park and those of us who love to hike with our trained dogs off leash do not like dog parks and one cannot hike in a dog park.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Teresa Cleland

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2749	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Los Altos, CA 94022  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

â– I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â– I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

â– The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely, A lawful pet owner.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2750    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Palo Alto, CA 94306  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 12:31:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the existence of off-leash dog areas. Even as a non-dog-owner myself, the proposed restrictions seem excessive, and effectively prohibitive for those who wish to give their the animals exercise and play that they need. Problems with off-leash dogs can be much better handled with better enforcement of rules relating to cleanup and aggressive behavior.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2751    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kensington, CA 94708  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 12:34:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support allowing off-leash dog(s) at Muir Beach. I believe that it is appropriate to limit the number of off-lease dogs to perhaps 1- or 2-dogs per adult; while a higher limit of leashed dogs per adult may be considered. I propose that at all times; dogs shall be under voice control by the owner/adult and any dogs not exhibiting control shall be immediately leashed.

I am a frequent user of the GGNRA recreation sites for the past 25-years, mostly those located in Marin County. During the summer months, I visit the GGNRA approximately once every week and during the winter months I visit the GGNRA approximately once every two weeks. About 25% o my visits to the GGNRA are with my dog. My remaining visits to the GGNRA are about 50% fr mountain biking and another 25% fr walking/hiking without dogs or bikes. I have gone horseback riding twice during the last 25-years through the private stables.

I am a new dog owner and my first 22-years of use at GGNRA never included any dog(s). During my 25-years of use of the GGNRA I have never encountered any conflicts with dog(s). My only dog conflict in Marin County opens space areas was a single occurrence on Marin Municipal Water District property.

The GGNRA is surrounded by urban area. Please ensure that off-leash dog activities are maintained at Muir Beach to provide the recreation opportunities consistent with the needs of the neighboring urban population.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2752    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 12:36:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I have been a resident of San Francisco for 40 years and have always had a dog. There is no greater pleasure for me and my dog (current and past) than to go to Fort Funston so that he/she can run free and socialize with other dogs.

I find it inexcusable that the Preferred Alternative is just that: preferred. I can find no justification in that plan for such restrictive measures.

I do not believe these restrictive measures were ever the intent of the original pet policy and strongly urge that the Park Service not be allowed to change the leash status in GGNRA areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2753    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** San Francisco SPCA Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 12:42:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On behalf of the San Francisco SPCA, a local animal welfare organization founded in 1868, I am writing to convey our strong opposition to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Supplemental Dog Management Plan (the "Plan"), which aims to drastically limit dog access in San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo counties. The SF SPCA strongly urges the National Park Service to modify the Plan to allow for greater access to urban recreational opportunities, including off-leash dog walking.

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

Significantly reducing dog access in the GGNRA will adversely impact hundreds of thousands of Bay Area residents and visitors. In San Francisco alone, dogs outnumber children. Yet, the Plan allows only

extremely confined areas permitting dogs in the GGNRA that will soon become severely overcrowded, which will result in serious congestion in nearby neighborhood dog parks. San Francisco's dog parks are already limited, and off-leash areas are particularly scarce. If guardians and their dogs are displaced from the GGNRA and forced to relocate to the city's dog parks, this overcrowding will become increasingly problematic and potentially dangerous. These negative impacts will be felt by individuals both with and without pets, as well as the already overburdened City of San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department.

The SF SPCA strongly urges the National Park Service to adopt a different approach to the current Plan - one that addresses the needs of ALL of the GGNRA's recreational users, including the countless Bay Area residents and visitors who have historically enjoyed access to the GGNRA with their dogs. Several viable alternatives to the current Plan exist, including, for example, a registration system that allows access suspension for irresponsible visitors and their pets. Responsible individuals, however, should be permitted to continue to enjoy outdoor visits to the GGNRA with their dogs while peacefully coexisting with wildlife and the environment, as they have done for decades.

In closing, the SF SPCA is strongly opposed to the current draft of the GGNRA Supplemental Dog Management Plan. The Plan should be significantly revised to meaningfully promote continued recreation for all visitors, including individuals who responsibly enjoy the GGNRA with their dogs.

Sincerely,

Brandy Kuentzel  
Corporate Counsel & Director of Advocacy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2754	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Heather Buchheim

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2755	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94949 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 12:57:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

We have been loyal supporters of your organization for many years- AND we are dog owners. We have always kept our dog under control, have him well trained and always pick up whatever he/we leave on the ground. Just because of an unfortunate and bitter few individuals, the thousands of bay area dog owners should not be penalized. Please reconsider adding further restrictions.

Thanks!

jim eggers

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2756    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Dublin, CA 94568  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 12:59:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Tim Oben

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2757    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 13:08:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please do not ban off-leash dog walks as proposed - one of the great joys of living in the Bay Area is a dog walk (good exercise for humans and canines) with a spectacular view

---

encouraging and enforcing responsible behavior is great (would be helpful to have more trash cans) - banning off-leash walks completely goes too far

thank you for your attention

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2758    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mountain View, CA 94040  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Jill Wiliams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2759    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 13:33:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Policy Must Address For-Profit Dog-Walkers.

A visit to Crissy Field on a weekday in the late morning reveals that the beach is being used by numerous for-profit dog walkers, who are conducting their private business using public space. On a recent Friday at 11am there were about 80 dogs on the beach under the oversight of about 10 walkers. Most walkers appear to have 6-10 dogs under their supervision, with the result that their dogs are very poorly controlled.

One solution would be to limit dogs-per-walker to two dogs; otherwise the concept of 'voice control' for dogs is clearly only theoretical.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2760    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 13:44:10

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** this is a terrible idea. I hike many many trails GGNRA and i just don't see the issue with dogs off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2761 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 13:46:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** New Dog Plan Must Reflect Test Case: Ineffectiveness of Current Dog Policy in Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area.

The new GGRNA Dog Policy must err on the side of restriction, since current policies are largely ignored by dog walkers in the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area. Approximately 50% o the dogs observed walking within the area are not on leash during the restricted date range, despite there being several signs and fencing at either end of the Area.

Since current policy is largely ignored in this test case for restrictions on dog access, future policy in other parts of the GGNRA must err sharply toward restricting dog access. Similar to speed limits, future policy must be highly restrictive in order to achieve even mild restriction.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2762 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 13:52:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the GGNRA's proposed limitation and elimination of off-leash dog areas. These areas, such as Fort Funston, portions of Crissy Field and even areas in the North Bay such as Muir Beach form a vital part of San Francisco's urban recreation areas. There are currently more families with dogs than with children residing in San Francisco, and eliminating the GGNRA off-leash areas will seriously over tax the limited city park space available in San Francisco.

Coming from a family with both a dog and kids,I cannot stress enough how important use of the GGNRA off-leash areas is to our family. It is a source of great joy and family bonding to spend time enjoying nature in these beautiful areas while our kids and dog can run freely.

The GGNRA management of these Urban nature areas must be balance to reflect the fact that they form a part of an Urban environment. They are not and cannot by virtue of the their location, be managed as pristine wilderness areas such as the National Parks. That is simply not the reality of their Urban location.

Thank you for your consideration

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2763 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**



**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Rodeo Beach Loop, Muir Beach and trails around. With additional restrictions and bans, people will have to be in the cars looking for other places to walk their dogs. Do you want to add to the traffic and pollution for the environment? Furthermore, let's not forget the changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2764    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 14:01:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In the 42 years that I have lived in San Francisco, I have not once encountered hostility to my off-leash dog(s) on the local beaches and on the trails on the flanks of Mt. Tamalpais. I have seen the human and canine populations grow without conflict in the areas you administer and we share. It seems to me insane to compress the space open to off-leash exercise. Most dog owners and dog walkers I have encountered over the years have been responsible, unobtrusive, careful to clean up after their charges. I wish you would provide more than vague and/or hearsay evidence that a huge majority of users are unhappy in the presence of dogs and their guardians. Please reconsider your policy planning. It makes no sense.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2765    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 14:06:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I live at Ocean Beach in San Francisco, and I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on

GGNRA properties for many years. We are a family of 4, and all of us enjoy using Ocean Beach with our dog, where we all get the opportunity to exercise away from the urban heart of the city.

Most specifically, I think it is absurd to even propose banning on-leash dog walking for any part of Ocean Beach. We who live in the neighborhood are the primary users and caretakers of this beach. I am out there just about 365 days each year, in rain, fog, wind or otherwise, to walk my dog a few blocks, letting her do her business while I am immersed in the Pacific Ocean environment. It is those of us who live at the beach, and use the beach WITH OUR DOGS, who also care for the beach. We pick up trash from people too lazy to clean up their picnics, and even worse trash from drug users and homeless people camping in the dunes. Walking our dogs is not the problem - - it is part of the solution to making this beach great!

It is inconceivable to go against the strong historical precedent of using Ocean Beach as a place to recreate with our dogs, especially on-leash. If this change is implemented, you can expect an enormous public backlash, as this will NOT be acceptable to the thousands of people who responsibly recreate at OB with our canine companions.

I feel similarly about the proposed changes to Fort Funston, where the current rules concerning walking dogs under voice control are working effectively to provide a safe and responsible space for people to exercise with their dogs. My dog exercises at Fort Funston under voice control at least 4 times per week, and I cannot imagine the impact on my family, my children, and our dog if we are not able to continue to do the same. I strongly oppose any proposal to restrict off-leash dog walking at Fort Funston to the equivalent of a 'penned in' area.

Regarding the new proposal, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jacob Lesnik

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2766	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** In my opinion the GGNRA leadership is not sincerely in reaching a mutually satisfactory agreement vis a vis dog owners. I believe that GGNRA has decided what it believes is the best course for dog management which is to further and further exclude dogs from the lands it manages until no dogs are allowed. Period. For that reason I am ready to move on to find a way to legally remove GGNRA from management of all lands in San Francisco and replace it with management more in tune with our community's unique needs and requirements.

Therefore, I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its

---

premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Additionally, in the SEIS the GGNRA asserts they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" as utilized in its enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI and the GGNRA's first Superintendent, the Honorable William J. Whalen, in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA. These promises, along with the conventional definition of the term "recreation", do not comport with GGNRA's current philosophy exemplified by Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management and Science for the GGNRA, who in 2007 was quoted as saying "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design.

Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it, e.g. the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management. Alternatively, for sites heavily utilized by dogs and their guardians, such as Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2767	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Cerrito, CA 94530 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 14:10:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

The National Park Service needs to be more responsive to public demand and to appreciate that the GGNRA was created expressly for recreation for Bay Area residents.

The 1979 Pet Policy, plus off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands acquired by the GGNRA in the future, adequately balances the needs for preservation and recreation. Your Preferred Alternative does not. It is far too restrictive and there is no justification for it.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

Sincerely,

Mary Barnsdale

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2768	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** In my opinion the GGNRA leadership is not sincerely interested in reaching a mutually satisfactory agreement vis a vis dog owners. I believe that GGNRA has decided what it believes is the best course for dog management which is to further and further exclude dogs from the lands it manages until no dogs are allowed. Period. For that reason I am ready to move on to find a way to legally remove GGNRA from management of all lands in San Francisco and replace it with management more in tune with our community's unique needs and requirements.

Therefore, I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Additionally, in the SEIS the GGNRA asserts they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" as utilized in its enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI and the GGNRA's first Superintendent, the Honorable William J. Whalen, in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA. These promises, along with the conventional definition of the term "recreation", do not comport with GGNRA's current philosophy exemplified by Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management and Science for the GGNRA, who in 2007 was quoted as saying "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design. Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the

beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time. If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it, e.g. the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management. Alternatively, for sites heavily utilized by dogs and their guardians, such as Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2769	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 14:13:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We do not support the NPS SEIS Preferred Alternative and request that the NPS provide a less restrictive Dog Management Plan for the GGNRA.				

Thank you,

Amy Novesky  
ND Koster  
Quinn Koster  
George Novesky

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2770	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 14:18:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean, As a proud long-time San Francisco resident and someone who walks regularly with my dog at Ocean Beach, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is shortsighted, restrictive, and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and the health of my community the way I have on GGNRA properties for over ten years. This plan takes away from our community at Ocean Beach because it prevents us from using the beach with family and friends the ways we have for decades. We live at the beach, walk on the beach (with our dogs), care for the beach, and encourage everyone around us to take care of the beach. The new plan was not modified to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. This type of reactionary, non-scientific policy change goes against our shared democratic values and the very fabric of our country's purpose for protecting open spaces. The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches				

---

have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Further, I can say that walking my dog at Ocean Beach directly benefits the community, wildlife, and beach itself. I pick up trash and debris every single day at the beach because it is a place that I care deeply about. I play my part as a citizen here and if my ability to walk my dog each day were taken away, I would simply walk somewhere else. As someone who has chosen to live at the beach and take part in this community, this would be a shame-it would create further problems for the beach and the City.

Sincerely

Noah Borrero, Ph.D

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2771	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who moved to the Bay Area largely due to the existence of dog-friendly parks and recreation areas, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I strongly believe that this alternative is much too restrictive.

I regularly walk with my dog in the GGNRA. Like many working San Franciscans, I also have a dog walker who takes my dog out every day to enjoy the various trails and beaches in the GGNRA. When I adopted my dog from the San Francisco SPCA, I made a commitment to provide a better life for him. Crucial to this is being able to give him adequate exercise and play in the areas where I live. This exercise is also important in increasing the health and well being of dog owners themselves.

The GGNRA's actions indicate to me that they have lost sight of their founding purpose - to be a recreation area for a densely populated urban city. Residents and their dogs have been using these properties as such since the original pet policy in 1979. This policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas, including areas that GGNRA acquires in the future.

There is a troubling lack of data to support GGNRA's preferred alternative described in the new draft dog management plan. In light of the thousands of people who submitted comments and concerns in response to the first plan, it is also troubling that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect these objections. In addition, there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

There is simply no credible reason to deny fair and reasonable access for off-leash dog walking in GGNRA property, an activity that has been an important facet of these lands for thousands of residents over the past 50 years.

I sincerely hope that the GGNRA will act in response to the thousands of people who have expressed substantive concerns about this plan.

Holly

**Correspondence ID:** 2772    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 14:59:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not do this! Dogs are born to run and play, there is already little open space in Marin County that allows dogs and their owners the right and freedom to do this. This is hugely discriminatory for those of us who are responsible dog owners and who have their dogs under voice control. Leashed walks DO NOT provide adequate exercise for many breeds.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2773    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I am a San Francisco, Inner Richmond resident concerned about the new GGNRA dog management plan that would limit access to large parts of the parks by respectful and conscientious dog owners like myself.

My husband and I are 30-somethings who enjoy spending time with our 4 year old rescued dog named Remy. We visit parts of the GGNRA on almost a daily basis. Our family loves going to Chrissy Field, the Marin Headlands, and Sweeney Ridge. We hike in the Presidio several times a week as it is very close to home. We also spend time at Fort Funston - Remy goes there 3 times per week with his dog walker.

We love to walk, run, and play in these parks. Our dog Remy is well behaved and under strict voice control at all times. He loves having the open space to run around in especially since we live in such an urban environment. In addition, his dog walker, who is also a Richmond resident, takes him and his pals to Fort Funston every week for additional exercise and socialization. Without this off-leash access to this park, he would lose opportunities to get his energy out and explore the outdoors while we're away at work.

It is very important to us that the new GGNRA dog management plan keep dog access to the very places that are so special to us. I am writing to you because I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I also oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Finally, I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I also would like to add that I believe there is no evidence to suggest that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any substantial negative impacts. We and almost all other dog owners I know are

very conscientious of our impact on the environment. We pick up after our dog and we do not allow him to chase the wildlife, dig holes, or otherwise cause disturbances. The GGNRA was created in 1972 for the maintenance of needed recreational open space, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. That's why it's designated as a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. With the new dog management plan, the GGNRA is reneging on its promises to preserve and protect recreational access to the GGNRA and the proposed plan infringes on my ability as a pet owner to enjoy the wonderful outdoor spaces that the GGNRA provides.

I believe it is unfair to vastly limit where people like myself recreate with our beloved pets. I urge you to please consider my comments.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Ruch

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2774	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood valley to Alta trail and also the Miwok trail. I don't see the science provided in the report that says dogs are threatening any species in these areas, other than second hand heresay.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. In addition, there is plenty of science that says that a dog gets people out to exercise more than if they did not own one, and this should be available locally. By eliminating this local access, we will all be getting into our cars and driving miles to places that allow off-leash access, further clogging the roadways and contributing to pollution.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2775	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Woodside, CA 94062 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 15:06:21				

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As you must know, there are more dogs in SF than children. Dogs need more exercise than they can get on the end of a leash. Please don't take away off leash space for them to run.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2776 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 15:16:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of off-leash activities at Fort Funston. It is my experience that dog walkers and non-dog walkers share this area well. In addition, most dog walkers are very responsible concerning the behavior of their pets, and cleaning up after them. Please continue to allow this multi-use activity in this beautiful location that is our back yard to the Pacific Ocean!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2777 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Austin, TX 78759

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 15:17:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Doggies need to run free. Playing fetch and chasing is like breathing to them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2778 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 15:20:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Cara Lowe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2779    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 15:27:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't ban dogs from the areas you are suggesting. Park of the lure of the area is the availability to hike with my dog. I am a good dog owner and always make sure my dogs are on voice command. I think it's a shame to ban dogs from the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2780    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 15:33:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA - particularly Fort Funston and Crissy Field, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
S. Kober

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2781    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 15:40:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is

way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jackson DeParis

415-843-1044

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2782	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Paul Hayward

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2783	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 15:56:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA, I am a mother of 3 boys and 2 wonderful and energetic dogs. I live in San Francisco and frequent the many great parks and beaches the city has to offer. My family and dogs visit the parks every day and get				

---

much needed fresh air and exercise there. The proposed GGNRA restrictions on off leash dog walking will have a severe impact on my dogs and the health and happiness of my pets and my family. I oppose the preferred alternative because its too restrictive and I support the formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off leash access in all the GGNRA parks. These parks are there for the people AND the animals and all deserve to run free in at least some desirable ares (not fenced) of these parks. Please make this fair for all parties involved.

Thank-you for your time.

Best,  
Alison Lufkin

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2784	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 16:31:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I am vigorously opposing GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. There is no substantive reason for such a dramatic change in policy. I ask you to focus on targeting problematic instances of any off leash violations is the better use of our attention. Please campaign for dog owner education of these rules and help the community to support your existing policies.

Thank you,

Jason Krueger

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2785	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 16:34:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	A better, and better enforced, dog management plan is badly needed in the GGNRA.				

Dogs have not been regulated in the GGNRA at the expense of wildlife, habitat and visitors. I have observed dogs chasing birds at Crissy Field on the beach and on the lawn on several occasions over the last 6-plus years. Leash laws are openly disregarded and poorly enforced. Off leash dog areas should be limited and well defined with appropriate barriers. Visitors to the GGNRA need to be able to enjoy themselves without having to interact with dogs, and they need to feel that they and their children are safe. Also commercial dog walking is not an appropriate active in a National Park.

Better regulations are needed and the proposed Dog Management Plan/SEIS is a step in the right direction.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2786	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Dog City Tours Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 16:38:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The NPS dog management plan is a crime against the people of the San Francisco Bay Area and all who value the Golden Gate Recreation Area and the freedom to enjoy its beauty.

The Plan consists of numerous baseless and unsubstantiated claims. There are NO EVIDENTIAL DATA to support the restriction and elimination of access to places where people have been enjoying themselves with their dogs for countless years.

The claims regarding bird habitat & nesting (Snowy Plover, Bank Swallow, etc.) are inaccurate and have been repeatedly disputed. They are not based on scientific observation. Similarly, the impact of dogs on plant life has been exaggerated and not substantiated by any standard or scientific means.

Additionally, there is no study of the real environmental impact of these restrictions on the rest of San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo Counties. The NPS has not considered how these restrictions will affect local communities and City parks. Given the already miniscule percentage (less than 1%) of the GGNRA currently available to visitors with dogs, the NPS plan is grossly unjust. It would severely impact the lives of its current users and adversely impact the lives of tens of thousands of Bay Area residents.

The NPS has consistently ignored the very concerns and comments it solicited and inaccurately represents the conditions in these locations. The changes that were suggested have not been implemented and appear to have been dismissed without consideration.

Dog owners/walkers constitute a vast majority of the regular users of these areas. They are overwhelmingly responsible and care deeply for these places. Damage, mishaps and other problems are small when compared to the overall impact of human users in the GGNRA. The lack of facts to support their position implies that the NPS is unfairly targeting a single group (people with dogs) out of pure malice with no regard for public outcry or the opposition to the plan from local governments.

I regularly bring my dog with me to Fort Funston/Ocean Beach and Rodeo Beach. If it were not for my dog, I would not get out and get this exercise nor would my dog. These are the only places in the Bay Area where we can run, play ball, splash in the ocean. The NPS changes will seriously impact the physical and mental health of countless people and their pets as well as the livelihoods of those who make their livings working with dogs outdoors.

With over 120,000 dogs, San Francisco is a Dog City. It is densely populated and open space is limited. This is why we set aside these lands years ago to preserve them forever for RECREATIONAL USE by people in the Bay Area, a fact the NPS chooses to ignore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2787	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	richmond, CA 94801 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 16:53:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** A leash does not necessarily make a safe dog. And a leash is an undue burden on those with well trained dogs. It is unreasonable to require all owners to have their dogs on leash at all times. The law should require owners to control their dog. Owners that cannot or will not should bear the burden of responsibility and be fined or have their animals impounded as necessary.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2788    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 17:02:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the current off leash policies in the Golden Gate National Recreational Area. The GGNRA is for RECREATION. It is close to major population centers and serves as a primary resource to allow city dwellers to enjoy the countryside, unencumbered by excessive regulations. What can be a more pleasant afternoon, than to take a walk in nature with your loyal dog? There are tens of thousands of acres of wilderness available to share and many areas that prohibit dogs without leashes. Let's keep it the way it is and encourage responsible pet ownership.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2789    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Linda Sonntag

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2790    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 17:25:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Talbot Moore

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2791	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 17:31:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please save off leash trails.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2792	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean, I am a responsible dog owner who lives in San Francisco & loves sharing its recreational areas with my dog. She is a well-behaved creature whose joy in running off-leash and free (where allowed) gives me joy & helps keep her happy and healthy.				

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

Unfortunately, I understand that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. I have also learned that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. It seems to me, as a result of this information, that this plan is ill-considered and should not be adopted as a result.

I'm probably most upset that the GGNRA doesn't seem aligned with its purpose which is to provide a

recreation area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please consider the mounting opposition to this plan and re-consider implementing the alternatives currently on the table. There has to be a plan that will work better for both sides.

Sincerely, Susan Cunningham  
9 Coleridge Street, SF CA 94110 - and her dog Zuma

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2793    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 17:56:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs need to be more carefully regulated in the GGNRA.  
Off-leash areas need to be fully enclosed.  
Clear and active enforcement is necessary for success.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2794    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 17:58:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This comment was sent earlier as hard copy. The online followup is just to make sure it is received.

January 18, 2014

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Keith McAllister. I am a retired City College of San Francisco professor, now approaching 70 years of age. For years my primary outdoor recreational activity has been walks with my dog under voice-control, usually at Fort Funston, less often at Ocean Beach. Your preferred Alternative F in the SEIS would simply eliminate that activity from my life. Alternative F precludes long off-leash dog walks at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and everywhere else in the GGNRA. There are no other parks within San Francisco which can be substituted. Let me emphasize: I am talking about human recreation, human exercise. Sitting and watching my dog play in a ROLA (or DPA) is not the same thing at all.

I am a life-long environmentalist: a member of Sierra Club and Audubon for 35 years, now a member and significant contributor to Nature Conservancy. So I care about the plants and animals in the GGNRA. I have read the ANPR, the DEIS, and now the SEIS carefully, and remain convinced that the claimed



environmental harm done by dogs is exaggerated, and sometimes fabricated. I will discuss specific examples of GGNRA's misuse of science in the attached comments. Visitors can continue to enjoy recreation in the GGNRA with their dogs, and the environment can continue to thrive, without the elimination of access proposed in Alternative F.

I am sorry that my detailed comments on the DEIS were ignored. I won't repeat them, but they are still valid-inconvenient truth for some GGNRA staff. But I will repeat two themes: 1) The GGNRA places no value on the recreational use of open space by people walking with their dogs, while putting great value on the displeasure felt by people who don't like to see dogs. 2) The GGNRA hides behind a facade of science with many citations in the SEIS document and 30 pages of references. But examination of the references usually finds no science there. My DEIS comments pointed out instances where GGNRA blatantly misrepresented the cited paper; the SEIS usually repeats this non-science.

DEIS comments and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors asked GGNRA to analyze the effects on City parks of draconian reductions to off-leash access in the GGNRA, the SEIS does not do so. GGNRA simply assumes people will continue to use GGNRA sites, accepting on-leash access in place of off-leash access, and accepting small ROLAs in place of room to walk with dogs. That assumption is most unlikely. GGNRA has moved into San Francisco, taken over huge tracts of open space, and now is behaving like a very bad neighbor.

I urge the GGNRA to continue its 1979 pet policy, which worked so well. Alternative A is an approximation to that policy.

Best regards,

Keith McAllister

#### COMMENTS ON SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR GGNRA DRAFT DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN

Keith McAllister

#### VISITOR USE AND EXPERIENCE

GGNRA/SEIS continues to arbitrarily value people who dislike dogs more than people who walk with their dogs. That is arbitrary and capricious prejudice.

The preferred Alternative F greatly reduces the off-leash areas at Fort Funston from Alternative A. Off-leash beach access is reduced from 1.13 miles to 0.66 miles of beach, and the upland off-leash area is reduced from 98.7 acres to 17.6 acres. Yet SEIS says (page 1176) this reduction would have minor adverse impact on people who want off leash, and moderate adverse impact on people who don't want off leash.

There is no logic to that evaluation. People who have been taking long walks at Fort Funston for years, accompanied by off-leash dogs, must give up that activity, entirely. They won't be able to do it at Fort Funston, nor anywhere else in the GGNRA, nor anywhere in San Francisco parks. They must simply give up a central portion of their outdoor recreational life. By any reasonable measure, that's a major adverse impact for them. People who don't want off-leash can still go virtually anywhere in the GGNRA and not encounter an off-leash dog. If there is any adverse impact for them, it is a negligible impact. They have virtually all of the GGNRA at their disposal, and also most of Fort Funston.

An evaluation of the impacts of alternatives on the two groups of people should include a credible estimate of how many people are affected. We know there are tens of thousands who go to Fort Funston for dog walking every year. How many don't go to Fort Funston because of the dogs there? One bit of data that would help here is the number of DEIS commenters that said they don't go to Fort Funston for that reason. GGNRA knows that number but doesn't provide it in the SEIS.

It is only because of the acute prejudice of GGNRA staff against people with dogs that GGNRA could describe the adverse impact of Alternative F on such people as minor. Underneath it all, GGNRA does not consider people with dogs to be legitimate park visitors, while people who don't like dogs are considered legitimate park users.

## GGNRA/SEIS MISUSE OF SCIENCE

The GGNRA's Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) states in several places that it is not a scientific document, and that science will not decide policy. On the other hand, the SEIS emphasizes that NPS staff have done a thorough review of existing credible scientific literature on dogs and recreation. The countless citations to papers would seem to indicate that the GGNRA believes that science does, in fact, support their policy choices. The GGNRA wants to have it both ways: 1) Science supports them, and 2) They are not bound by science. In fact GGNRA will do what it pleases and ignore science except for its cynical presentation of a scientific veneer.

I can't possibly check all GGNRA's citations. But the SEIS cites some sources that I am familiar with, and the SEIS uses those sources inaccurately. (That's the most polite way I have of saying it.) I will list a small sample.

### Dogs and Pathogens

#### 1. SEIS says: Dogs expose visitors to dangerous pathogens.

The SEIS first makes this claim on page 336, where no data or scientific studies are cited to support the claim. There is a long list of possibly, can expose, and many ways. Then a long quote from an anti-dog DEIS commenter discusses dogs run[ning] up and pee[ing] on innocent bystanders.

Later, on page 1231-1232, SEIS says, Currently, adverse impacts on visitor human health and safety from dog-related pathogens exist at all park sites considered in this draft plan/SEIS. Sites such as Fort Funston may have more of a health and safety risk from dog-related pathogens... Again, absolutely no evidence is offered of any adverse impacts on human health from dog-related pathogens at Fort Funston, or anywhere else in the GGNRA. Instead, we get the opinion of another anti-dog commenter on the DEIS: One commenter noted that multiple infections have been reported at local hospitals from bacteria transmitted from dog feces. The commenter then provides a long list of diseases he claims were transmitted by dogs. No citation is offered to any document; there is no way to check the veracity of the statement. That's not evidence of anything.

So in both cases of the claim, GGNRA offers no evidence, only the un-scientific opinions of two unidentified, strongly biased, anti-dog commenters which GGNRA selects from the thousands of DEIS comments.

I suppose we should be thankful that GGNRA has dropped its doubly bogus citation of a non-existent document that it used in the Draft EIS to make this unsupportable claim. Remember NPS 1999, the substudy of the San Francisco Sewage Master Plan? In fact NPS 1999 was something unrelated, and no

such substudy of a sewage master plan existed. Now, without any pretense of evidence, GGNRA continues to make the claim, and relies on two biased anti-dog commenters as substitute for real evidence.

#### Soils and Vegetation

SEIS spends a lot of space making the case that dogs damage soils and vegetation. Nowhere does SEIS attempt to quantify that damage, though they acknowledge that there are many other forces that alter soils and vegetation within the GGNRA. So, even though there is no evidence that the effect of dogs in the GGNRA is significant, SEIS devotes considerable pseudo-scientific effort to prove the effect exists. Discussed as follows:

2. SEIS, page 374, uses Shulzitski and Russell 2004 to say, heavy off-leash dog use increases deterioration of native plant communities.

Shulzitsky said this in his prestudy introduction to the unpublished version of the paper. He offered no evidence because he didn't study dogs or their impact on plant communities. Shulzitski 2004 is simply not a scientific citation about dogs and plant communities. Note that Shulzitski did not make the claim in the version of his paper submitted to a peer reviewed journal (*Ecological Restoration* Vol. 27, No. 4, 2009.) I conclude that he gave GGNRA what GGNRA wanted with this off-hand remark, but declined to make a statement to scientific peers for which he had no evidence.

3. SEIS, page 426, cites Shulzitski again to claim that dogs damage soils and vegetation in the restored areas at Fort Funston: on many occasions, dogs and humans were observed inside this area.

What Shulzitski actually said in the published version of his paper is, though a small number of visitors and their pets continued to use the restricted areas, the measures [post-and-rail fencing] were successful for the most part. Please note the large difference between on many occasions and a small number. As in other cases noted in these comments, GGNRA cites a source to say something different from what the source actually said.

4. SEIS, page 425, continues the bogus claim made in the DEIS that [Recreational] disturbance of the cliffs in most instances would potentially contribute to cliff erosion [at Fort Funston].

In fact, as in the DEIS, GGNRA offers absolutely no evidence that recreationists contribute to cliff erosion at Fort Funston. The cliffs at Fort Funston have eroded greatly over the last fifteen years-because winter storms pound the base of the cliffs. Period. There is no other source of cliff erosion that anyone has measured or reported.

Items 2, 3, and 4 are particularly important in the Impact Analyses of the Alternatives at Fort Funston. In fact, items 3 and 4 are from those impact analyses. GGNRA misuses scientific sounding citations to claim adverse impacts that are supported by no evidence whatsoever.

5. SEIS, page 374 uses Sime 1999 to say dogs could damage vegetation and soils, with resulting influences on vegetation, soils, and wildlife.

In fact, Sime was discussing sensitive alpine habitat, of which there is none in the GGNRA. Using a citation to say something so incontrovertible as, dogs could damage vegetation and soils, simply illustrates GGNRA's desire to look scientific without actually being scientific.

Sime 1999 is Chapter 8, Domestic Dogs in Wildlife Habitats from a larger document: *Effects of Recreation on Rocky Mountain Wildlife: A Review for Montana*. Committee on Effects of Recreation on

Wildlife, Montana Chapter of the Wildlife Society.

Chapter 9 of the larger document is devoted to the effects of recreationists on soils, vegetation, and water. There is even a section in Chapter 9 on trampling of vegetation. But nowhere in Chapter 9 are dogs mentioned. That clearly suggests that the scientists who actually studied soils and vegetation didnt find dogs to be a significant source of impact.

6. SEIS, page 374, uses Sime 1999 to say that dogs could possibly [emphasis not in original] spread and establish new populations of invasive and/or non-native plants.

It should surprise no one by now that Sime offers no evidence such spread by dogs has actually occurred. GGNRA made the dogs spread invasive plants claim in Negotiated Rulemaking and again in the Draft EIS, both times without any evidence. Repeating it a third time doesnt make it true, especially when no evidence is offered this time either.

7. SEIS, page 375, argues that dog waste and dog urine affect soils.

As usual, SEIS offers no scientific citations. It cites NPS 1999, which is Natural Resources Section, Resources Management Plan, Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Prepared by Golden Gate National Recreation Area. December 1999. Thats useless on many counts: 1) Its not a scientific document, 2) Its GGNRA citing itself, 3) Its a citation to a huge document, with no page number, so no one can check the citation.

SEIS presents, in lieu of evidence, only the usual can, could, and very many may. GGNRA made the dog waste harms soils claim long ago, during Negotiated Rulemaking. In the Technical Subcommittee, GGNRA was asked for evidence to support their claim. The request was repeated at subsequent Technical Subcommittee meetings. No evidence was ever produced.

In comment on the DEIS I pointed out the DEIS still offered no evidence, even though the DEIS repeated the claim. Now we are at SEIS. The claim is still made; there is still no evidence. Really, after three strikes, you are out (and should withdraw the claim).

#### Dogs and Wildlife

8. SEIS, page 376, cites Miller et al 2001 and Simes 1999, 8.4 to claim that dogs disturb wildlife more than people alone, and that dogs increase a persons radius of disturbance.

The SEIS misuses Miller et al 2001 just as the DEIS did. Millers statement about radius of disturbance doesnt come from any evidence he gathered. What his evidence showed, and the point of Millers study was, that dogs disturbed the birds less than people with dogs or people alone. Sime offers absolutely no evidence or citations to support her claim.

9. SEIS, page 377, uses Sime 1999 to say, Injuries sustained may result in death or may compromise the animals ability to carry on other necessary life functions resulting in eventual death.

The studies in Rocky Mountain Wildlife which document killed and/or injured animals describe deer that were deliberately run down with trained hunting dogs, and sometimes killed. None were killed or injured by dogs accompanying recreationists. Sime goes way beyond what her colleagues report, (those who actually studied the interactions), offering her evidence-free speculation.

10. SEIS, page 378, uses Sime 1999, 8.10, to say dogs can . . . injure or kill birds.

This citation demonstrates why the numerous citations of Sime 1999 in the DEIS and SEIS are simply

worthless. They are not scientific evidence of any kind. Sime does say on page 8.10 that dogs can kill or injure birds. But, as usual, Sime provides no evidence to support the claim. In fact, Sime discusses eight (8) specific studies of impacts on birds. Some didn't involve dogs at all. The literature cited by Sime shows no case of a bird injured or killed by a dog.

Lets be specific about what Sime says. Here are the studies discussed in Sime 1999, pages 8.10-8.11:

- a) Hansen and Grant (1991) state that pedestrians generated the most negative responses by birds, but Sime jumps into that same sentence with her speculation that presence of dogs may [emphasis added] intensify bird responses to pedestrians.
- b) Burger (1986) studied effects of human activity on shorebirds. People walking accounted for 43% and 50% of disturbances in two bays studied, followed by fishermen, airplanes, and then dogs.
- c) Hoopes (1993) studied human-related disturbances of piping plovers: pedestrians 86%, cars (not just dogs) 7%, vehicles 5%, bikes 2%. Ten observed chick mortalities were caused by cat, herring gull, human handling, and off-road vehicle - none by dogs.
- d) Yalden and Yalden (1990) studied nesting golden plovers. Adult plovers spent 11% of the day responding to people.
- e) Keller (1991) lists dogs as disturbers of eider ducklings (after fishing and people walking, and not ranked against windsurfing and boating) but doesn't quantify the dogs effect. No mortality or injury reported.
- f) Baydack (1986) disturbed lekking sharp-tailed grouse with various treatments. Females were displaced by all disturbances, including parked vehicles and snow fencing. Males were flushed only by humans and leashed dogs. He does not compare humans alone to humans with dogs.
- g) Patterson (1952) found that humans flushed sage grouse on a lek (dogs not involved.)
- h) Ingold et al. found that nesting ptarmigan in Switzerland slowed their heart rate when approached by a hiker (dogs not involved.)

Contrary to Simes and the SEIS citation, in none of the studies were birds injured or killed by dogs.

11. SEIS, page 379, uses Andrusiak 2003 to claim, Dogs disturbing foraging birds may diminish a bird's foraging time and can result in a loss of energy required to migrate, and can significantly affect their survival during migration.

Andrusiak did not say that in Andrusiak 2003. Andrusiak conducted an extensive literature review, looking for effects of dogs on birds. His conclusion was that the statement, Dog disturbance (excluding other sources of disturbance) to overwintering or migrating birds affects their survival and/or reproductive success, is categorized as Unknown/no data. That is to say, Andrusiak found no evidence that dogs affect the survival of birds during migration. It is dishonest of SEIS to pretend that Andrusiak provides scientific support for their claim. (This misuse of Andrusiak was pointed out in comments on the DEIS. GGNRA could have looked at Andrusiak's paper to see they were misusing it. GGNRA either didn't bother to look, or looked and decided to continue with their blatant misrepresentation of Andrusiak's paper.)

12. SEIS, pages 932-933, claims that allowing off-leash dogs to continue at Fort Funston would result in continued long-term minor adverse impacts on the bank swallow.

GGNRA has been claiming for 15 years that the bank swallow colony at Fort Funston needs protection from people with dogs. Some of the bizarre counter-factual evidence offered in the DEIS has now been left out of the SEIS. Small progress toward reality. Still, there is no documented recreational disturbance to the bank swallow colony, only the repeated statements from the same thoroughly biased GGNRA staff. It has not happened that a dog has collapsed a burrow in the colony. An honest evaluation of Alternative A would say that no significant long term impacts on the bank swallow colony are likely. There are no adverse impacts occurring now, so it is not accurate to predict continued long-term adverse impacts.

#### Dog-Wildlife Disease Transmission

13. SEIS, pages 382-3, relying primarily on Sime 1999, argues that dogs in the GGNRA will spread diseases to wildlife in the GGNRA.

As usual, Sime is an unreliable source. Her studies do not show disease transmission from pet dogs to wildlife. Further, although SEIS presents evidence that there is rabies in northern California, especially among bats, there is no evidence that the rabies comes from pet dogs. In fact, dogs are more likely the victims of transmission of rabies or distemper from wild animals. In this case, it is simply a pet owners responsibility to vaccinate pets against these diseases to protect the pets. No GGNRA pet policy is going to affect disease prevalence among wild animals in the Bay Area.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2795	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94609 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 18:00:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern:				

Please do not limit off leashe dog activities in San Francisco parks. There are very few places all ready that offer a safe off leashe experience, and by limiting them further people and their dogs will be driven to prohibited areas where the environmental impact can be much greater.

Nick Bergmann

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2796	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Redwood City, CA 94062 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 18:10:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I grew up in the Bay Area and when I was a kid, we could take our dog to the park or to the beach and play off lease. I have many find memories or throwing tennis balls in the ocean at San Gregorio and other beaches in Half Moon Bay. Today, dogs are prohibited from most beaches - even when they are on leash. It is becoming increasingly difficult to exercise our pets, and why? Because of a few isolated incidents? Please do not take away the few places we have left to allow our dogs to roam free. Most of us are responsible pet owners and we deserve places to exercise our animals without the restriction of a leash. Most of the land around here forbids dogs - isn't that good enough for you? If you have any place in your heart for animals or the people who own and love them, do not take away any more of our space. Thank you				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2797	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Sir,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Headlands, Rodeo Beach and other areas in and around Mt. Tamalpais.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

And as final note, people have had a longer relationship with dogs than the institution of marriage. There are many positive reasons for this and they shouldn't be ignored or denigrated.

Respectfully,

Maud Trachtenberg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2798 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Manchester, NH 03104  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,10,2014 18:23:46**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Small minded people that only care about themselves do not care about the human dog relationship or what it takes to keep it healthy. It is unfortunate such people have the power to hurt the rest of us. You should be ashamed of yourselves and your ignorance.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2799 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,10,2014 18:36:44**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** In reference to the GGNRA Dog Management Plan for Crissy Field, I support Alternative D for the maximum restriction on dog use of these public spaces. Although dogs can be enjoyable to watch, and animate the park, I have witnessed numerous instances where out of control dogs have ruined picnics, disturbed Scrabble games, shaken wet and sandy fur onto unsuspecting visitors, and have generally behaved badly while the owners act unapologetic or even defensively when asked to control their animals. I am a dog lover and a regular visitor to Crissy Field, but it is an unpleasant thought

to imagine the very place I will be resting my hand may have only moments before been used as a dog toilet. Parks are for people, not for pooping!

-Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2800    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94704  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 18:49:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I will keep this simple. I am a dog lover. I am also a staunch environmentalist caring deeply about the ecological integrity of our diminishing, threatened, and fragile ecosystems. Normally I cringe at the term "multiple use" as that most often means exploitation.

The GGNRA is an urban park (in the sense of it's proximity to San Francisco and other urban centers) visited by millions of people engaged in many forms of outdoor activities, among those walking and playing with our beloved canine friends and companions. There are precious few places left in this country a dog can run free and frolic. The beach areas are some of the last refuges. I have been using and enjoying the GGNRA since its inception and have always loved watching people and their dogs frolic, as well as played with my own dogs in the past. For so very many of us this is, or has been, the principal activity that draws us to GGNRA. I have very rarely if ever personally witnessed any serious conflicts with dogs and people, or dogs with wildlife. The vast, vast numbers of dog owners are extremely responsible with their dogs who engage in harmless, fun activities.

For dogs (and us, their loving human companions) to lose the right to play at the beaches and other areas of GGNRA would greatly diminish my and many others' experiences and enjoyment. Again, it's why so many of us go there. It is our park!

Please keep the GGNRA free and open to dogs!

Thanks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2801    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 19:00:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I walk my kids and dogs off leash everyday. My kids chase the birds more than my dogs but that doesn't mean I should leash my kids. It is great outdoor exercise for our whole family. Dogs need freedom to run around in a safe space and they can not get the same exercise on a leash walk.

Dog owners consider their dogs family and these spaces will go used rain or shine by devout dog owners. It will be an extremely sad day when these privileges are taken away from our innocent loving dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2802    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---



**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,10,2014 19:21:47**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA:

I am the guardian of two dogs that I adopted from two different rescue organizations. Both of my dogs were rescued from SF Animal Care & Control. I love them both very much, and hope that with my care and attention they will live long, healthy lives.

People always comment on how lucky my dogs are because I saved their lives, but in reality I am the lucky one. Because of them, I am a happier, healthier, and product member of our society.

Before I adopted my dogs, I was a bit of a couch potato. I had just moved back to CA from Boston. I worked long hours (from home) and every day after finishing up work, I would just sit and relax and watch TV. After doing this for awhile, I realized I needed to get out more and get some exercise. At the time I was living in San Francisco on John Muir Drive, near both Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. On the rare occasions when I would go walking, these were two places I liked to visit. There were always people around, and I met and had great conversations with many of them. I especially liked stopping to talk with the dog owners. I realized that most of them habitually got out and about because of their dogs. Quite a few of them told me how their lives had changed for the better because of their dogs. That's when I decided to adopt a dog.

I adopted Redgy, a Jack Russell-Dachshund mix, when he was 5-1/2 months old. He is very energetic, playful and attentive. We spend time at Fort Funston and Ocean Beach 2-3 times a week. It is good for both of us. He is very well behaved and walks well on a leash. But it's great for him to regularly get off leash to run and play with both me and other dogs. A good hour or so of off-leash play allows Redgy to work out all his energy. By the time we get home, he is exhausted and can just sit, relax and nap beside me.

I ended up adopting my other dog, Fenway, because the clock was ticking on him at the ACC. I started off just fostering him until the group that rescued him could find him a permanent home. But he and Redgy got on so well together that I decided to adopt him. Now I go to Fort Funston Ocean Beach (and periodically Crissy Field and Golden Gate Park) 3-4 times a week to work off all their energy and to get my exercise. We probably spend 8-10 hours a week out and about at one of these public areas. As I said, it's good for the dogs, but I know I wouldn't be as happy and healthy or even as mentally sharp as I am today if it wasn't for them.

I now live in a condo complex in Pacifica. I don't have a back yard and there isn't a lot of green space around where the dogs can play off leash. Pacifica does have a dog park, but it is a fenced in space with just gravel, no grass. It's a perfectly fine space for owners who have dogs they can't let off leash elsewhere. But for me, being able to take my dogs to a park or a beach, with more natural surroundings and space to run and play, is much better.

In addition to caring for my own dogs, I do volunteer for the two rescue organizations that my dogs came from. I don't foster anymore, but I do help with taking foster dogs out on walks to give them exercise and some much needed outdoor time and play. It is great to have public parks and spaces where I can take them, since as I said earlier I don't have any such space where I live.

Both for my own dogs and for all the dogs in rescue care - - this is why I am writing to voice my opposition to the GGNRA's new dog management plan. It is too restrictive. The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA.

There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA will not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Also, the new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking, and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please do take time to give serious thought and consideration to my and many, many other dog owners' and care givers' input and perspectives. If you do, I know you will understand the vital importance of retaining and not diminishing off-leash access within the GGNRA.

Thank you for your time and attention!

Regards - - Joyce Q.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2803	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Stinson Beach and the Oakwood Valley Trail. Being a dog owner and having access to the existing dog-friendly areas of GGNRA has made me appreciate our community immensely and has made for a friendlier, very enjoyable community for me, my family, our friends and neighbors. Fostering a safe and friendly community is important.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed

---

in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you for your time, for reviewing my letter and for considering Alternative A.

Best,  
Erin McMahon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2804    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 19:51:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Best regards,  
Andrew Sullins

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2805    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Inverness, CA 94937  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** McEver Design Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 20:05:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA dog management plan. I have been taking my voice controlled dog/s throughout the area for 15 years, always with a leash and baggie in hand. It's crucial for a dog's health that they have a chance to interact with the wild environment that GGNRA has set aside and is threatening to eliminate.

Please consider Supervisor Sears' draft resolution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2806    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 20:07:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would prefer:

â€ Fort Baker - Map 9 C  
â€ Chrissy Field - Map 10 A  
â€ Fort Point - Map 11 D  
â€ Baker Beach - 12 A  
â€ Land's End/Ft Miley - Map 13 A or Map 13 D  
â€ Sutro Heights - Map 14 D  
â€ Ocean Beach - Map 15 C or F

I do like the 3 dog limit for commercial dog walkers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2807 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 20:12:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a lifelong resident of San Francisco. I am a wife and mother of 2 children. I am a 2nd grade teacher. And I have 2 dogs and a cat. I feel very fortunate that we have such great outdoor recreational areas in and around the City. As we all know, it is very important for large urban areas to have outdoor areas for their citizens to use. I have noticed that off leash dog walking areas have many people using these outdoor areas. It is wonderful to see people getting outside with their dogs. They are getting much needed exercise, time outside which relieves the stress of the workday, socialization with other people, and quality time spent with their canine companions. It would be so sad if these recreational areas were restricted. There are so many people using these areas, because they have dogs. What would they do if they couldn't take their dogs to exercise and relax and have fun in these areas? They could walk around their neighborhoods, but then the recreation areas would not be used. They could take their dogs to city parks which are small and would be ruined by the increased traffic of all the people and dogs who currently use the GGNRA. The impact of dogs on these parks could be devastating. Why limit who can use GGNRA? It is a recreation area, not a national park that needs to be preserved. We need to have outdoor areas for all to use. Please keep these outdoor areas open for all to use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2808 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 20:19:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have a very active and healthy puppy who is 8 months old. We enjoy taking our dog the off leash to join other dogs in play. Without these options I worry his health as well as ours will be impacted by limiing play in off leash areas to small areas and with the potential for overcrowding. Our idea of a good day in one of our beautiful parks is not being overcrowded having to exercise caution with every step. We are asking that you don't take away our options for off leash dog parks.

Sincerely,  
Gina

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2809	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 21:31:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Directors:				

This is to submit the same comments with a couple of copy changes. I do hope you will look to this one as my final edit and note the corrections and proofing.

Thank you! My letter follows:

Dear Directors:

After 20 years of taking dogs to walk, run, and play at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Muir Beach, and a few times to Rodeo Beach, I will tell you that we are THE most self-policing/self-monitoring group using any of those open spaces, save for the horse people who also share the space.

Humans, on the other hand, who come for recreation, make a huge amount of trash, which is left not only in the trash bins, but all over the beach. I find bottles, toys, pieces of broken things, along with an array of food packaging. They start fires, let their kids run and scream, chasing birds and climbing all over the cliffs, and after all that, leave garbage on the beach. When the clean-up crews come for clean-up days, their bags are filled with human leftovers, not those from dog people.

Dog people pick up their poop, do not allow their dogs to chase wildlife, and add only the dog poop bags to the trash bins. When someone misses a poop, another walker invariably lets them know.

Almost all dog people prevent their dogs from chasing or in any way intimidating birds or other animals. Since dog people are gone by sunset, the little animals who live in these areas are then free to come out and live their nocturnal lives. People who come to these areas for human recreation or party purposes, on the other hand, come in at all hours of the night, leaving trash, beer cans, tents, human feces, etc. I have come across all these things time and time again around the trails at Fort Funston. Never are they dog people and rarely remains of dog recreation. Humans do not police each other- -they tend to be passive and pretty much ignore the trashy habits of each other.

By and large, dog people in the Bay Area are smart, conscientious, and hold high standards for keeping their walking areas clean and free of anything that may ruin the aesthetic or environmental quality of their dog run areas. They are very harsh with any dog people who don't adhere to those standards.

I am an animal advocate, not just a dog advocate. I am one of thousands of Bay Area dog people who strictly disallows my or anyone's dogs to harm any plant or animal out at these wonderful places.

Dogs must have open space to play and run. As long as humans and horses go without leashes, dogs also deserve that same feeling of freedom to sniff and fetch and play with each other.

Please do not make these arbitrary rules against our dogs. Our dogs are our families. They are a big part of the joy of Bay Area outdoor life.

Thank you for your consideration,

Melissa Flower

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2810    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 23:04:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't take away our GGNRA! If there is a problem with how a small number of people are behaving within it, then, please, with the resources you were planning to use in enforcing increased restrictions, ticket them for any infraction that applies. That is leadership. But closing trails and beaches to the rest of us who tread lightly and make sure our dogs do too, is wrong. The path toward permits and further restrictions flies in the face of the GGNRA's mandate to be an accessible urban recreation area. Even the name describes its planned purpose. GGNRA does NOT stand for the Golden Gate Restricted Area, nor the Golden Gate Nature Reserve. It's the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and should remain so in perpetuity. -Tamsen Bell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2811    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 08:02:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposed 'dog management' plan reads more like a dog elimination plan. It is packed with exaggerated, inaccurate and purpose skewed statistics. The current head of GGNRA is clearly anti-dog and that agenda drives much of this written document.

Fact people in the cities have dogs. They have used these facilities, mostly reasonably and responsibly for generations. Why is there so clearly an agenda to eliminate dogs? You can legislate whatever you want but, like our inane drug policies, all you accomplish is criminalizing normal everyday citizens.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2812    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 08:05:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a 30 yr. resident of San Francisco, i am very upset at the latest Dog Management Plan. I have been active in the Off-leash movement here in SF and i have seen no willingness by the NPS or GGNRA to accommodate or even consider the effects this draconian plan will have on our dogs. Dogs and Dog Owners for decades have had the right to walk and run our dogs in these areas and eliminating over 90% oit is inhumane and ill-conceived. These areas are City Parks, not natural wilderness areas, and the needs of City residents needs to be considered and respected before all else. I strongly protest this latest Plan, which in reality, is just a carbon copy of the original. Listen to the people, and act accordingly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2813    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Napa, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 08:07:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I wholeheartedly support off leash areas. We have a huge population of well behaved dogs and responsible pet owners. These off leash areas are a center of community and fun.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2814    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 08:24:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi,

I am a home and pet owner in San Francisco and frequently walk my dog in several of our city parks. Having a dog that is able to run freely in off leash areas is important to me in that it makes me happy as well! I have a stressful job and seeing my dog run and play off leash is important to my mental health and it allows me to function in a high stress work environment. Please do not take away our off leash areas! Thank you,  
Ralph Patricelli

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2815    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sunnyvale, CA 94086  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 09:01:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2816    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 09:21:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am very disheartened to hear that GGNRA may be taking away the wealth of off-leash recreation areas that my family enjoys so immensely with our dog. As a native born San Franciscan, one of the things I have always said makes me love my city even more is being able to go on long nature walks in the city

---

with our dog running around as happy as can be! It is a unique thing for a city and one that I hope you will fight to preserve. Fenced in areas are fine in a pinch, but they are not an outing that our family looks forward to as we do with our walks in Fort Funston and the beach.

Thank you for your time,  
Christie Sorenson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2817	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Inverness, CA 94937 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 09:50:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA management plan to limit or eliminate the 1% o land that is open for dogs and their human partners.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2818	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern,				

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

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Andrea Bocchimuzzo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2819	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 10:20:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't restrict off leash areas for dogs in San Francisco. While I'm not a dog owner my two year old daughter loves areas such as Fort Funston particularly for the dog watching. Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2820	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 10:29:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi,

Plan does not provide adequate facilities for off leash recreation with dogs. The population of people with dogs is growing every year, yet we are cutting back on the space available for off-leash and on-leash recreation with dogs - what part of this makes sense?

As dog owners, we are outside in the parks EVERY DAY! That makes us one of the BIGGEST user groups of parks - including the GGNRA. The areas available now are already too small, and we should be expanding them, not shrinking them.

Dogs have been in the GGNRA - well - basically forever! But wildlife, plants, wild animals flourish in the park, if dogs were causing irreparable damage to the wilderness aspects of the park, would we not have seen effects by now? Instead, we have a glorious, living park alive with shared use as an urban recreational area.

Sincerely,

Claus Schlund

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2821    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 10:31:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I very much support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, which supports off-leash and dog friendly access to the GGNRA. This means I strongly oppose Alternative F, which I believe to be mean spirited.

Dogs off-leash are already off limits on over 99% o the GGNRA, and that is already entirely too much. So please keep the 1% oen and not restricted.

Thank you,  
Susan Berlin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2822    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-1953  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 10:49:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it has little do with recreation outside of limiting it, and it doesn't seem to

---

represent the interests of the majority of the people that pay taxes here. Dog parks in SF are rare, too small and too far away, and the plan fails to account for how un-exercised dogs on crowded sidewalks and streets will pose far more harm to people than trained dogs playing in safe rural off-leash areas. Furthermore the SEIS research seems unscientific time and time again. Building fences across Crissy field or the beach areas, as well as adding a 'leash police', seems like a far more disturbing and disruptive use of land and resources. We pay far too much in property taxes for the privilege of living in SF to have the land we're paying for controlled by a seeming single interest in this manner. I urge for a review or return to the 1979 proposals rather than this short-sighted and overly restrictive approach.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Katy

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2823	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 10:59:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Hannah Murray

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2824	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 11:12:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Places such as Fort Funston actually thrive because of the people who take their dogs there. If not for people walking their dogs almost nobody would enjoy that area. People who want to				

---

enjoy the outdoors without dogs around have plenty of other areas to visit, far more areas than we have where we can go with our dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2825    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94111  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and will prevent my family from recreating with our dog for our health, the way we have on GGNRA properties for many years. As Financial District residents, our access to these outdoor recreational areas is absolutely essential for my family, including our school-age son and the family dog.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Karen Scarr

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2826    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the proposed changes for the following reasons:

1) Oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Optional Points to Make (Choose as many or as few as you want):

1) SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions.

2) SEIS still lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

3) SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not to do them.

4) SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

5) SEIS says there has to be a no-dog area at all sites where off-leash dog walking is allowed. For example, the SEIS says Muir Beach is too small to have both an off-leash and a no-dog area, so therefore there cannot be an off-leash area at Muir Beach (p. 113). There's no similar idea that sites that are no-dog also have to include off-leash areas. This shows the inherent unfairness of the SEIS.

6) SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA document on the GGNRA website). They say they received over 4,700 comments, but never say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS says: NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas. (p. 100). But there's no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they

from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.

7) SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The SF Supervisors and dog walkers asked for a thorough analysis. What we got was cursory at best.

8) SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) in the GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.

9) SEIS still does not consider management tools that could mitigate alleged impacts from dogs in the No-Action Alternative. For example, dog training classes, dog-horse workshops, and poop cleanup days could all mitigate concerns about dog safety and pathogens in feces that are used to argue that the No-Action Alternative will not work and therefore the GGNRA must restrict off-leash access.

10) SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that in many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities. (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to & expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972)

11) SEIS will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. The only site-specific consensus agreement to come out of Negotiated Rulemaking was to allow off-leash dog walking on a trail in Oakwood Valley in Marin. This was included in the DEIS. However, it was removed from the SEIS (Oakwood Valley is now proposed to be on-leash only) because the GGNRA decided that there would be no off-leash dog walking on any trail. All the money and work that went into Negotiated Rulemaking was wasted.

12) SEIS still will not allow any off-leash dog walking on New Lands acquired by the GGNRA in the future, even if dog walking occurs has traditionally occurred there.

13) SEIS cites several surveys of visitor use and visitor satisfaction, including two done in 2011 in response to DEIS comments, that were so poorly done that their results are essentially meaningless. A 2008 visitor use survey at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field used people who intercepted people at these sites and asked about their park usage. However, the interceptors were observed by several people to actively avoid talking to people walking with dogs, hopelessly skewing their results. A 2011 visitor use survey at Fort Funston and Muir Beach, done specifically in response to DEIS comments, only counted people as

walking dogs if they had a leash in their hand. People walking with a friend and the friend's dog were not counted as a dog walker (because they did not have a dog of their own with them), even though they were only walking there to walk with the friend's dog. A 2011 Visitor Satisfaction Survey was so confusing respondents didn't know if they were being asked about their satisfaction with current conditions at GGNRA sites or with the severe restrictions proposed in the DEIS.

14) SEIS still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who don't want to be around dogs. This criticism was made of the DEIS too and apparently ignored.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2827    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2828    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Neto Community Network Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 11:28:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am very interested in striking a balance between dog off-leash availability, environmental preservation and safety for all who use GGNRA land. However, because GGNRA land is one of the few places that is available to dog walkers, and that those areas are already very constricted compared to GGNRA land available to all other audiences, I would want to see as much space as possible allowed for walking dogs.

Because I use only Marin County and some San Francisco GGNRA areas, I will confine my comments to these. However, in principle, I strongly support as much off-leash area as possible. It seems to me it reduces the environmental and safety pressures the more alternatives are available to those of us who must have places to walk our dogs off-leash. Because dog owners are expected to have dogs under voice control at all times, a great number of options for off-leash walking reduces the number of dogs in any given area at one time.

As a dog owner who also works and must use a dog walker from time to time, it is also important that dog walkers have places available to walk their dogs, and be able to walk enough dogs to make a living so they can continue to provide this essential service.

So I explicitly support Plan A in the following areas: Stinson Beach; Oakwood / Alta Avenue; Muir Beach; Rodeo Beach; Marin Headlands; all sections of Crissy Field; and all areas of Ocean Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2829    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 11:28:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow us to walk our dogs in off leash play areas. We are respectful dog owners and citizens and pay taxes to maintain these parks. You can't shut us out.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2830    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 11:28:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The current proposed GGNRA dog management plan is far too restrictive and should be modified. We need more access to parks that are dog-friendly, and this proposed plan severely restricts such access. We must consider current recreation needs and create a park management plan that works best for most. I would strongly encourage a utilitarian approach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2831    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in southwestern San Francisco, about 5 minutes from Fort Funston. I have two beagles, and have been taking them to Ft. Funston for years. In over 20 years of going there, I have never had a bad experience. I have always found the dog owners there to be very responsible about picking up dog litter, trash, etc. In fact, Ft. Funston is a very non-threatening and comfortable environment (as opposed to some of the city parks where a lone woman does not always feel safe).

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying

---

with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral de Tierra.

Please reconsider the proposed ban on off-leash areas such as Fort Funston. Proceeding with this ban will seriously impact the quality of life for ALL San Francisco residents, not just dog owners. Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2832	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 11:30:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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



The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Melissa

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2833	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 11:53:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please help us keep the open areas for dog available , the little freedom we are able to offer to them is very important to keep healthy pets. Dogs love to run free, and they deserve that opportunity. Please don't take it away				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2834	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 11:57:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Bhargav

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2835    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 11:59:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Ft. Funston and at least some other of the current "doggie beaches" leash free. For the many, many dog owners in San Francisco and the surrounding area, the opportunity to run on the beach and hike in the hills with our canine companions is an important recreational/health-maintenance activity. I live across the bay, but Ft. Funston is a favorite destination for me and my dogs. Since I usually combine our beach visit with lunch, you could say that I'm helping the local economy!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2836    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 12:05:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** please do not punish and entire group of people and dogs because of the bad behavior of some. the key is clear rules and education. enforcement and respect on all all sides of the issue. i agree that there are irresponsible dog owners, just like there are irresponsible parents, and citizens. but to ban off leash across the board is just not right.

please, please please do not cower to the angry, vocal group.  
please, keep some off leash use of GGNRA areas.

sincerely,  
milli

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2837    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 12:05:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My dog is a rescue dog with a lot of anxiety. And the two best things for a dog with anxiety are exercise and wide open spaces. I cannot take my dog to enclosed dog parks. The space is too small and he is too anxious. Therefore, I am not able to use any fenced-in area designated for dogs in the city or out. If the open trails and beaches in the GGNRA are closed for off-leash dog use I will have nowhere to take my dog that is near the city and safe for us to exercise and socialize off-leash. This would make his quality of life so much poorer and that is just unfair when there is so much land available for multiple use and the vast majority of dog owners are so respectful and responsible when it comes to their environment.

Instead of such severe restrictions, please instead formalize the original pet policy established in 1979.

---

We need these areas of the GGNRA for our dogs. Many of us depend on it!

Sincerely,  
Brandi D

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2838    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Inverness, CA 94956  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 12:09:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't limit dog access on GGRNA lands anymore than it already is. I support the Sears solution for this issue and ask you to do the same.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2839    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 12:11:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Save off leash dog walking- Please!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2840    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

If there are areas that need to be closed for habitat or wildlife needs, you will find that dog owners will faithfully follow and support these initiatives. You will also find that dog owners self-police. I would

encourage you to provide education and community outreach if there are activities and behaviors that you would like to see different.

We all live in this beautiful area and urban dwellers, dog owners and dogs are all committed to preserving and enjoying these areas.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2841	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 12:18:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Stephanie Mendez

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2842	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Kathy Dwight

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2843	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 12:22:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jean Chung

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2844	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent Dean:				

I am writing to share my opposition the Preferred Alternative given its overly restrictive nature. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

---

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Bryan Rogers

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2845    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 12:32:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am deeply fearful of the loss of fun outings for San Franciscans (and other Bay Area families). I agree that professional dogwalkers have often abused the privilege of using parks and beaches, but I think families and individuals with one or two dogs should be able to run them off-leash in most of these areas.

I think that what some people don't understand is the pure joy of tossing a ball or stick into the waves and watching your dog's response. This is what our family did for all the years while our kids were growing up: when we couldn't agree as a family on a single thing, we all agreed that going to the beach with our dog was just perfect fun. The dog's enthusiasm is infectious!

For me, going to the beach without my dog really wouldn't be worth the effort because the pure joy would be missing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2846    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 12:33:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA:

I have been born and raised in the Marina District of San Francisco and have been walking my dog down on the Chrissy Field beach and on the Southern Marin trails for nearly 50 years. I am angered that the government wants to take our freedom to walk our dogs here in SF and on many trails/ beaches in Marin away from us. The government is here to represent the people and the people of San Francisco and of Marin are telling you we do NOT want you putting more restrictions on OUR recreation areas. There are plenty of places people can hike where dogs are not allowed so please, please leave our beaches and trails alone for us to be able to walk our dogs. The GGNA is an urban playground for ALL to enjoy and not a National Park with all its restrictions.

Sincerely,

Heidi Detjen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2847    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , MN 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 12:40:53**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Visiting Fort Funston with my dog is my favorite past time in the city. It's the one of the only places he's allowed to roam free without worry of cars or other interference. The community is wonderful and everyone seems very accepting and dog friendly. My dog knows he's near Fort Funston just by smelling the ocean air, I've never seen him more excited. Please don't take away this free roam sanctuary for our dogs. It would greatly diminish the quality of life for dogs who frequent the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2848 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 12:41:06**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Don't do this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2849 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Santa Ana, CA 92705

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 12:50:18**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an avid dog walker and promoter of dog and human well being, I am writing this to ask you to not limit off leash dog parks, trails, beaches and areas that are currently in question.

Dogs love to be free and off leash. When my family and I visit the San Francisco, Bay Area, we love all the outdoors it has to offer us and our dog-off leash. We take him everywhere with us. The pure pleasure of seeing him happy, being free is such a natural thing to do. I have asked myself as a human how would it feel to live in a world where everywhere I went I had to be on a leash. I realize dogs are domesticated animals, but they still need freedom.

I think creating this law will hinder the locals and visitors and make the San Francisco/Bay Area not as appealing, especially the dog lovers that live there and visit and there are many.

Sincerely-

Ann

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2850 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 12:54:37**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not change the over 50 year current policy of allowing dogs to be off leash at Fort Funston. It is a major part of life for the 1 in 3 residents of SF.

The current policy continues to work very well.

Thanks for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2851	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 13:06:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

There are probably no accurate figures on the number of dogs in San Francisco. The usual figures of somewhere around 150,000 are based, I believe, on the number of registered dogs, and since many dogs are not registered, the cited figures are probably substantially lower than the real numbers.

I think everyone would agree that there are an astronomical number of dogs in the City, and growing rapidly by the month. The sheer numbers and future increases necessitate rethinking policies and enforcement.

There is virtually no enforcement of any regulations regarding dogs in the City or in National Park areas, and of course San Francisco has an unusual situation in that so much City land is also National Park land.

For reasons of public safety, health, and the environment there should be very limited off-leash space in the City and San Francisco should comply with national policies in our national parks.

Even though many dog owners may be responsible citizens, the lack of enforcement and overly permissive policies create a situation where the possibly small percentage of scofflaws among them amount to a significant public problem due to the huge and growing population of dogs.

Many people let 2-6 or more dogs run freely, making supervision and waste clean-up impossible and create a public health and safety menace. In general in San Francisco, those who wish to have no interaction with off-leash dogs have almost nowhere to go. including markets, theaters , stores, beaches.

"Voice control" is always a myth that makes any enforcement impossible. One often sees owners shrieking at their dogs to no avail especially in the ubiquitous dog fights that one sees in all parks. Or owners who ineffectually tell their dogs not to destroy the turf by digging but allow much destruction or pursuit of birds.

No citizens should have to experience any chance of dog bites, a statistically significant occurrence, given the enormous canine population.

I was recently in Chicago and was amazed at seeing virtually no off-leash dogs, except in the relatively few fenced-in areas reserved for them. It made for a much cleaner and safer environment.

It has been decades since Harvey Milk's "pooper scooper" law dared to raise big-picture discussion of the impact on quality of life of the dog population of the City. Since then, the exponential explosion of dogs makes such discussion urgent.

In San Francisco there is a strong and well-financed lobby that opposes any regulation of dogs and is opposed to any dog-free or leash areas. This does not necessarily represent all dog owners, especially



those owners whose dogs are often attacked by off-leash dogs. But there is strong fear of the political clout of this lobby among politicians and public officials.

Please stand up for the public safety and health of our City and heed the environmental concerns of the Audubon Society and maintain strictly enforced leash law on our parks and beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2852    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 13:08:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not take away any more "off leash" trails in Marin County and on Mt Tam trails. If anything add more! Many dogs are more stable and peaceful off leash. Allowing dogs to really run makes them healthier animals. If anything, require dog owners to certify that there dogs are capable of being "off leash". That way, uncontrollable dogs must remain on leash and they won't spoil the "off leash" privileges for the mostly capable "off leash" dogs in Marin county. Please do not require dogs to be leashed more than they currently are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2853    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 13:18:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The proposal to ban dogs from Sloat to Lincoln is excessive. I walk my dog on this beach on a daily basis and it would be a huge loss to not be able to continue this practice. I understand the concerns for wildlife and other visitors, but I feel that at the very least, leashed dogs should be allowed on all of the beaches.  
To only allow dogs to be North of Lincoln, (which is in the heavily trafficked fire pit area that also frequently includes broken glass), or South of Sloat is too restrictive. I too, would like to be able to walk the full length of the beach with my dog, and it's not fair to restrict this area in this way.

It would make more sense to allow a smaller area like North of Lincoln to be off leash, and then allow leashed dogs for the rest of the beach.

While there have clearly been some users of the beach who have allowed an animal to roam into protected areas, or failed to pick up feces, these incidents should not reflect on the whole community, who for the most part are responsible dog owners and should be allowed full use of the beach.

Instead of enforcing a complete ban, I feel that more education about the endangered/protected wildlife could be useful. Additional signs on the beach with information about why the area is leash only, etc. Additional installations of poop bag stations and trash cans would also help to keep the entire beach area clean.

Also, the signage about the rules should direct people to different areas, so if they are in a leashed only area, they can easily find an off-leash area.

And if it's absolutely necessary to provide a no dogs allowed area of the beach, then make that the area south of Sloat, or some smaller section of the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2854    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 13:23:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I firmly support retaining off leash recreational space in the GG National Parks. The California coast line is huge and much of it already prohibits off leash dogs. As a long-time San Francisco resident, I spend every weekend at Fort Funston with my dog off leash and will be greatly impacted by new restrictions.

I have heard concern about wildlife protection in connection with the parks. Every week I see children climbing up the dunes and eroding the sandy cliff face at Ft. Funston. Organized "boot camp" exercise groups climb the dunes and tear up the turf. If off leash dogs are banned in the name of wildlife and environmental damage, then off leash children and fitness groups should also be banned.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2855    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 13:32:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am the proud owner of three dogs.They are well behaved and non aggressive. I walk them off lease usually twice a day. They are young dogs with a lot of energy, and love to get out and run around. To have them all on leases wouldn't be fun for them or me. Our family has gone to Muir Beach dozens of times with our dogs and have never had a problem. Sure some dogs don't listen very well,but for the most part the dogs have a blast.Please don't punish all dogs and their owners for a very few bad apples. Also I have had a few encounters where people yelled at me for having my dogs off lease ,for no reason at all. If you are scared of dogs, or have an aggressive or unruly dog, maybe you shouldn't go to where there is open space where you are likely to encounter other dogs.  
Thanks for listening. Roy Gulick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2856    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 13:32:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Katy Garlinghouse

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2857	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi -				

My name is Carrie Asby, and I live in San Francisco with my dog, Walter Jones. We visit Crissy Fields weekly to get exercise, fresh air and take in the fabulous view of this wonderful city.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

Please keep walking my dog off leash at the beach or on the trails legal. Out of all the problems in this work, a dog running off leash at the beach or on a hike isn't one of them. Thank you for you time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Carrie Asby

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2858    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 13:43:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Good afternoon,

I am a fourth generation San Franciscan. For the past three years, we have walked our two dogs at Mori Point. Each and every time we do, I spend my walk picking up the endless amount of trash on Mori beach. I even continued to do so throughout my entire pregnancy, when bending over once much less 100 times risked complete public humiliation. Naturally I would never leave my dogs' litter on the beach either. Not once have I ever seen another soul doing so.

As a responsible, tax paying member of this community, I expect to be able to access a small sliver of our open space with my dogs and child as a family. Just like I have to share the road with bikes and muni stops with Google buses, I ought to legally have access to small portions of beaches with my canines.

Please do not give my family yet another reason to be forced out of San Francisco. There are plenty of ways to achieve all goals respectfully in this matter.

Thank you,  
Jennifer Harrison

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2859    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 13:52:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a 93 yr. old woman who resides in San Anselmo. I have a companion dog who is the love of my life. I pay a friend to walk the dog in various parts of Marin County including Tennessee Valley, Muir Beach and Rodeo Beach. I cannot walk the dog or allow him off-leash, so knowing he's getting this kind of active exercise is such a blessing to me. He sleeps better and i sleep better after these outings. It's common sense that dogs need exercise and being off-leash is so very helpful with their development and socialization. Having this ability to get my dog exercise is so important to both of us. Please don't take this away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2860    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 13:58:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the GGNRA draft dog management plan, restricting off leash dog walking in San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo, CA.

I am a resident, rescue dog owner, of San Francisco and use these areas, specifically, Fort Funston, Ocean

---

Beach, and Crissy Field every weekend to spend quality time exercising both myself and my dog. Off leash dog play is crucial to my dog's health and socialization and walking freely in these areas allows me to enjoy them for exactly what they are intended for: recreation.

If this plan is accepted and enforced I will no longer use the the GGNRA for personal enjoyment - Restricting these areas would cause me to find new areas of off leash dog play, all of which will not be able to handle the overflow resulting from these restrictions.

In addition to opposing restricting these areas, I think it is confounded to propose fencing these areas - it will ruin the fluidity and beauty of the landscapes. It is also ridiculous that this management plan has been proposed without conducting appropriate studies substantiating the reasoning.

I support the GGNRA's management of the original 1979 dog management plan. San Francisco intended that these areas allow for off leash dog play and personal recreation, and the GGNRA should be managing these lands and future lands granted to the GGNRA as they were originally intended.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2861	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 14:10:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am very disappointed in how the GGNRA is planning on handling dog access and off-leash access on land GGNRA has been hired to manage FOR the people of the Bay Area. This is a fighting point for responsible dog owners who realize and understand that having a dog is a right and to have a happy, balance dog requires varied places to walk, run, and play with them not on leash. Our off-leash parks and many leashed trails have been what makes San Francisco one of friendliest dog cities in the country. In one fell swoop you with eliminate that. Please know that I and others like me will fight this.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2862	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Jake Barlow

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2863    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 14:15:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not ban off leash dogs at beaches. Fine offenders who do not pick up after their pets and leaving pets unsupervised. Majority of us dog owners are responsible. While there are few people who aren't, it is not fair that the entire dog community has to pay for it. Parks and beaches are to be shared and among all of us and removing our rights to enjoy the park/beach with our pets is unfair and unjust. Most of grew up with memories of running on the beach, swimming and playing with our dogs. I want to be able to pass the experience with my children. PLEASE COME UP WITH AN ALTERNATIVE PLAN WHERE EVERYONE CAN SHARE THE BEACH!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2864    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Save Off Leash Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 14:32:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Steven Larson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2865    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Stinson Beach, CA 94970-0666  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 14:32:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Draft Dog Management Plan as I feel it restricts too heavily the amount of locations where dogs are permitted. While I agree that there should be many areas where wildlife is free from potential interference by dogs, I also feel that it is important for dog owners to have a variety of terrain with ready access on which to exercise their dogs. As we have created a culture in which humans and dogs have become a close and immensely mutually beneficial pairing, we have a moral obligation to create environments in which dogs' comfort and health are well met.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2866    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 14:46:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing to strongly object to the Preferred Alternative of the Dog Management Plan. The plan is way too restrictive for dog owners who already have difficulty finding places to walk their dogs. The land in GGNRA in San Francisco was given by the City of San Francisco for recreational use. If people aren't able to re-create in the City, then they'll be forced into more rural areas which will have greater impacts on wildlife. The plan violates original agreements that promised off-leash recreation in parts of GGNRA. Those parts are already extremely restrictive and this plan will make them even more so.

I am a senior citizen and I attribute my relative good health to the fact that I walk with my dog at least twice a day every day. It keeps both me and my dog in excellent shape, both physically and mentally. It is a known fact that a well-exercised and socialized dog is a good dog, one that is friendly toward people and other dogs. A dog constantly kept on leash is not a well exercised dog.

The plan does not take into consideration all of the thousands of comments dog owners have submitted in various formats through the years, including myself. It is time for GGNRA to pay attention to all recreational needs of its visitors, including those of dog owners!

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Andrew Moore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2867    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 14:47:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is

way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Joe O'Connor

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2868	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive and I love having my very friendly dog off leash, there aren't enough places to do it! There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome!

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Jessica

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2869	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 14:55:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Fort Funston was the very first place my dog Timber and I went after arriving in San Francisco to visit a friend in the fall of 2001. We had been in the car for 8 hours after driving up from LA and we both needed a chance to stretch our legs after the arduous journey. My friend from the city recommended the park for its beauty and more importantly, for its vast off-leash, dog friendly setting. Much to my surprise it was all he told us about and more. We were greeted by friendly people, happy				

---



children and ecstatic dogs and their owners and acres upon acres of open space to be explored by my dog and I. She loved the other dogs, the sand, the bushes and the cliffs after being couped up in the car. I could imagine it is the same for dogs and their owners after having been in their home or office all day. Each time I returned to the city after that initial visit it would make it a point to go to Fort Funston as soon as possible so myself and Timber could roam free and enjoy the best of the bay area. I have since moved to San Francisco, and in the five years I've lived here, I have taken numerous friends, family and acquaintances who visit the bay area to the exact same spot. In the hundreds of times I've been to Fort Funston, Crissie Field, GG Park, Rodeo Beach, Fort Baker, etc. has anyone expressed anything but pure joy and wonder at the fact dogs are welcome and not once have I heard a complaint from someone without a dog or seen a dog or their owner affect the natural balance or cause a problem.

It seems obvious that the best purpose for this piece of land, along with others such as the meadows in Golden Gate Park and the vast lawns and beaches of Crissie Field is for dogs, their owners along with other families and children to be allowed unfettered access to the land and the water, free of any restrictions. Timber and I make the trek to Fort Funston, Crissie Field and the Golden Gate Park every week and cannot imagine where we will go to enjoy such a profound experience if you go forward with your plan to severely restrict the off-leash areas on our National Parks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2870	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I walk my very energetic Wheaten terrier regularly at weekends at both Fort Funston and Crissy fields - RECREATIONAL areas. During the week, our dog walker takes her to fort funston which she adores.

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is very restrictive and will prevent me from exercising with my dog the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years now.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I expect to see Fort Funston, Rodeo beach and many other beautiful recreational beach areas in the bay area start to resemble "ghost parks" if this new dog management plan goes through. San Francisco has always prided itself on being a dog-friendly city, it will be very sad to see that perception fade because of the GGNRA's new proposed plan.

Sincerely,  
Anne-Marie Twomey

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2871	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:10:22**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County (maintaining the access we have enjoyed for decades in that area) and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

Dogs who are well-behaved not only enjoy healthier activity when playing off-leash, but they model appropriate behavior for other dogs (and dog owners). In the Golden Gate National RECREATION Area, dog-walking is a legitimate and desirable recreational activity, enjoyed by huge numbers of dogs, dog owners, and dog-lovers alike. In particular, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that dogs in Rancho Corral de Tierra are significantly disturbing vegetation or wildlife. The vast majority of the reported "incidents" result from the insufficiently announced/communicated changes in policy from the historical use and access dogs and their owners have enjoyed in the area.

Please preserve off-leash access in San Francisco and San Mateo County, and protect appropriate recreation for healthier dogs. Please do NOT arbitrarily remove this valuable resource that San Francisco is famous for.

Sincerely,

Gever Tulley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2872 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-4464

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:26:04**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Please allow dogs to continue to go off-leash in our wonderful open space areas such as Crissy Field, Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. The experience of being outdoors with my family and the other responsible dog owners of San Francisco is one of the main reasons I chose to live in San Francisco 28 years ago. Please don't take away the dogs' off-leash access!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2873 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** SaveOffLeash.com Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:** OfficialRep**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:27:51**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** 1) Any reduction to on or off-leash dog areas will require dog parents to travel greater distances, convening on fewer spots making the related traffic and parking more congested. Have these impacts been estimated, quantified, evaluated, considered, peer reviewed and publicly disclosed? If

so, where is that analysis?

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2874    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:29:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The idea that "without action, these resources and values in some areas of the park might not be available for enjoyment by future generations" due to the impact of dogs and the presence of dogs leads to "resource degradation" is decidedly unreasonable when you compare the effect of dogs to many of the other effects of humans in these parks that include (but aren't exclusive to): horses, bicycles, dirt bikes, and humans themselves. People do much more damage and leave much more trash (i.e. resource degradation) in the parks than dogs ever will, so to restrict the use of dog owners in these areas will only make a small difference when compared to the overall problem.

If resource degradation is the true issue, the NPS would do much better to limit overall traffic in these areas (which I know would never happen) to curtail the issue. Dogs aren't the problem and the science will show that dogs aren't the problem - irresponsible people are. Responsible dog owners are probably the best patrons and supporters that the parks have, and if you alienate this group, you are losing out on all of the support from this group that highly values our natural resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2875    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Piedmont, CA 94620

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:33:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/08/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because because it severely limits my access to the parks and trails I use and love, because my dog is my constant companion. There is no reason why dogs should be restricted to walking on leash only; this is a crazy idea that will impact many people who use the park and various areas under GGNRA control. I walk for health reasons (panic attacks are lessened by walking each day) and as a single woman I rely on the security I have with my dog at my side. Please don't take this away from us. Thank you!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2876    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Glen Ellen, CA 95442  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:37:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** What a travesty! Dog owners have been using trails and beaches for many years with little or no ramifications. Why is there now a problem with having your dog off leash? Walking my dog in the GGNRC is healthy not only for me, but also my dog. I have never had a problem in doing so. Please reconsider this new ruling because it will definitely keep me from enjoying the GGNRC.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2877 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-1785

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:39:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the plan was created using only the input of special interest groups instead of allowing private citizens to have access to this agency. Additionally, the public comment period is ineffective because it requires citizens to make comments in a cumbersome and time-consuming manner. Consequently, special interest groups have been given carte blanche while taxpayers have been left holding the bill without any say once again.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2878 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** sausalito, CA 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:39:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a resident of Marin County and a frequent user of the GGNRA, I do not support any plans to criminalize off-leash pet exercise. While our family has a dog, our dog is not adequately trained to be allowed off-leash in public. It is my opinion, however, that just because some dogs are not well behaved off-leash, all dogs and owners should not be punished for the ill behavior of a few. To do so would be like firing all public employees for the bad acts of a few public employees.

Keith Ogden

Sausalito, Ca.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2879 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103-2212

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/04/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan, because the very few off-leash areas in San Francisco provide an area for our dogs to get exercise and to work freely with trainers. Without these areas, I would worry that my dog wouldn't get enough exercise, because we live in a city apartment without a yard, and this would have an impact on his health. Please save the off-leash areas in San Francisco - thank you!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2880    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-3506  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/04/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it lacks proper study or fairness. For example, there is no peer reviewed study, just hearsay about damage dogs may cause.

The NPS does not believe the GGNRA should be treated differently than Yosemite. In fact, GGNRA is a RECREATION Area.

GGNRA is also clearly influenced by money donated by minority special interest groups like GGNPC. com . Notice how this unassociated non-profit even tries to look like it's a government agency.

GGNRA has been trying to remove its responsibility to support recreation for which the lands were originally designated. They continue to defy the 1979 Dog Management plan which has been challenged and upheld as recently as 2005.

They continually chip away at reducing dog areas while there are more dogs than children in SF. Literally 50% o households have a dog.

This is not about dog rights vs. human rights. It is about dog parent (human) rights. As a child and dog parent, I do not have time (nor want) to walk my dog in a dingy tiny dog park, take my dog home, lock her up and go enjoy the lands that everyone else can enjoy on my own.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2881    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94131-3030  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/04/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan.

I strongly oppose the preferred a.lter.native for all local parks because it is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted com ments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.

What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describe how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be, not as a national park, which is not something that is appropriate in a crowded urban area.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2882    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-3030  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/04/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it doesn't reflect the needs of the public and seriously changes the quality of life for dog owners in the area.

The GGNRA is a beautiful piece of land. For years, it has been shared by lots of different kinds of people for a diversity of uses. We need to protect those uses for \*everyone\*.

One of the most amazing qualities of the GGNRA is that it's largely open and unobstructed by fencing or pens of any kind. Any plan that adds fencing to dog-use areas will blemish this otherwise pristine land.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2883    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-5956  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/04/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it restricts the ability of any San Francisco resident, who vast majority do not have access to a backyard facility in their own homes, to safely and healthily own a dog. If you've ever owned a dog, you know that at minimum they need to be exercised 30 minutes two times a day to avoid separation anxiety, destruction to rental property, weight gain, depression and other health issues. A dog that remains indoors and with no exercise is a dog that an owner will quickly be com e unable to manage and maintain ownership of. It doesn't take much for a dog owner to throw their hands up in desperation and abandon a pet, should the access to facilities be com e difficult. With a plan like GGNRA Dog Management Plan there is certain to be an impact on shelters, rescue adoption agencies and dog training/walking facilities as an increasing number of dog owners will abandon their pets. We already face extreme issues with overcrowding in shelters and stray animal control - why then force beloved pet owners to have to give up their pet when it could be otherwise avoided.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2884 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-2626

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/04/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I love walking my dog off leash and under voice control - for her health and happiness, and for the health and happiness of my family. Dogs do nothing but make the GGNRA a great and happy place for families to enjoy the beauty of Northern California - requiring them to be on leash is tragic and a very bad idea. Please help our dog and please help our family!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2885 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94062-3017

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/04/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

First of all, thank you for considering my opinion. I recreate with my dog in the off leash areas of the GGNRA often and it's a wonderful part of the Bay Area experience, both for people (including non-pet owners) and pets. A place like Ft. Funston is a local institution for dog owners and those who enjoy dogs alike.

Secondly, and more formally:

1) I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable.

3) I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy as the MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions.

Best Regards,  
Matthew Goforth

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2886 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-1005

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/04/14. I strongly oppose the restriction of off lease play areas because it is too restrictive. It also does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred a.lter.native on nearby parks. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.

The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And finally, there are so few places that are off-lease dog friendly within San Francisco. My dog is very high energy and loves to run on open stretches like Fort Funston. Without these special places, he and I will not get the exercise we need and love.

Sincerely,  
Lauren Bagden

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2887 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112-1815

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/04/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because pets need to excercise and people have small yards/apartments who have pets but no room. if you ban pets from parks some people will have no fun and not go to parks.also if you ban them you are a jerk.not like a pets gonna attack someone.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2888 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san mateo, CA 94403-2139

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because in a densely populated area such as the Bay Area, it is not only filled with people but also their animals. If this bill passes it will cause what few parks and trails that allow access for pets to be com e over crowded and unenjoyable. Let us enjoy the great outdoors with our furry friends!



-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2889    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Campbell, CA 95008-5111  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

Ft. Funston was a boon when I discovered it in 2006 after moving to the Bay Area from my native Chicago-land. My initial impressions of the area was of an unusual intolerance towards dogs and dog owners. Strict off-leash laws and harsh enforcement left me feeling dejected, and the wholly inadequate off-leash park areas (small, rundown, cramped and poorly equipped) had my dog depressed and uninterested in play. Ft. Funston changed all that, and I'm not speaking in hyperbole as it is a 1 hour drive from home and yet a trip we regularly make. Dogs and dog owners have very few options in the Bay Area for recreating in a meaningful way in nature. Please don't take what little we have away.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2890    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1764  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because my dog uses off-leash trails 3 times a week and would be confined to a very small beach if this goes through. Reducing the area she has to play puts her at greater risk for being attacked by another dog.

My neighbor's dog was recently killed by another dog in a small dog park. I feel this could have been prevented if the dogs had more room to play.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2891    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123-1990  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. Congress should not adopt the The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. The Plan is overly restrictive regarding where dogs can be within GGNRA both on leash and off leash. Currently, there are many areas of GGNRA that are already closed to dogs. There is no good reason to expand those areas. There is also no good reason to ban off leash dog play in the already limited areas that it is permitted. In balancing the environmental impact

---

against the enjoyment of dog owners, there appears to be no compelling environmental reason to keep dogs --. on leash or not --. off this federal land. Please do not further limit the areas on which dog owners can enjoy their outdoors with their dogs beside them.

Sincerely,

Laura Vartain

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2892	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94609-2254				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:40:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...				

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2893	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127-2124				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:40:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because one of the biggest reasons I love living in this city, is the outdoor life it affords. Almost everyday and certainly every weekend, my family and I go to Fort Funston with our dogs. We hike, enjoy the beautiful views and the company of other people and their animals.				

I was shocked to learn about a proposal by the GGNRA to severely limit dogs and off-leash dog walking in Ft. Funston, Crissy Field and other parks --. especially as it didn't take into account any of the views or opinions of the public: the people who live and work in this city.

Just about 1 in every 3 households in SF has a dog, and this is going to dramatically impact San Franciscans. It is also going to impact city parks, because if this proposal passes hundreds upon hundreds of people and their dogs are going to flood places like Maclaren Park and Golden Gate Park. I've seen what happens when too many dogs are in a confined space, and I'm also worried about the potential serious accidents it will cause should this happen.

I urge you to learn about this issue and help us come to a better resolution.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2894	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94605-3379				

---

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

Officials at GGNRA,

Please reconsider the initiative to restrict dogs so that they must be on a leash in designated park areas. Previous to living in Oakland, I lived in San Francisco from 1998-2008. I have enjoyed the beautiful parks in the city as do most dogs. Now that I live in Oakland and have my own dog, it brings me great joy to be able to share the open space at Ocean Beach with my dog. This is an area where there are no ticks and plenty of other friendly dogs for her to socialize with. Also, many people without dogs enjoy the spontaneous energy that is created when dogs are allowed to play in a respectful manner. Not once have I seen a mishap created by a dog at the beach, nor have I noticed the dogs seriously destroying the habitat. In fact, over the years having surfed at Ocean Beach, I have see the coastline and dunes drastically change as result of storms or high surf.

It is with great concern and disappointment to know that my small dog must be on a leash along the coastline.

Kind regards,  
Stephen Nichols

-----  
sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2895    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1113  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... Our dogs need a place to run and play. These recreational areas are a part of our daily lives and help us keep our dogs happy while they live in San Francisco. There are too many limited areas where our dogs can play in the city and the golden gate national recreation off leash areas are a huge part of our quality of life!

-----  
sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2896    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066-5836  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will

---

feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

--.--

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2897    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF, CA 94131-1250  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:40:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I am an avid walker, nature lover and responsible dog owner who believes parks can be shared by all.

--.--

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2898    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Riverbank, CA 95367-9651  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it proposes taking away yet another freedom and puts the health and happiness of dogs in jeopardy. It will cost money to reinforce such a plan and it is overwhelmingly ignorant of the wishes of the majority of Bay Area residents. Do not put into law what offends the minority few who view dogs unfavorably. Stop trying to protect society from itself with socialism and tax dollars needed elsewhere!

--.--

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2899    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Castro Valley, CA 94552-5308  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because Areas where our dogs have been welcome to walk or play off-leash for decades could be severely cut or banned outright under the revised GGNRA dog plan. The new rules would affect off-leash as well as on-leash access at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Muir Beach, Rancho Corral de Tierra on the slopes of Montara, and many other parklands.

There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been ...

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2900 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-2854

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it's too restrictive and will drain resources on an already resource strapped city. Let's put our monitoring services to good use and keep people safe in urban environments that are currently hotspots for drugs and crime like the tenderloin and upper Haight. Dogs off leash should be the least of our problem and it sends a pretty strange message about our priorities if we have someone walking around our parks enforcing leash laws, when people are sleeping in our streets.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2901 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-2935

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/05/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jana

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2902 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-2614

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/06/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not

considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used.

2) SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by public comment.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2903    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123-1408  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/06/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there are thousands and thousands of us who walk our dogs every day to stay healthy & fit, with our dogs safely under control - dogs can & need to run around and walk way way further than humans - they NEED to be able to run around while we walk. Other people get huge amounts of pleasure from my dog, every day - this is a city of dog lovers - don't destroy that - or it will be another reason to leave San Francisco

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2904    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103-3918  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/06/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because having a place to run and play with my dog means a lot to both of us.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2905    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132-2615  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/06/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...Fort Funston and other locations in the GGNRA are rare places where dogs can run free. I don't have a dog, but I do enjoy walking there if only to watch the dogs running, playing and frolicking in the sand and ice plant...it warms the heart.

---

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2906 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-4718  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/06/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it would fundamentally change the culture of our city. San Francisco is a city where it's residents work hard and play hard. We choose to live in the city for many various reasons but one unifying factor is the ability to equally enjoy the easily accessible natural resources. Off leash dog areas provide much needed recreation, providing both physical and mental stimulation for myself and my dog. A place where we can interact in a way that is unavailable anywhere else. In my personal observation, off leash dog areas and dog owners are much more protective and responsible for caring for these areas. Fort Funston is one of the cleanest beaches I've seen - and you have to package EVERYTHING out and up to the top of the cliff!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2907 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118-3609  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/06/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...  
I walk/run my dog on the beach at Ocean Beach & Crissy Fields, sometimes Muir Beach on each and every weekend. 3 days/week, my dog is picked up by a great dog walker who takes her with other dogs to play and hike at Ft. Funston. She is such a healthy active dog, if she only was allowed to go out on a leash, it would KILL HER SPIRIT!! This beautiful CITY (SF) has more dogs than human children! They deserve what they need most...freedom and playtime.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2908 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-2839  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/06/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the severely limits the majority of peoples enjoyment of a recreational area. The majority of dog owners and non-dog owners support allowing dogs off leash in these places. We should be looking at ways to increase the amount of areas available not decrease

---

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2909 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114-2715

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/06/14. As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred a.lter.native described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted com ments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2910 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-2233

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/06/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

I absolutely love living in San Francisco. What's so fantastic about this part of the country is the many places to spend time outdoors year round. There's nothing my husband and I love more than spending time outdoors with our dogs. Unfortunately, in the city of San Francisco, most people (like ourselves) do not have yards, so we head to places like GGNRAs to get exercise. We've always felt a sense of com munity in these parks, meeting others who care just as much about taking care of these amazing areas.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted com ments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specifi



-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2911 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-2717

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... we have been living in San Francisco enjoying the very areas being threatened to be closed down from off-leash dog use for over 15 yrs. In addition to helping build and paying taxes to support these areas be com ing the beautiful places they are today, we have taken great pains to ensure our animals/dogs are not in the way of other citizens enjoying the property in their own right. Those of us who walk these areas regularly in fact take much better care of it than others (removing trash, picking up after others, keeping a look out for any species or wildlife afflicted, and keeping in touch w/park mgt to ensure upkeep is met.) Please do not take away our use of these lands --. you will be driving a huge, dedicated San Francisco com munity that has felt this is home for years - ELSEWHERE!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2912 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941-4557

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there is already a limited amount of space in the Bay Area where dogs can be with their owners. As many people today have dogs as 50 years ago, yet dog recreation areas have ALREADY been constricted. And, by and large, there are no new environmental or safety issues that have com e into play because of dogs. Dogs are NOT what is hurting the environment or creating safety issues, etc. Focus on the real environmental and safety issues impacting our com munity.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2913 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-2321

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I believe that a balance between recreation (please see the name of GGNRA) and conservation is critical. Recreation should include opportunities for people, including children and dogs. By taking away a recreation spot we have relied upon for many years, you are materially changing a social contract we have with you. If you will not live up to the recreation end of the bargain we have had, we should not be required to support GGNRA with tax dollars or public land. It's simply not right and it's not fair.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2914    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF, CA 94112-1815  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the residents of San Francisco and other bay area cities need open spaces to walk their dogs off leash contributing to better physical and mental health for all. This will result in healthier, happier cities.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2915    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-3719  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I think it is unfair for the dogs to not have the freedom to run and exercise.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2916    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-3246  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA and has lived here for 40 years, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alter.native described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted com ments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet

policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2917    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94108-2818  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2918    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-2773  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it's one of the few direct ways I see my tax dollars paying off directly FOR ME. I use Fort Funston every weekend, and my dog uses it every day. It is a huge reason why I've stayed in San Francisco.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2919    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501-6414  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because of the inherent imbalance it causes. There are already huge swaths of beaches set aside for any species of concern. This landgrab is a re-run of the bureaucrats attempt in 2011, and should be shot down for the same reasons. We need more off leash space in the federal parks that we pay to support. We need fewer bureaucrats looking for work to do.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2920    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061-2430  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member

---

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alter.native described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2921 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501-3169

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because these places you want to ban are the best for our dog and we always have fun and good exercise at them. The smaller dog parks are like prison yards and can be congested and dangerous. We have never had a problem at these GGNRA parks and always pick up after our dog. Everybody I see at these places is very respectful for their privilege.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2922 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Eureka, CA 95501-4616

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I will no longer be able to enjoy the area with my off-leash dog. I prefer that the 1979 pet policy remains in effect and that additional off leash areas are added in San Mateo and Marin Counties.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2923 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-3416

---

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it removes vital recreation space for many Bay Area residents.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2924    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Cave Junction, OR 97523-9831  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...I think that is wrong. Don't let SF turn into NYC and their nasty little dog run areas.

Mental and physical health requires being able to run and play for all creatures. I have walked me dog in SF for years and the only trouble I ever had was when a pit bull escaped their house and attacked my dog on the sidewalk. Make it a requirement that only socialized dogs can run free if you must make new rules.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2925    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116-1050  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. GGNRA's new proposal is arbitrary and capricious, not based in valid science. It is also an unjustified "taking" of lands given in trust by the City of San Francisco. Is this another egregious example of Federal overreaching? This proposal should be immediately reviewed at a higher level and rejected. ..

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2926    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-2907  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I instead support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I also oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred A.lter.native proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of

---

Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2927    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

You seem to have lost sight of the "Recreation" charter behind the GGNRA. I sincerely hope that the widespread opposition to your plans will inspire some soul searching.

As a dog owner, it is shocking to me how few options there are in the Bay Area for exercising dogs. And now you want to restrict access further.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Katherine McCormick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2928    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-2313  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. San Franciscans love our dogs, but it's hard for dogs to get enough exercise in a city. Vast off-leash areas are necessary for many dogs, including mine, to get the exercise they (and their human friends) so desperately need! When my sweet sheltie mix does not get sufficient exercise (and multiple on-leash walks per day are not enough, nor are trips to the tiny fenced in dog runs) she becomes a nervous wreck, and she begins annoyance behaviors such as barking.  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive and there are no good reasons for these changes. No studies have documented an adverse impact of dogs on the environments in these areas. I

---

support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences also destroy the wonderful natural beauty

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2929    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-3504  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/07/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for the past 8 years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2930    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** oakland, CA 94607-2013  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/08/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it is completely ridiculous and extreme. The proposed preferred alternative plan goes too far. We don't need more fences. Stop boxing us in. Stop "solving problems" that don't exist. GGNRA has a long history of fighting dog owners. There have been numerous lawsuits in the past. It seems that park management could find more effective things to do with our tax dollars than fighting the people that pay them. This needs to stop! The proposed policies have an adverse impact on the disabled and elderly, and on people that might not feel comfortable visiting our beautiful parks without their dogs in tow: for example women trying to exercise by themselves or simply going for a walk alone. I urge you to stop this agency that is clearly out of control, and is still incensed about losing lawsuits about the same topic in the past, from wasting more time and money in an effort to get even with dog owners!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2931    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Livermore, CA 94550-8976  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:53

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/08/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2932 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103-3983

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/08/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. The GGNRA is an important part of my life. I am at one of the parks three times every week with my dog. It is my primary source for entertainment and relaxation over the weekend. My dog, Otto, and I are there fog, rain, or shine every single weekend. Please do not let NPS take this away from me and my family. It is one of the primary reasons I moved to San Francisco. It is so rare to have open space like this available in a major city. Please please please help us keep the parks the way they have been for decades.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2933 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103-3323

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:41:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/08/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it severely limits off-leash dog walking areas in and around San Francisco. This plan was put together with minimal input and feedback from the general public. Only special interest groups who are already skilled at this type of process really got to give input fairly. It stands to restrict 90% o the 1% tat was negotiated by all stakeholders over a two-year period that was upheld by a federal court judge. If NPS felt a need to have it u.pdate.d or changed, the same process needed to be activated. Also, public com ment periods are ineffective and demand too much from the public creating a real lack in access to our government agencies and departments.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2934 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Richmond, CA 94801-4150

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/08/14.

I strongly oppose the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. If I wanted to live somewhere

---



where the government controlled my behavior I would move to China. These are public lands and they should be used how the public wants them used. Live free or die.

There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Howard Peters

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2935	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Piedmont, CA 94620				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:42:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/08/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because because it severely limits my access to the parks and trails I use and love, because my dog is my constant companion. There is no reason why dogs should be restricted to walking on leash only; this is a crazy idea that will impact many people who use the park and various areas under GGNRA control. I walk for health reasons (panic attacks are lessened by walking each day) and as a single woman I rely on the security I have with my dog at my side. Please don't take this away from us. Thank you!				

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2936	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133-2217				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:42:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because taking my dog Charlie to Crissy Field is the highlight of our day. And that says a lot living in San Francisco. Living in a high density city it's necessary for our mental health to enjoy the beaches and nature with my dog. I'm a responsible dog owner and tax payer that begs you not to take this right to run the beaches away from us.				

---

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2937 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122-4511  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the natural habitat of this and any other space occupied by humankind has and, I sincerely hope, always will be shared with our most constant and loyal companions on earth, dogs. They have ALWAYS been present in our habitat and have always been part of our lives to discriminate against them and their caregivers is inhumane! Dogs are being blamed right and left for human deficiencies, if this space is not open to them the impact on their innocent little lives will be far greater than the impact they ever had on the GGNRA every was. Please find it in your heart to allow this important freedom to use this natural space to help the dogs and people of San Francisco healthy and well socialized.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2938 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109-2844  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

1) Oppose the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred A.lter.native proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is prim

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2939 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Half Moon Bay, CA 94019-4041

---

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan VEHEMENTLY. Go ahead and restrict access to environmentally fragile areas, require dogs to be under voice control but don't cut off so much access! It will force more dogs in fewer areas. And there are plenty of places for families to go without dogs if they choose, keep some for those of use who have well-behaved dogs that we clean up after. We pay taxes, too, and use few other services like schools. And we vote.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2940    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103-2504  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan for the following three reasons:

1) Oppose the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred A.lter.native proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwell. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy.

Regards,  
Jeremiah Hall

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2941    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124-2920  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...As a citizen of San Francisco, and of course of the USA, I believe our parks

---

and other open areas should be shared by all family members, including dogs. Dogs are not a problem. The real problem is owners. As usual, the decision to punish all for the misuse of the few hurts us all. My dog needs exercise, not just a walk, and the need to socialize with others of his species. Necessary for health and fitness. Let us keep in mind that the parks have been used by dog owners all these years with a minimum of destruction of habitat. Now due to a small number of bad owners all of us will be punished. Maybe not what you immediately think of, but keep in mind that San Francisco has a reputation of having more dogs than children, so we truly NEED the off leash areas which we have historically made use of. Problem is that the minority of non-pet owners have been much more vocal than the owners. Well, today that changes in hopes of changing your minds about what really is important to citizens.

Vote to keep GGNRA wide open to dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2942	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115-1540				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:42:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. Dogs need exercise to be healthy, and are allowed now to run free in only a miniscule fraction of GGNRA lands. Other park users and wildlife certainly have valid interests, but the right way to address them is not to take away from those who already have very few options for recreation.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2943	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94402-1365				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:42:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because dogs are an essential part of humanife and have been for thousands of years. To prevent access to NRA's is discrimination. Pet atracks are exceedingly rare. This legislation risks throwing the baby out with the bath water. Not to mention enforcing will be impossible given current funding.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2944	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Belmont, CA 94002-1507				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:42:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...dogs need a good, full out run to keep their muscles toned. Mine are good citizens and reliable on voice control. There are very few spaces in our county (San Mateo) where dogs can be legally off leash. I have visited Fort Funston and I have never seen dogs out of control. In fact has always amazed me how peaceful the walk and the dogs are.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2945	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116-1905				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...				

1) it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred A.lter.native proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwel com e. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) The Monitoring-Based Management Strategy is still based largely on com pliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non- com pliance, it still is primar

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2946	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94109-2844				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:42:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...				

1) Oppose the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred A.lter.native proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort

Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primary

-----

sent via [popvox.com](http://www.popvox.com) ; [info@popvox.com](mailto:info@popvox.com) ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2947    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115-1033  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because San Francisco is a dog-friendly city and this is one of the joys of living in the Bay Area. Residents and well behaved 4 legged family members should be able to enjoy recreation throughout the GGNRA and not be restrictive. This is one of the most beautiful cities in the world and as long as there is respect of it and care to keep it clean, then we should be able to have access to it. If you have ever seen the joyful expression on a dog's face as they run freely and play with others at Crissy Field as well as that of the owner's and others enjoying the space, you understand and appreciate what a special gift this is. Dogs teach us so much about how to live life with joy and to live in the moment, and their positive energy permeates the air when they are in their element and absolutely enhances the Bay Area lifestyle. Being able to enjoy nature's beauty with our 4 legged family members is one of the reasons I live here, and I hope you will consider the importance of this access to residents and also how much undue stress this plan will add to city dog parks and neighborhoods.

-----

sent via [popvox.com](http://www.popvox.com) ; [info@popvox.com](mailto:info@popvox.com) ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2948    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94127-1626  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the "best professional judgment of NPS staff" to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for "proof" that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

-----

sent via [popvox.com](http://www.popvox.com) ; [info@popvox.com](mailto:info@popvox.com) ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2949    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-2516  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because..It is grossly unfair to Park users and dogs. Dog owners are responsible citizens and are entitled to safe access for themselves and their pets to all of our parks. .

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2950    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** LOS ANGELES, CA 90027-2540  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I recently moved to LA where dogs are not allowed on any beaches or public parks and it's devastating to me and my dog who spent years running free at Crissy field. Please dont take away the happiest moments of a dog and dog owners life together! Let everyone enjoy the natural beauty and splendor!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2951    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-5012  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

SEIS did not adequately consider com ments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these com ments (e.g., negative impacts on com munity and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred a.lter.native. The SEIS lists many, many com ments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS com ment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2952    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114-2526  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the GGNRA land is to be used and enjoyed by all Californians, including those with dogs. As a lifelong, active dog owner, I enjoy the beauty of our hiking trails and oceans, and appreciate being able to do so with my dog. Dogs do not cause harm to the environment or the landscape, and therefore should not be punished from enjoying the great outdoors here.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2953    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133-2349  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because dogs have always been a part of city life. How much more do you want to change this city?

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2954    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-2913  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it was put forward by NPS/GGNRA and was not formulated with any input by the public except for special interest groups privy to access this agency. It stands to restrict public access to NPS/GGNRA areas.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2955    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-2539  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it takes away the ability for dog owners and nature lovers to enjoy the great parks of SF. Responsible dog owners with obedient dogs should not be penalized for careless owners and aggressive dogs who behave inappropriately in public. It should be up to the owners own discretion as to

---



when to keep them on/off leash.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2956    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-2743  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will restrict access to an important recreational opportunity for both dogs and their owners. Off-leash dog walking is an important opportunity for many to get exercise and socialize with others in the com munity, including with people of other races, ethnicities, socioeconomic statuses, physical abilities, etc.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2957    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117-2516  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because..it is grossly unfair to dog owners and dogs. We walk our dogs frequently at Crissy Field and have noticed that dog owners are very responsible and should not be excluded from using our parks. We are dog owners and we vote. We are counting on you for a fair resolution to this matter,

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2958    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901-1211  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because. there should be areas for dogs, some places for off leash dogs, and some places for on leash dogs. I find the bay area pet owners to be responsible for both their dog's behavior and for their clean up. I take advantage of GGNRA both with my dogs and without them, have not witnessed any problems with the presence of dogs. Further restriction of where dogs can be will produce a negative effect in such a great place to live!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2959    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102-5801  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. Oppose the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

There are already not enough off-leash areas in San Francisco! It is ok for the city to allow homeless peoples to live surrounding multiple blocks around my house, yet responsible dog owners are being restricted even further in their attempt to live a good life. I do not feel safe around my house and now I cannot even give a good life to my dogs. Absolutely absurd and makes me embarrassed for the law makers of this city.

--.--.--

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2960    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94710-1834  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because

1) the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred A.lter.native proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2961 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Cottonwood, CA 96022-9813  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...dogs need to be able to run and play! There are other options instead of banning fetch and play. Try limiting the hours of play or limiting it to a certain area of the parks. We rarely take our dog with us when we travel, but i am not bothered by dogs playing when we visit Golden Gate Park or any other park for that matter. It is rare that there is a rude dog owner and when you run across one, other dog owners usually put them in their place by explaining proper dog owner etiquette. Please do not ban this. Thank you.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2962 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1113  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is unnecessary. There are an abundant amount of parks and recreation areas that do not allow dogs to be off leash. There is no reason to restrict the few places that are still available.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2963 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Franciscp, CA 94114-2103  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it under values the utility of have dog owners out and about. Parks would be under used if you cut out people walking dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2964 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044-4229  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:49

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because these lands are part of the city and we need to be able to share them for EVERYBODY, including dogs and their owners. Off-leash dogwalking has a long history in San Francisco and this is what makes the Bay Area great.

The policies that are being set forth are too restrictive and the GGNRA is not listening to the vast majority of people who are responding to this who are against their restrictions. This is recreational land, not Mt. Rushmore or The Grand Canyon.

We can be harmonious with ALL interests in this.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2965 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-5434

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the plan is too restrictive. I support the 1979 pet policy and urge formalization of that plan.

I am against the fencing plan to mark off leash areas at Fort Funston. The fences will impact the natural habitat and wildlife.

Consider all of the public com ments that have been submitted; not s.elect.ive one.

Thank you.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2966 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-3801

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I am NOT OPPOSED to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Draft Dog Management Plan. It makes sense. In my experience, dog owners allow their dogs to run off leash, and have little consideration for vegetation, wild life, and other people who don't want their dog running into them. There are plenty of places for people to walk dogs, even off leash. And, no one told them to buy a dog.

Please SUPPORT THE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION ARE DRAFT DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Thanks.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2967    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-2459  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the Preferred A.lter.native is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
There is no need for fences to delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?  
The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2968    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-6104  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

1) It is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) Roughly 50% of SF homes have dogs. We pay our taxes and the majority of us clean up after our dogs. Like the dogs of many of my neighbors, my dog is well trained, under voice control and brings smiles to the faces of people we meet along our way.(Including tourists without dogs!) He is a water dog, and needs to swim. This plan will make it nearly impossible for my dog to swim and will make other city dog parks overcrowded. This is unfair and unethical!

Dogs running free add unique character to SF and the Bay Area parks.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2969    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95123-2131  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:42:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. SEIS still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who dont want to be around dogs. This criticism was made of the DEIS too and apparently ignored.  
In our area are already most parks and beaches restricted to walking the dogs on a leash and on certain trails only or dogs do not have access at all. Now with this proposed Dog Management Plan 90% of leash open space, where dogs can be exercised and enjoy to run freely as they need to, will be taken away.

-----  
sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2970    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94710-1834  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because

1) the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred A.lter.native proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwell. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources reported.

-----  
sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2971    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-3223  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member

---

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. We must evolve to have our land management and preservation plans satisfy modern living- including more people and pets. If GGNRA insists on going back in time, how far back should we go? Should we make all open space people-free? We need to find a more sensible solution than that which is currently being proposed.

Sincerely,  
Carrie Varoquiers

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2972 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123-3108

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I am a responsible dog owner and my dog and I should have the right to enjoy those areas. I volunteer every year for the GGNRA and give back because I appreciate being able to use those areas with my dog. I will use my vote and whatever else I can to have the freedom and ability to use the space. Thank you.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2973 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94111-1946

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is too restrictive, it further reduces recreational areas where dogs can be taken without good cause. I am a responsible dog owner (and tax payer). I pick up after the dog, I keep my dog on leash when other people are around or it appears prudent (for example if horses or other animals around) and actively watch her if she is off leash to make sure she is not bothering anyone (and I've observed that the vast majority of dog walkers also act responsible for their dogs, we shouldn't be punished for a minority of people who act carelessly with their dogs. Those individuals who act irresponsibly should be ticketed or otherwise reprimanded). I love being outdoors and having my dog with me is part of that. Reducing popular areas where dogs can be in the GGNA (of which already there are not many relative to the areas dog are not allowed -even on leash) actively discriminates against my use of the parks. I recognize that some people do not like dogs around and that there should be com promise so that everyone can enjoy the parks, and so I don't object that there are some areas where dogs cannot be taken. But those who do not want dogs around should be willing to make the same com promise and acknowledge that for many the GGNRA is one of the main recreation areas for dog-lovers. At a MINIMUM I would like to see all the current dog allowed areas of the parks continue to allow dogs even if they were required to be kept on leash. There is no real justification in the SEIS for major changes,

and there was insufficient response and support provided in response to comments and questions from the comment period from dog walkers. Please support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you!

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2974    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94133-4110

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I actually do not oppose the plan because many dog owners are not responsible when they use parks or public recreation lands with their dogs. It's quite common they let the dogs run free. It's hard to go for a walk without being bothered by unleashed dogs. I have been attacked and bitten by free running dogs before when on Ocean Beach. Professional dog walkers use public lands and often let the dogs run free. Sometimes they meet up there and you have dozen or more dogs running around taking over the beach. There are too many dogs on public lands and although dog owners who are for this are more vocal about the subject, I don't think they are in the majority.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2975    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103-2504

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it was developed with absolutely no scientific study of the issues that it purports to remediate. The severe restrictions that it imposes upon the public are unwarranted and overvalue a few small special interests above the recreational needs of the vast majority of Bay Area residents and wildlife.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2976    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-1923

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is one of the few opportunities for our whole family to enjoy the GGNRA parks, which we would not otherwise visit.



-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2977 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941-3919  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is too restrictive. The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area a huge percentage of which includes dog owners. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas on current lands and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I don't understand how officials who I haven't even voted for are allowed to arbitrarily change policy about how people can use public lands, without any oversight or accountability to the people their policy affects. Thank you.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2978 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118-1856  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I enjoy the trails and parks very much with my dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2979 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-3407  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I am a 10-year resident in San Francisco and have owned a dog the entire time. As a dog owner who not only regularly uses the GGNRA regularly with my dog, I am a dog owner who based my home purchase on the proximity to Ocean Beach for the use with my dog!

It would be a devastating loss to dog owners to not have these areas for off leash enjoyment. For the past 10-years of regular use, I have noticed that often times the majority of people using these areas have dogs.

By restricting these areas to dogs, you immediately are crippling the use of these areas for the 50% of homes in SF that have dogs. I know from experience that any time I leave the house to enjoy the outdoors, I have my dog. If my dog isn't allowed to enjoy these areas with me, I won't get to enjoy them either. We will be forced to go to small, cramped dog parks that, if this law passes, will be completely overcrowded.

I believe you have to keep in mind the importance of a dog needing space to be a dog, they need to be allowed to do what is ingrained in them. Please consider how this will effect the owners and dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2980    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038-0864  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...Essential Points To Make  
1) Oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
  
2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?  
  
3) Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2981    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-2717  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the best use of this area is for off-leash dogs & their owners & dog lovers with or without dogs of their own--and that includes the elderly, the lonely, kids, the disabled, those hanging by a thread emotionally--all of whom are welcomed & made to feel comfortable in this environment. This is not an area ideal for families & picnics--like so many other places in the Bay Area. This place is unique--there is nothing comparable for dogs & dog enthusiasts--and its best use is its historical, legally-mandated use, i.e., a sprawling, free, off-leash area for dogs and the owners, walkers & hikers who appreciate them.

---

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2982    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112-1135  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I support the GGNRA Draft Dog Mgmt Plan although it is still too lenient on careless dog owners and too risky for the environment. Sensitive bird populations and humans need more protections from out of control animals.

Even the most responsible dog owners can't control their animals off leash at all times. Please don't be swayed by a special interest group of rabid dog owners is trying to co-opt the waterfront areas at the expense of conservation and others' safety.

Although beyond the scope of the current consideration, I think a much stronger and more long-lasting benefit to the environment would be declaring the GGNRA part of the Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary or Fitzgerald Marine Reserve, so that future generations of people and wildlife could equally benefit from our beautiful coastal areas.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2983    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115-4252  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will limit the access my well behaved dog and I will have to the out-of-doors in San Francisco. We enjoy Crissy Field and are careful not to infringe on the restricted area. it would be a sad thing for us to lose access to the East Beach as well. Out of door recreation is important to the health and well-being of dogs, and the proposed Dog Management Plan limits access too severely.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2984    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-1131  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

---

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them, and SEIS never gave results of public comment on the DEIS. This shows the inherent unfairness of the SEIS.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2985	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103-1865				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:43:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it does not make sense to restrict dogs when there is not factual evidence that the dogs and their owners do anything but use the space for family walks. my dog is my family and she deserves the right to exercise in our park like we have with out incident for three years. Have you been to the GGNRA? This draft plan has received no public input and seriously makes no sense.				

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2986	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122-1836				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:43:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/09/14. I have learned of the poorly planned GGNRA "Preferred Alternative" and oppose it completely for several reasons. I have been a San Francisco voter since I moved here in 1987. I vote in every election, and I vote for every office and for every measure. I pay attention to which politicians support the programs I approve of, and it makes a difference in how I vote.				

My partner and I walk our dog very responsibly, using especially Crissy Field, Fort Funston (where my partner served in the Coast Guard), and Ocean Beach.

First, as to the PA plan itself, it restricts dog walking far too much. I see no justification for the changes. We have a perfectly good policy established in 1979 which should now be formalized, and extended to the new GGNRA areas in San Mateo County.

Fences around off-leash areas are unnecessary, unsightly and off-putting. Are dogs and their humans a virus we need to quarantine?

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

Second, procedurally, this attempt by the GGNRA to change the leash status is arbitrary, undemocratic, and very poorly researched.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2987	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94108-1041				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:43:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/09/14. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area Draft Dog Management Plan is bad for San Francisco, bad for the bay area, and bad policy.				

It is clear the second draft did not take into account any of the comments from the first draft, from dog owners and non-owners alike.

There is no justification for such severe restrictions on dog-friendly areas within the GGNRA; in some cases, up to 80% of the currently usable space will be lost.

The suggestion to fence in off-leash areas simply amounts to punishing dog owners and limiting their enjoyment.

The unilateral decision-making and ill-studied "proposal", not to mention the secrecy with which the SEIS is developing policy (e.g., stating the number of responses but not the content or context, the reliance upon non-peer-reviewed literature, lack of true studies of impacted areas, etc.) is anathema to our city and what it represents.

When Harvey Milk sought to keep the streets and parks of San Francisco cleaner, he did not seek to ban dog areas or create an atmosphere where dog owners feel they are second class citizens. No, he created a law that required dog owners to be responsible. Let us use that spirit to guide us.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	2988	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94109-6584				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:43:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it's stupid and we don't need more rules in our lives forced by government

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2989 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San francisco, CA 94133-3717

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

1) Oppose the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred A.lter.native proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwel com e. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2990 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-3604

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because tons of people make use of the parks with dogs. The parks would be empty without dog owners.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2991 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122-3531

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it would limit the places my dog and I can exercise and be social with other dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2992    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1241  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/09/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because if people have a right to bring their children and babies to these areas, we have the right to bring our children there also, namely our dogs ,and we will do so regardless of any nonsensical law. People with dogs on leash and service dogs like mine have a right to this open space; this is what I pay taxes for.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2993    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-1785  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the plan was created using only the input of special interest groups instead of allowing private citizens to have access to this agency. Additionally, the public comment period is ineffective because it requires citizens to make comments in a cumbersome and time-consuming manner. Consequently, special interest groups have been given carte blanche while taxpayers have been left holding the bill without any say once again.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2994    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-3744  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. As a committed environmentalist, I understand the need to protect and balance interests in National Parks. The Park Service has NOT, however, balanced the interests of all its users and the animals that use the Parks as habitat --. and indeed, the NPS has excluded and ignored the interests of literally tens of thousands of its users.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2995    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110-5147

---

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it denies equal access to public lands. Furthermore, this is an urban area, not 'natural' except to the extent that human settlements are natural. Dog owners are the natural allies of the police and a natural form of crime prevention by their ubiquitous presence at all hours in public spaces.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2996    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-2512  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I have a dog who loves to run around in these areas. He isn't doing any harm to the environment, he is more part of nature than we humans are, I can't tell you how much trash and human body waste I see in these areas. Humans are ruining the environment not dogs! Let's not punish dogs for what humans are doing to the environment!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2997    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-3511  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because preserving off leash areas is essential for my dog to get the exercise she needs in our urban environment. I value living in a city that encourages use of outdoor spaces, and the off leash area is an important part of our parks.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2998    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115-3106  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I think we have a duty to these beautiful animals that provide us with so much. I think it is unfair to except these com panions to spend their life on 6 feet of leash.

---



-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 2999    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Leandro, CA 94577-3017  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because bringing my dogs to some of these fantastic beaches is something that we have enjoyed for many years, and one of the enticing reasons why we moved to this wonderful area. Please help to keep these beaches dog friendly so we all can enjoy them - there are plenty of beaches already that do not allow dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3000    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Belmont, CA 94002-1211  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there are hardly any places to walk your dog and explore the outdoor's as it is. Pebble Beach, San Diego and even LA have great dog friendly places to go and explore, we don't want SF to be known and un=pet friendly. The research does not support the NPS's argument anyways.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3001    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103-4713  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I'm for The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...As a former dog owner, I feel that Ocean beach is the only suitable beach area for dog activities. There is just too much negative impact and negative interaction at other GGNRA areas.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3002    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-6432  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member

---

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because Crissy Field is the only place accessible by public transportation where the many apartment dogs of Lower Nob Hill can get maximum exercise. My dog provides emotional support for me every day, and our one-a-month trips to Crissy Field are my support for him.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3003 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** LARKSPUR, CA 94939-2107

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3004 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123-3932

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because dogs and their owners should have equal access to the GGNRA as everyone else... dog owners pay the same taxes as non-dog owners, limiting access is wrong. Aside from that, I firmly believe that owning a dog promotes a healthy lifestyle, getting people out of their homes and spending time outdoors. There are already too many areas that forbid dogs, and a lot of those areas go unused. What's the point of public space then?

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3005 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94131-2531

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:43:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because my dogs need to run faster than I can to stay in shape! There is plenty of land for conservation and off-leash use.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3006 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127-2038  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because this is a dog friendly city and we need more (not less) places to take our dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3007 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-2606  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it poses unreasonable restrictions on dog owners. Healthy and safe access of public lands for dogs is extremely important to ensure the quality of life in and near San Francisco.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3008 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-3208  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the beach at Chrissy Field is the only place my dog can get out and run. He is a timid dog who doesn't like to run and play in the smaller, confined dog parks of the city. At the dog parks, Buster spends most of his time trying to climb behind me on the bench. At the beach however, he runs ahead - then back and splashes in the waves. He's an entirely different dog.

As for safety and environmental concerns, I don't see how dogs on leash are any different for the environment than off - so long as they are kept out of environmentally sensitive spaces, as they are currently. In all my visits to the beach, I have never seen any problem interactions between the dogs, nor threatening/harmful behavior towards other humans. In my experience, dogs are allowed off leash in many other beaches and natural areas throughout the state - why should these be different?

For us living in SF, these are some of the very few areas that we and our pets can do what others do out their back doors - at the beaches, lakes and mountains - all the time. Please do not take away this important resource.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3009    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-1923  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is really important for urban areas to provide off leash dog areas for their citizens. Dogs need to run off leash, and for responsible dog owners an off leash walk is their most vital and frequent access to trails and recreation areas. When I take my dog to Ft. Funston for a hike I see a place that offers shared use to dog owners, non-dog hikers and horses. This area is used actively by all of these constituents, but most daily use is by the dog community in San Francisco. It is a vital part of my and my dog's health and well being to have access to this amazing place. Dog owners are caretakers of this place, cleaning up on the beach and making sure that trash and dog feces are picked up regularly. It would be a tragedy to close access to this wonderful and unique place.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3010    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94949-5439  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because parks where we are able to exercise our dog are more and more limited. For those of us who KEEP THEIR DOG UNDER CONTROL we should not be continually restricted. Rather issue citations for those who are not properly controlling or training their dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3011    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Dublin, CA 94568-5550  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. It is far too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area.

These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3012    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94115-4556  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I am a responsible dog owner, who does nothing to take away from the environment or any other persons experience. I enjoy taking my dog to all the parks that SF has to offer much like those who have children. When the TN Valley trail stopped allowing dogs it was a huge disappointment. I pay taxes to enjoy these parks with my dog and would be extremely upset if any other parks do this as well. This is one of the huge reasons I can justify paying outrageous SF and CA taxes!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3013    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112-2822  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...there is already limited space for dogs to roam free and socialize and they and their owners both need this to be happy and healthy. There is a calming and centering that the dogs receive when they have open space to socialize and this makes for a well-adjusted animal. In places like San Francisco, it is especially important due to the lack of open space available and dog owners are very diligent about upkeep and volunteering of off-leash parks.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3014    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116-2066  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

---

It restricts the current, positive conditions of these areas. Off-leash dogs are well behaved and enjoy being free to run and play. I am writing in support of off-leash activities at Fort Funston, and other GGNRA locations. It is my experience that dog walkers and non-dog walkers share these areas well. In addition, most dog walkers are very responsible concerning the behavior of their pets, and cleaning up after them.

Please continue to allow this multi-use activity in this beautiful location that is our back yard to the Pacific Ocean!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3015	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941-1711				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:44:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because:				

1) SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them.

2) SEIS still lists impacts that "might", "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA.

3) SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not to do them.

4) SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote.

Thanks,  
Jason

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3016	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110-3379				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:44:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3017	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sonoma , CA 95476-7680				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:44:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it is important to allow dogs within limitations to be able to enjoy the GGNRA. It enhances their lives and ours.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3018	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103-4438				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:44:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because having these off-leash dog parks are incredibly important to the well-being of our beloved pets, and ourselves.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3019	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94121-3511				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes.

I oppose

fences that surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3020	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019-2347				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:44:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...				
	1. rural coastal area with needs individual from urban area concerns				
	2. my dog and I hike these trails weekly for 15 years - I pick up, care for and deeply respect the coastal lands I love to walk with my dog and family				
	3.the issues of concern stated are not issues experienced in this region of the GGNRA lands.				
	Thank you for considering my request.				
	Yasmin Caminiti				

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3021	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94131-1914				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 15:44:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...Oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort



Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3022    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116-2425  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it is important to allow dogs within limitations to be able to enjoy the GGNRA. It enhances their lives and ours. This is an unfair and certainly suspect in terms of abuse by the GGNRA. Investigation and oversight is necessary. To declare 90% of the land area Off Leash to residents of SF & the Bay Area is ridiculous when over 50% of the Bay Area families own dogs and this interferes with our use of the recreational land in our parks.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3023    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122-2408  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it is a poorly reasoned argument to overturn the status quo which works for all users. Please listen to your constituents and not the extremists.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3024    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132-2617  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it disadvantages many dogs and their owners from priceless bonding time and exercise time. Dogs and their owners, who attend off-leash parks, usually are confident, nice, and playful. Dogs who do not demonstrate the proper ability to be comfortable around other dogs and people, usually are not at these off-leash parks. Off-leash parks are vital for a healthy relationship with your dog

---

who is, in many peoples lives, their number one companion.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3025    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-2518  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is overly restrictive and does not reflect the needs of people who use the GGNRA areas.  
The Dog Mgmt Plan put forward by NPS/GGNRA was not formulated with any input by the public except for special interest groups privy to access this agency. It stands to restrict 90% of the 1% that was negotiated by all stakeholders over a two-year period that was upheld by a federal court judge. If NPS felt a need to have it updated or changed, the same process needed to be activated. An autonomous action by the agency was a very insular one at that. Also, public comment periods are ineffective and demand too much from the public creating a real lack in access to our government agencies and departments

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3026    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-6012  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:44:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/10/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... My dog is a regular visitor to all the areas proposed on this list. My dog goes every day to enjoy one of the GGNRA parks and needs this to promote a healthy life. Offering these areas for pets promotes a healthy lifestyle for myself, my family, and my dog and allows us to get out to enjoy the preserved nature that surrounds San Francisco. Without these areas, there will not be any areas to take my dog. I live in a condo in SF and need the outdoor space to exercise my dog on a daily basis. Please do not take this away.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3027    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 15:46:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My comments are related to dogs and specifically dog walkers in GGNRA. I'm a frequent user of the trails near my house, both hiking and biking and have been bitten (I've filed a report with Park police) chased, and lunged at too many times to count. I'm now carrying pepper spray because I

---

fear all the off leash dogs that gather around Alta trail (as many as 40 if not more most days) The dog walkers especially on Alta trail will usually have 7 dogs each, all of leash. There will usually be 5 different groups of dog walkers creating an absolute nightmare scenario. It is impossible to enjoy the trail when out of control dogs are everywhere. I should not have my enjoyment of these trails dismissed because the "dog walkers" have taken over this space. These people are earning a living doing this, not someone who's taking the family dog out for a walk. I'm a dog owner and appreciate being able to take my dog to some of these places, but I'm sick and tired of having my experience ruined by a business using a public resource for their personal gain. I think anyone with more than 3 dogs should be held to a different standard and not allowed to use the public resources like this. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3028    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Carly Jefferson-Dow

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3029    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 16:09:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I became a dog owner after recovering from cancer treatment at age 28. The healing that has taken place after just a few months of walking/running/fetching with my beloved dog Sal along crissy feld, fort funston and ocean beach has been absolutely extraordinary. I never realized how important happy dogs are to their owners or how important exercise is to maintain the happiness of the dog. I've never taken these amazing resources for granted, it's why I live in SF. I can't believe access is being threatened, it's outrageous. Please, please maintain the permitted off-leash areas of GGNRA.

With all hope and sincerity,  
Molly C. Mitchell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3030    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 16:09:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

This Environmental Impact Statement is fatally flawed because it utterly fails to address the single most serious environmental issue of our generation: Carbon Dioxide releases.

In doing so the authors have made a juvenile mistake by failing to consider unintended consequences. Which is surprising, because they are so easy to predict in this case.

The "preferred" plan severely limits off-leash (and on-leash) dog walking access. But no-one is going to stop walking their dogs as a result of this. Also, no new dog walking areas will open up.

So let's examine a family from El Granada who have a couple of dogs (very typical for a Coastside family). Currently that family can walk from their house and walk their dogs in Rancho Corral de Tierra: Net result, no carbon dioxide emissions for transport.

Under the new scheme this same family will have to drive as far as Fort Funston to walk the same dogs off-leash. And I can assure from talking to people that many will make that journey.

That is a sixty mile round trip. Let's say they do that twice a week and get 30 miles to the gallon in their minivan.

That means over 200 gallons of fuel each year. Which means about 3800 pounds of CO2 per year. And let's say we have a thousand family in this situation on the Coastside alone (a low estimate).

That is nearly 4 MILLION POUNDS of CO2 per year from the Coastside alone. All a consequence of this so-called "Preferred" environmental plan!

This plan is an environmental disaster. How the NPS could have proposed this is crazy. At a time when we all are doing everything we can to curb CO2 emissions the NPS is requiring families to release millions of extra pounds a year. Yet the NPS chooses to totally ignore this in the Report.

Which is why I say the only legal thing to do is nothing (Alternative A, no action) until a real environmental impact review is done. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3031    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 16:25:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off-leash dogs are one of many unique aspects about the Bay Area. It is a lifestyle. Yes, there are problems with off-leash dogs, but a wholesale restriction against the 95% of responsible dog owners is unjust and unproductive. The GGNRA is smarter and more nimble than such an obtuse approach. Respectfully, Jeff Mitchell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3032    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 16:35:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am horrified by the GGNRA's plan to drastically reduce the number of places for walking dogs on and off leash within the GGNRA. While I am not a dog owner, this plan is destructive to the quality of life in the Bay Area and its citizens ability to enjoy outdoor recreational opportunities in open space.

Please make it a priority to do everything you can to stop the Golden Gate National Recreation Area from implementing its new plan to cut by 90% the area in which people can walk with dogs in the GGNRA. This will have an immediate huge negative for Bay Area citizens.

Despite the fact that the GGNRA's original plan received an overwhelmingly negative response from citizens, with thousands sending comments against, the GGNRA made no significant changes and unilaterally decided to implement an extremely unpopular, destructive plan despite this overwhelming opposition. The GGNRA's mission after all is as a National Recreation Area after all, not a National Park and there's no tenable reason that citizens should be so radically restricted from the enjoyment of their right to walk their dogs in the vast 80,000 acres of the GGNRA.

Thank you,

Kathleen Dolan Davies

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3033    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 16:37:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please please please add don't take away space for dogs and their people! Please dedicate as much space as possible to the kajillions of us who consider our pets part of our families!

One of the very things that makes the Bay Area so special is its dog friendliness and outdoorsy culture where many people co-exist beautifully. Dogs need people and people need dogs. For both to be happy, dogs need to run and be free to play! Watching this in my everyday life brings joy to me and my hundreds of dog friends community I've built through the years. No one gets out anymore or knows their neighbors. Having a dog changed all that for me and the countless people I meet who I wouldn't have crossed paths with had I not had a dog in the many many parks we use regularly.

Thank you for listening. Dogs make our world a better place. Period.

Annie Sammis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3034    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Interdisciplinary Council on Developmental and Learning Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 16:40:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Joseph Don Cohon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3035    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 16:52:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3036    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 17:00:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,  
I am a resident of Muir beach and regularly take my dog to Muir beach for both my dog's and my own

---

enjoyment, recreation and relaxation.

I strongly oppose Alternative F- the GGNRA plan restricting off leash dog access.

As you know dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the GGNRA. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

To claim there are off-leash opportunities at Little Beach is a ridiculous and arbitrary solution. This is not a viable option given the VERY small size of Little beach and it is neither state or federal property. We are curious why this is still in print in the SEIS.

Furthermore the NPS/GGNRA has not conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and those comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Lastly, I just learned this afternoon that the (Kate)Sears Resolution- opposing the GGNRA's Dog Management Plan -was unanimously adopted by the Marin County Board of Supervisors today. These votes demonstrate how united and strong we are on our resistance to accepting this plan.

Sincerely,  
Corinne Valentine

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3037	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Stinson Beach, CA 94970 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 17:04:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sarah Butler

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3038	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 17:15:01**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Please let us keep our parks dog friendly! Don't punish responsible dog owners.

Lauren

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3039 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 17:17:09**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I strongly oppose the new laws that will take away our off-leash areas. I have lived in San Francisco for over 20 years now and enjoy all that the Bay Area has to offer. However, I grew up on a ranch, surrounded by animals and have unfortunately had to let this part of my life go because the big city of SF isn't exactly animal friendly. First the horses were taken out of Golden Gate Park, and now we are in danger of losing the freedom of playing with and exercising our dogs off leash.

Off leash dog sites such as Fort Funston and Chrissy Fields keep BOTH dogs and humans healthy and happy. There has to be a better way.

Taking away these areas or putting in place more restrictive leash laws does not in any way improve our great city, it only detracts.

Please reconsider.

M. Stewart and Sister Sadie Valentine (dog)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3040 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 17:18:33**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.



The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Alex Chrisman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3041    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 17:26:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We love taking our dogs to places all across the GGNRA. Our dogs go everyday to Fort Funston, and it is hard to find many other places for dogs to get outside and run around San Francisco. We frequently also take out dogs to the Marin Headlands, Crissy Field, Presidio, and the southern parts of GGNRA (near Pacifica- -Rancho Corral de Tierra, Milagra Ridge, etc.) and would really be devastated if we couldn't do this anymore.

I think the distinction between National Parks and Recreation Areas is a key issue here. These are lands set aside for recreation, not for environmental protection. Other NRAs include other, non-natural places, such as bodies of water created by damming rivers, etc. Much of the areas in question are in largely urban areas (e.g., Fort Funston, Crissy Field), and are far from being untouched, natural places (e.g., Fort Funston is blemished more by decaying military installations and waste water discharge outlets than by dog walking).

Please, do not do anything to reduce dog walking in GGNRA- -the people of the Bay Area need place like these!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3042    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I moved to my home on Via Recodo in part because the Miwok trail was right nearby and I have 2 dogs. I have no yard and if I knew there was even a possibility that dogs would be banned on the trail in my backyard, I would not have moved here. I take my dogs on Miwok every single day, always on leash. I have no problem with the leash requirement on that trail but to ban dogs altogether?? That's absurd!

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you.  
James

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3043	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 17:29:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

As a city of many dog owners, one of the major factors that contributes to the health of the individuals who live here is dog ownership. And one of the driving factors behind dog ownership is the ability to easily and enjoyably exercise our canine companions. And the wonderful areas of the GGNRA are prime areas to exercise with our canine companions. Having dogs off leash does not restrict any others from using the park (I often see runners, families with kids, and various other individuals) who do not have dogs using the parks right along with those who do. So restricting the space in which an individual can have their dog off leash helps few, but hurts the many of us who need these open spaces to provide the exercise our canines need.

Sincerely,  
Joel Philpot

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3044	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 17:31:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3045	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pleasant Hill, CA 94523 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 17:42:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who has enjoyed taking my dogs for great exercise runs in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Erika Maurer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3046	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Anselmo, CA 94960 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 17:47:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am writing to you to keep and maintain off-leash dog areas. I am a tax payer, a voter and a responsible dog owner. I have enjoyed GGNRA with my dog for years and I have witnessed other dog owners doing the same. Dogs, like people, need to feel and experience the beauty and the freedom of nature. There is nothing like a dog running on a beach or the happiness of a dog picking up smells along their walk. I feel as though it makes for a better, balanced and happier dog overall, just as it does for people. I also believe that a happy dog is a less threatening or anxious dog. How would we, as people, like to put on leash all our lives? Dog parks are not a solution but tend to be a bigger problem.

---

I am a tax payer and have chosen not to have children. I have helped fund playgrounds, schools and other activities for children throughout my life because it is a right for those children to have better lives. I feel the same about my friend (my dog). She is my friend, child and companion and I strongly believe that it is her right as well as mine to provide her with the best life possible - which includes enjoying nature and hiking with me without a leash.

I strongly encourage you to maintain the current leash laws and NOT put any more restrictions on the current laws.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3047	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 17:50:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose Alternative F.				

I favor Alternative A.

I am a dog owner who is sensitive to wildlife issues and very much appreciates access to the GGNRA.

Further restriction my responsible use of the GGNRA will not further your goals which, I would like to point out, should be OUR goals. It appears that your document was drafted by those who think that they their judgement should trump that of those whom they supposedly serve. I sincerely hope that this is not the case and that you will review all comments with open minds.

The issues that you are trying to address have little to do with dogs. This is an expanding urban area and the local park system is going to be used much more heavily than a wilderness park. A long-time resident, I have come to accept this. If you are unable to come to terms with this, you are in for a lifetime of Sisyphean disappointment.

The approach of singling out a minority (dog owners) to find a politically viable way of decreasing park use appears cynical and unfair, and runs counter to the spirit of the original park charter.

Alternative F is wrongheaded. It would make a few people happy and a lot of people upset. Please revise your thinking.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3048	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 17:58:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This proposed ban on off-leash recreation is completely out of touch with the needs of the bay area community. I urge you to reconsider.				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3049    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 17:59:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very disappointed in learning about proposed restrictions and outright prohibitions against dogs in the GGNRA areas in Marin County. As a long-time resident and responsible dog owner, hiking the open space and GGNRA trail system with our family is an every day joy made even more complete with our lifelong companion - our dog Cody. However, further limiting the participation of our family dog is completely wrong. There is already such a small percentage of our trails and beaches currently available to dog owners, so why such draconian measures to further restrict areas when a pet policy had previously been approved and enacted. We support support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3050    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 18:06:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This plan as it stands is outrageous. The GGNRA is set in an URBAN area, this isnt Yosemite. We simply MUST have SOME space for offleash dog walking in San Mateo/Pacifca area. Currently and under your current plans there will still be NO offleash areas and this is preposterous.

Dogs are an integral part of my life and I wouldnt get any exercise if it wasnt for my dog. They (he) is literally a life saver and has helped me through many difficult circumstances including the death of both my parents and my best friend over the last 5 years.

PLEASE do not be so selfish. Open up SOME space for offleash walking in San Mateo.

Thank you.

Andrew Narraway

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3051    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 18:11:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't own a dog but I know a lot of people do and that dogs can be family to many people. Lots of families enjoy taking dogs out for walks and if off-leash gets banned then most dogs would probably be depressed having to stay inside most or all the time. Most dogs wouldn't even be able to have fun while playing fetch or running around with owners and it would be heartbreaking since dogs wouldn't be able to get the exercise it would get running around without a leash. Dogs don't have voices

like we do so they cant speak up for themselves but i think that they would be very frustrated if they can't run around or play anymore so please do not ban off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3052    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 18:12:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a Mill Valley resident and property owner and I oppose the "dog management plan" (which is actually a "dog ban" plan). My use of the public trails in my neighborhood will be significantly impaired if I cannot walk my nine(9) pound poodle on these trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3053    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94063  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 18:18:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please save the off leash dog parks of the Bay Area. We enjoy going off leash in our Great State please keep them open and off leash.  
Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3054    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland , CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 18:19:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't reduce the amount of space that our dogs have to play in! My dog gets much better exercise and socialization when she is off-leash, and it is delightful to watch dogs playing together. It is a shame that we are eliminating dog access in our parks. Please don't reduce my dog's access to off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3055    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying nature with my dog.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ron deBruin

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3056	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Los Gatos, CA 95030 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 18:20:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep off leash areas open for dogs to roam and play. Dogs need to socialize to be good citizen canines. Off leash socialization for dogs has been proven to benefit the animal and society. Thank you				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3057	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 18:21:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs have taken over baker beach. Dog walkers bring 5 to 10 dogs at a time.leaving feces. Dogs are out of control and barking. Dog owners are a minority taking over beaches that should be for people and birds. Do not listen to these whiny dog owners who think they have more rights than children, because they are more vocal.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3058	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Redwood City, CA 94063 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 18:23:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We have been coming up to Fort Funston and Crissy Field with our dogs for more than 10 years. We drive up from Redwood City specifically for these places. The views are spectacular. We have been bringing our children and our dog and creating precious family memories. Dogs need space to run and there are very few places on the Peninsula that can accommodate the rambunctiousness of an Australian Sheppard. It would be a shame to see another great place for dogs taken away.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3059	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I hike with my dog off-leash 3 to 4 times a week. It is necessary to keep me healthy in body and spirit. We are regulars at the Marin Headlands, Fort Funston, Sweeney Ridge, McNee Ranch, and on. This is one of the main reasons my husband and I live here: open space we can freely enjoy with our dog. It is also the reason we have supported the parks with donations. Until the GGNRA dog plans ...

The GGNRA should enhance our park experience, not destroy it. Legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space." The current proposal would end a time-honored tradition. On the trails, the majority of my fellow hikers have dogs with them.

There is no justification for new dog restrictions. The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impact.

\* I oppose the restrictiveness of the Preferred Alternative. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy plus off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3060 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 18:39:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Over 50% o San Francisco households have dogs as pets. To be healthy, dogs need to be able to exercise freely in open space. The need to be able to run, which requires off leash space. This is a quality of life issue for the dogs, but also for human SF residents who own dogs. Off leash park areas are a necessity for the GGNRA.

Thank You,

Cassandra Fritzen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3061 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 18:44:22

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not close any more areas to dogs on or off leashes. Dogs are my best friend and that for many other taxpayers. we are paying for the right to enjoy our communities.

I will personally contribute money to change the politics in Marin if you vote to ban more areas from dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3062 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 18:48:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** All you are doing is contributing to making it even harder to have a dog. Result is overcrowded shelters because people cant be bothered. And sadly the dogs are the ones that ultimately pay the price. How about providing education for dog owners? I do not understand why you want to make it harder for pet owners. Leave us access to parks and beaches for our doggies, they have a right to be here as much as YOU do and enjoy these facilities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3063 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

It's shocking and deplorable to me to think that the GGNRA would submit to fear-based thinking in regards to the pet policy in public lands. This repressive approach to conflict has led our country into dark periods in so very many areas, and it's shameful and dismaying to think that the Bay Area of all places - would fall in step with these repressive tendencies.

In a free society, its our individual responsibility to manage ourselves, our pets, our bicycles, our cars, our environment. It's not the role of government to attempt to rectify or assuage individual fears through restricting the movements and actions of others. This is a democracy. We already have systems in place to resolve issues of true violation - the courts. It's time we stop regulating and start trusting those systems to deliver results when justice is warranted.

I'm also alarmed by the lack of compromise and any awareness of the nuanced situation the GGNRA is attempting to mitigate with this proposed policy change. How about requiring a pet permit, or requiring walkers with over 5 animals to register with the GGNRA? Something like this could assist any incident resolution by creating a strategy for followup. Your lack of attention to the actual issues has led to broad brush blame that is unjust and unwise. And if you stop to think for just a moment, you'll realize that you're simply going to push all the dog owners to walk their pets in more public areas, increasing those touch points between pets, pet owners and the very people who are complaining about dogs in the first place. A policy like the one proposed will only further stress situations involving irresponsible owners and their poorly trained pets.

You know it's funny - I actually truly fear bicycle riders more than I fear dogs, even those owned by inattentive owners. I nearly get beamed by people breaking traffic laws on their bicycles on a weekly basis. How about a complete ban on bikes? That sounds hugely reasonable to me, based on your line of thinking. Is it really so different from your attempts to regulate this public land? Hardly.

There's no polite way to address your efforts because you have shown less than no sign of compatibility.

---

The Save Off Leash people have found a way to be more cordial, and I have included that letter below.

- - - - -

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Melissa Mecca

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3064	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 19:17:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not ban off leash in Fort Funston & Ocean beach! We dog owners need a place to run our dogs. SF dog owners are very good about cleaning up and caring for the areas.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3065	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San. Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 19:17:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As most of in San Francisco have a very limited amount of outdoor space, it is essential that we have space to exercise our pets in safe, designated areas. There are many areas where citizens can go to utilize the park areas, and reducing the space available for pet use would push pets into the urban areas, causing unnecessary traffic for citizens. Please keep the space as it is currently allocated!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3066	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 19:27:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a city full of dogs and small apartments, these outdoor areas as key. I strongly support alternatives to closing the areas for off-leash dogs as it's vital asset to both the dogs and human owners quality of life.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3067	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 19:29:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have 2 dogs rescued from San Francisco shelters (used to have 3), and 2 children ages 3 and 5. We own our home in San Francisco. We walk the dogs at Pine Lake, Fort Funston, Golden Gate Park, Golden Gate Heights park and other areas in San Francisco. We depend on large off-leash areas to exercise our dogs. Between my wife and I, we spend at least 2 hours each day walking our dogs. Dog walking is essential to our quality of life in San Francisco. We both moved to San Francisco in 1992 and have lived here continuously except for 2 years when we lived in Petaluma. The single most important reason for our return to San Francisco from Petaluma was the lack of off-leash dog walking areas in Petaluma and the availability of off-leash dog walking areas in San Francisco. In fact, while we lived in Petaluma, we would drive to San Francisco at least twice a week to walk the dogs at Fort Funston or other off-leash areas in San Francisco because there was no place to do this in Sonoma or Marin. San Francisco is a unique place for walking dogs. We appreciate this and do our best to be good dog owners. But, if extensive off-leash areas are not available to us, we must again consider leaving the city. We are raising a family, owning property, working and paying taxes in San Francisco as well as rescuing dogs from our overcrowded shelters. The Draft Dog Management Plan excessively restricts off-leash areas in San Francisco and would seriously reduce our quality of life in San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3068    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, I have lived in Tinuron for 20 years, and now live in Mill Valley after stints in San Francisco and the East Coast. A significant factor as to why Marin is the wonderful place that it is, the real estate prices are as high as they are, and why the community is such a supportive and open-minded one is because of our access and enjoyment to open space, including the GGNRA. And while it may sound ridiculous, enjoying GGNRA with dogs brings people together and plays a major role in bringing joy to the lives of Marin residents, and tourists (Bay Area and beyond). This includes me and my family.

We enjoy Muir Beach with our dog Walt regularly, and we consider ourselves very respectful dog owners, doing our best to keep Walt from disturbing other human and animals' experience at the beach. We never see dog excrete by other dog owners, and are diligent in our own cleanup efforts.

I am also an avid birder, and take my binoculars and field guide into the park regularly. I understand that some of my fellow birders and conservationists are taking an over-zealous approach to policy advocacy in an already heavily regulated park. As a dog lover and someone with a deep respect for birds and their habitats, I believe the proposal for Alternative F is well beyond the bounds of reasonable policy.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3069	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 19:32:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please let my pup, August Blue Moon and his friends continue to enjoy our communal areas.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3070	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 19:33:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is extremely restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Mark Wright (Private Citizen)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3071	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 19:35:17**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a longtime Bay Area resident and dog owner, I strongly oppose the proposed GGNRA Dog Management Plan. As it currently stands, less than 1% of the trails and beaches in the GGNRA are dog-friendly. Thus, anyone wanting a dog-free experience has 99% of the 80,000 acres to use without needing to share with dogs or their owners. In such a densely populated area, it's irresponsible to place further constraints on an already restrictive system.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3072 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 19:35:37**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Good afternoon,

I am taking a few moments to voice my concern over the impending Dog Management plan and the subsequent changes that it will bring to our great city. As the owner of a dog who requires extensive amounts of exercise, but yet is well trained and obedient, I find the potentially limiting leash laws to be not only inconvenient, but also concerning for my pet's health. I simply cannot run long or fast enough to properly exercise my dog, and stricter leash laws will lead to frustration for both my canine and myself. We currently enjoy off-leash exercise on a daily basis, and have never had any issues with behavior towards other dogs, children, or adults. So much of our city's culture revolves around "park life," and these new laws will perpetuate the current trend that families are not welcome, and only single, wealthy individuals should live here. I am all for responsible pet ownership (dogs should always be under voice control and be leashed in areas of heavy traffic) and there are surely different steps that can be taken to appease all parties involved in this argument.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Alison Biggs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3073 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Hildred

San Francisco resident, tax payer and dog owner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3074    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Additionally, in the SEIS the GGNRA asserts they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" as utilized in its enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI and the GGNRA's first Superintendent, the Honorable William J. Whalen, in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA. These promises, along with the conventional definition of the term "recreation", do not comport with GGNRA's current philosophy exemplified by Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management and Science for the GGNRA, who in 2007 was quoted as saying "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design.

Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it, e.g. the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management. Alternatively, for sites heavily utilized by dogs and their guardians, such as Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3075    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Dean,

My fiancee and I, and many of our friends, walk our dogs daily in the GGNRA, specifically Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Lands End, Baker Beach. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I literally spend at least 12 hours each week in these areas with my dog, and I have never had any complaints or problems, and in fact have only had wonderful experiences and complements. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy.

Judging by the preferences expressed in the GGNRA's preferred alternative, the GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am a member of the Sierra Club and a homeowner and tax payer near Ocean Beach in San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
David Scheer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3076    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 19:49:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've been a National Park Season Pass purchaser for most of my life. I generally support the efforts and ideals of the National Park Service toward congestion reduction, protection of our natural resources, etc. I had heard there was contention regarding allowing dogs on Crissy Field and other GGNRA beaches and areas, but not until I recently heard a radio add supported by UNANIMOUS vote of the San Francisco Supervisors did I know of the plans to BAN dogs from National Recreation Areas.

Crissy Field is HEAVEN for my 2 chihuahua mixes, all dogs, and dog owners, and local families. I have

---

never seen a place where they are so happy, and all the dogs get along whether on or off leash even. I've also never witnessed anyone having a problem with any dogs there.

The US Park Service should NOT attempt to make this and other National Recreation Areas off limits or restrictive to dogs. I can understand leash laws where dogs can represent a hazard to pedestrians, cyclists, or traffic... I can also understand citations for failing to clean up after one's dog... but not outright BANNING of dogs! The concept is outrageous and un-American. Having a dog is part of the American family unit and American dream, and makes me wonder what the Park service might consider next... Shooting offending dogs such as the Russians do in Sochi??

Please do the right thing and allow dogs in the GGNRA, apply leash laws where appropriate, and help keep this AMERICA, THE LAND OF THE FREE.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3077	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 20:07:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please,				

Do not make these changes. Keep allowing dogs on the beaches and other areas you propose to disallow.

Open space areas such as beaches should be for all, including dog owners and their dogs.

Thanks!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3078	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94601 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 20:07:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am deeply concerned about an impending policy change in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The proposed reduced off-leash areas in the GGNRA, located in this heavily urban area is of great concern for me and other dog owners I know. Dogs, especially urban dogs, need these areas for exercise and recreation. These areas are vital to dogs that tend to live in small areas with small or worse, no yards. Pet owners who do not have yards, which is commonplace in cities like San Francisco, rely on these areas to exercise their pets. Without them, we have a serious quality of life issue for the humans and dogs in this equation. I believe that open, off-leash areas such as Golden Gate National Recreation Area allow people to feel that they can give a pet a good life, even in the city, because in spite of not having a yard, they can make it a point to take their dogs to places like the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. To ban these off-leash areas may cause would-be pet owners to feel that they have no place to take their pets for exercise and recreation, and thus make it harder to be a pet owner. Not to extrapolate too much, but our pet adoption rates are so poor as it is.				

Please (please, please) do not let the off-leash areas in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area be closed. It is so critical to dog owners and dogs alike. Our pets need them, badly. And so do we.



**Correspondence ID:** 3079    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pleasanton, CA 94588  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 20:16:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't change the dog leash laws at Crissy Field. When we had a dog it was the highlight of his time when we would go there. He'd get excited when we were crossing the bridge! She's been gone for a few years now, but we still love to go to Crissy field and watch the dogs play and watch the ocean and water activities. Watching the dogs play enhances the area unbelievably! My daughter lives in San Francisco and one of her favorite things to do is to go by Crissy Field and watch the dogs and play with some of them. The dogs are all having a great time and not causing any problem every time we're there. They're very good for the area and are not a detriment at all. It's much more fun to visit there when there's a good amount of dogs there playing together and chasing sticks or balls - even way out into the water.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3080    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 20:17:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've been a National Park Season Pass purchaser for most of my life. I generally support the efforts and ideals of the National Park Service toward congestion reduction, protection of our natural resources, etc. I had heard there was contention regarding allowing dogs on Crissy Field and other GGNRA beaches and areas, but not until I recently heard a radio add supported by UNANIMOUS vote of the San Francisco Supervisors did I know of the plans to BAN dogs from National Recreation Areas.

Crissy Field is HEAVEN for my 2 chihuahua mixes, all dogs, and dog owners, and local families. I have never seen a place where they are so happy, and all the dogs get along whether on or off leash even. I've also never witnessed anyone having a problem with any dogs there.

The US Park Service should NOT attempt to make this and other National Recreation Areas off limits or restrictive to dogs. I can understand leash laws where dogs can represent a hazard to pedestrians, cyclists, or traffic... I can also understand citations for failing to clean up after one's dog... but not outright BANNING of dogs! The concept is outrageous and un-American. Having a dog is part of the American family unit and American dream, and makes me wonder what the Park service might consider next... Shooting offending dogs such as the Russians do in Sochi??

Please do the right thing and allow dogs in the GGNRA, apply leash laws where appropriate, and help keep this AMERICA, THE LAND OF THE FREE.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3081    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francico, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 20:25:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I realize you're in a tough spot, but I still don't understand why any off leash dog use is being allowed. I know it will be a fight, but fighting for the right thing is part of a Park Ranger's job.

400 other National Park Service sites don't allow any off leash dogs... what's the point of being part of the NPS if you're going all out on your own? People in this area have so many city, state, and county parks where they can walk their dogs. Other people have no such luck, but people here just take those benefits for granted.

Off leash dog walking does not benefit the park. It might not harm it, but there is no benefit to the park at all. Off leash dog walking rarely benefits visitors other than possibly the dog's owner. It certainly doesn't benefit children or people who are scared of dogs.

Off leash dog walking really only benefits the dog, and no part of NPS regulations list that as a priority. Please place all visitors ahead of a few dogs and allow no off leash dog walking on NPS property.

Thank you and good luck.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3082	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Anselmo, CA 94960 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 20:34:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I moved to Marin recently and am surprised to find so few options for walking dogs in parks or off leash.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3083	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94709 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 20:47:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Natasha Fallahi

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3084	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94709 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 20:50:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Titus Chiu

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3085	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94611 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my family and our dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and will prevent us from enjoying the parks as we have for many years.

I am deeply concerned that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the substantive concerns and reasonable objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has long provided a unique and diverse recreation area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ana A.  
Oakland resident

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3086	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 21:28:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My wife and I would not live in the city if we didn't have access to parks and trails for our dog. We chose our location because of its proximity to Crissy Field and Baker Beach and the off leash privileges that we enjoy with our dog. We believe that this is a city occupied by responsible dog owners who respect the rules and respect the rights of non dog owners so that we can coexist in harmony. Please do not force us into small neighborhood parks where overcrowding will be a real issue. Thank you				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3087	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Ross, CA 94957 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 21:28:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local

residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you,

Lee Notowich

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3088	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 21:29:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Brenda Yost

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3089	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117-4013 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 21:36:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3090	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 21:39:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	San Francisco needs more space for dogs.				

Please, you must continue to allow dogs on Ocean Beach and at Fort Funston.

If you take these areas away from dog owners, so many problems will turn up...the parks will be over-crowded...there will, as a result, be more incidents involving dogs and people...dogs and dogs, etc.

I don't own a dog, but I do not want to have to deal with these new issues of over-crowding.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3091	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 21:57:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Theresa Kim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3092    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan and to ask you to reconsider this plan. Walking/running/playing with my dog Kona along our beautiful waterfront with my wife is easily the best part of my day. Our dog is part of our family and she is as happy as ever when she is running around and playing at the beach. The draft plan is way too restrictive and will prevent these family walks/runs from occurring, which will have a direct negative impact on my health, my dog's health and these family moments that we cherish so much. I urge you to let us and the other numerous friends and residents we have met over the years that enjoy these same type of moments in our beautiful city. This is the last real off leash area left in SF and it would be a shame to see it go away for no good reason.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please let me know if I can answer any further questions. Please continue to keep the GGNRA as a place that everyone can enjoy!

Thanks,  
JR

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3093    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 22:25:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is

---

way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Linda Garber

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3094	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 22:31:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a San Francisco resident and one who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my sincere opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It would prevent me from our favorite past time- strolling together in open space for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Allison Lasser

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3095	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 22:33:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** To Who It may concern,

I am a registered voter in San Francisco and a resident of 20 years. I am pro OFF-LEASH dogs in the GGNRA. I pay my taxes and I have a respect for the parks and the wildlife that inhabits there. I am voicing my opinion that I support off leash dog walking!

Thank you,  
Yvonne Soria

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3096	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 22:43:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lori Kaiser

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3097	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 22:48:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Off leash dog walking has become more and more restrictive each year. Owners should be allowed areas to exercise their animals without tethers. Dogs become less aggressive when they are off leash since they do not feel restricted or constrained. The fenced dog run areas are over crowded and too small for multiple animals to fetch effectively with their owners and taking a nun fettered walk is out of the question.  
Please do not eliminate areas where dogs and their owners can walk freely.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3098	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 22:49:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow access for dogs off leash in GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3099    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Vly, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 22:58:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This proposal is the most heavy handed, misguided, over reactive piece of legislature the GGNRA could have possibly created. As a dog owner (and a dog walker) I grew up in what is now the GGNRA. I watched it unfold and still refer to the lower fire road by Miwok Stables as the Marincello Rd. To restrict dog walking i.e off leash, in such a broad stroke, will only cause more crowding and have a negative effect on the livelihood of commercial dog walkers. Personally, I feel the amount of dogs a dog walker is allowed at one time, should be reduced to no more than 4. I typically do no more than three. As it is now, areas I frequented in the past, are now being used more and more. And Im rarely on MCOSD or park land! It is imperative that this legislation be completely re-evaluated.

Thank you, Ellen Garvie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3100    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 23:12:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed ban on dogs at Ocean Beach between Stairwell 21 and Sloat Blvd is inappropriate and unjustified. The NPS is proposing a complete ban on dogs without considering enforcing the current on-leash policy. In fact, the impacts analysis section of the document compares the impacts of the current on-leash policy with little-to-no enforcement to the preferred alternative of a dog ban with enforcement. To truly compare the impacts of an on-leash policy at Ocean Beach versus a ban on dogs, the NPS would need to compare both scenarios with similar levels of enforcement.

The primary reasoning for banning dogs at Ocean Beach as described in the Draft Dog Management Plan Supplemental EIS is based on protection of the Western Snowy Plover. There is evidence in the scientific literature that off-leash dogs can have negative impacts on breeding and overwintering Western Snowy Plovers in other locations. However, nowhere in the SEIS is evidence provided that leashed dogs impact the Western Snowy Plover. Throughout the SEIS, the NPS cites a 2001 article by Lafferty to infer that on-leash dogs disturb plovers. The data in this article includes only two events of leashed dogs disturbing shorebirds and there is no evidence that these birds were plovers. This article actually states, "Leashing reduces both the probability that a dog disturbed birds and numbers of birds per disturbance." To use this as evidence that plover disturbance by leashed dogs is a problem is disingenuous.

The SEIS states that banning dogs at Ocean Beach will provide for "consistency with the Recovery Plan

---

for the Western Snowy Plover." In spite of this claim, nowhere in the Recovery Plan does the USFWS suggest banning dogs on beaches that provide overwintering habitat. In fact, the recovery plan recommends leash restrictions to protect plovers, which is exactly what is currently in place at Ocean Beach. The NPS would be consistent with the recovery plan simply by enforcing the leash regulations that are currently in place.

Enforcing current leash laws at Ocean Beach is a solution that would both protect Western Snowy Plovers and provide for recreational uses of the beach by dog owners. It is clear from the evidence provided in this SEIS that increased enforcement leads to increased compliance. Ocean Beach is an urban beach that is heavily used by park neighbors and locals. The impact of losing the ability to walk a leashed dog on the beach or to sit on the beach with a leashed dog is a significant impact to the entire community. There is no justification for banning dogs on Ocean Beach when enforcing current leash regulations would result in the same level of protection for Western Snowy Plovers.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3101	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Santa Cruz, CA 95060 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3102	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 23:23:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3103    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 23:29:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a 2nd gen Franciscan and I love this city but you can't kick out all my family & friends along with all my furry family & friends!  
They don't have any money, only poop! So don't make them suffer for our dumb neighbors bad attitudes!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3104    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94502  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Dee Wallis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3105    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 23:41:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My partner and I are seniors and have enjoyed hiking on the many trails of Marin County over the years. In 2011, we adopted 2-yr old Maya, a German-wirehaired pointer/black lab mix, at an animal shelter. She has brought much joy to our lives and is so appreciative of all we do for her. I

---

research where we can take Maya along for our hikes and it is very challenging to find trails allowing for dogs. We agree dog owners must be responsible and attentive to their pet while enjoying the natural environment. Bringing along leash, poop bags and water with container for the dog as well as our gear is a must. It is always helpful when we find receptacles along the way to dispose of the poop bags. The greatest joy for the 3 of us is when we are allowed to let Maya off leash to run freely but always under voice control. We are willing to follow guidelines and restrictions that park services mandate in order to have the right and privilege to use the parklands for our recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3106    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Ocean Beach Dog Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
To: Superintendent of the GGNRA Frank Dean February 11, 2014

From: Ocean Beach Dog Member Thomas Roop

Subject:2014 SEIS Dog Management Plan

I oppose the SEIS preferred Dog Management Plan because there is no Site Specific Scientific Peer Review that by law is the first thing that must be done!

\*\*\*\*\*

On December 16, 2004, Joshua Bolten, Director of the Executive Office of the President of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in Washington, D.C., published and circulated a "Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies" about the issuance of the OMB's "Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review".

This bulletin was subsequently published in the Federal Register (2664 Federal Register / Vol. 70, No. 10 / Friday, January 14, 2005 / Notices; see <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/70fr2664.pdf>)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

<http://www.nps.gov/policy/peerreview.htm> I Oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive.

There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes.I Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

I Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

I Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

What I am for is the clearing of sand on the Sunset Trail and repair the road and make The Sunset Trail and other roads ABA Compliant for wheel chair access.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3107 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:49:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I oppose GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan because it is just too restrictive. GGNRA is happily used by people and dogs, daily and in many, many areas. Creating fenced areas will hinder wildlife and create problems in many lovely, half wild areas.

Why didnt SEIS list the many comments from regular citizens who walk there? Why did they use other dog parks to create EV reports?

I walk several places in the GGNRA, and have for years, with my dog & kids, and have never had a negative encounter with any people, with or without dogs. People, dogs and recreation are all peacefully co-existing. It is a beautiful thing and that the SEIS report didnt tell that story is ABSURD!

Years ago, before people walked their dogs regularly at Fort Funston, the area was populated by hoodlums & drug dealers. People were afraid to use that park. Now it is used, as recreation, for thousands of people. That makes life less safe for park service people

You see these areas, you know how impossible this will be to enforce. Dont pass a law you can not enforce and people will hate. You will be seriously, seriously mocked.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3108    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** SaveOffLeash.com Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 01:06:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed Complianced-based Management Policy is completely absurd. Why should 75% cmpliance be the threshold? Why should GGNRA have sole evaluation on compliance? Where re the checks and balances? And why should any change be permanent? Where is reciprocity? Is GGRNA willing to have an equivalent clause that states if compliance is > 75% ten area management would be changed to the next LEAST restrictive level (with levels add to include complete non-restriction)? HOW CAN ANYONE READ THIS AND a) THINK THIS PLAN IS FAIR AND BALANCED? and b) NOT REALIZE THE GGNRA'S CLEAR PERMANENT BIAS AGAINST DOGS AND RECREATION?

"If compliance falls below 75 percent (measured as the Executive Summary xiv Golden Gate National Recreation Area percentage of total dogs / dog walkers observed during the previous 12 months not in compliance with the regulations) the areas management would be changed to the next more restrictive level of dog management. In this case, ROLAs would be changed to on-leash dog walking areas and on-leash dog walking areas would be changed to no dog walking areas. This change would be permanent. Impacts from noncompliance could reach short-term minor to major adverse, but the compliance-based management strategy is designed to return impacts to a level that assumes compliance, as described in the overall impacts analysis, or provide beneficial impacts where dog walking is reduced or eliminated."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3109    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 02:37:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Dimitry Kushelevsky

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3110    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 04:05:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is a travesty. Our dogs deserve better. We deserve better than this. Professional dog walkers have been forced to spend thousands taking courses, extra equipment, getting their cars and businesses up to code. We have gotten licensed, permitted, bonded and insured, we pay business taxes, and been following all the stipulations put upon us, yet this is how we are treated???

We give up at least one weekend a month to go clean up your sites, take extra courses on how to improve canine and human behavior, and here is our reward: get out, you're not welcomed here. Take your dogs, leash them up, and leave.

Look, I'd understand if you'd want to levy fines, police more closely, ban the bad apples, but all of us?? and where are we supposed to go now?? We've put all our sweat and tears into this land, we love it as much as you do, there is no where else to go.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3111    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---



**Received:** Feb,12,2014 05:53:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My wife and I have two dogs, and love to take them on long walks with them off leash. It's great recreation, and freedom, for both us and for our dogs. Over the years we have watched as one place after another becomes restricted to having dogs on leash. Why, we don't know. Is there a large group of people out there that don't like dogs? Or that just want all the recreation area restricted for what they want? There needs to be some balance - some places where people can go and not be bothered by dogs off leash, but also some places where people with dogs can go and let their dogs run free. We have been going to Fort Funston for years. It is the only place left at which we can take our dogs and go for a walk with them off leash. It's freedom. And isn't that what America is about - freedom? If that's the case, then shouldn't our government be working to preserve freedom, rather than take it away? If there were other places people could go to take their dogs for long walks off leash then restricting Fort Funston would perhaps be defensible. But to take away the last place for people in San Francisco to have this freedom lacks balance and just seems mean. Please leave Fort Funston open to dogs being off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3112    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito , CA 94966  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 06:06:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and the loop at Rodeo Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,  
Kathleen Deadder (& Miss Maeve the retriever)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3113    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 07:28:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** By banning dogs from 99% o GGNRA you are depriving dog owners from enjoying nature with their dogs. While I would love to see the Alta trail at the top of our street free of dog walkers -

---

who bring up to 10 dogs at a time off leash - I think penalizing the rest of us is a little harsh.

My husband volunteers at the Humane Society and his concern if these restrictions go into place, is that fewer dogs will be adopted and more dogs will be euthanized. As tax payers we strongly object to the stringent measures proposed. Why not make a limit on the number of dogs one can walk on the trails. I would certainly support that, so our trails are not littered with dog excrement by people who have too many dogs off leash that they are unable monitor them all.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3114	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94703 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 07:41:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lauren

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3115	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 08:01:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am hoping and praying that we keep the off leash areas available! It's such a great place to be able to take your family and for many of us that also means our four legged friends. I have lived in San Francisco my whole life and do to want to see these places get reduced!!!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3116	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** NA, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:  
Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3117 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3118 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112-4441  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:15:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because in this city there are more dogs per household then children. The governments job is to serve the people, how does this ridiculous plan serve the people?

--.--.--

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3119    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94121-1605  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:15:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it hurts the quality of life for many of San Francisco's residents. Our dogs are part of our daily lives. Not being able to take them to the beach for our daily beach walks or parks to enjoy picnics with our families is a travesty and an infringement upon our rights.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3120    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94123-4822  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:15:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...we have not been shown any real evidence that dogs are hurting the bird population. we also have not seen the results of who has opposed this measure. Fifty six percent of households have dogs and we.already have limited use of off leash land. please don't take the rest away for us to enjoy

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3121    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94111-1952  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:15:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will deprive my family, including my school-age son, of the ability to recreate with our family dog as we have for many years without harm to other people, animals, or the environment and deprive us of access to essential open space.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3122    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014-1258  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:15:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan please reconsider.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3123 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132-2348  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:15:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because dogs are like are babies, our children and they love the beach!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3124 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Palo Alto, CA 94304-2375  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwell.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3125 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94107-3416  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:15:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...  
please do not punish an entire group of people and dogs because of the bad behavior of some. the key is clear rules and education. enforcement and respect on all sides of the issue. i agree that there are irresponsible dog owners, just like there are irresponsible parents, and citizens. but to ban off leash across the board is just not right.

please, please please do not cower to the angry, vocal group.  
please, keep some off leash use of GGNRA areas.

sincerely,  
milli

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3126	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044-2003				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 08:15:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/11/14. The off leash areas around San Francisco are very valuable and widely used. Please do not shut them down!				

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3127	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Menlo Park, CA 94025				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 08:15:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRC is not Yosemite or Yellowstone. It is a recreation area within a highly populated urban area and enjoyed by residents of SF and others who live in the bay area and we want to enjoy our outside time with our dogs. I especially oppose proposed new restrictions on where I can take my dogs on leash, places where dogs are to be banned altogether.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3128	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117-2244				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 08:15:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/11/14. I strongly oppose the GGNRA draft dog management plan, restricting off leash dog walking in San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo, CA.				

I am a resident, rescue dog owner, of San Francisco and use these areas, specifically, Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field every weekend to spend quality time exercising both myself and my dog. Off leash dog play is crucial to my dog's health and socialization and walking freely in these areas allows me to enjoy them for exactly what they are intended for: recreation.

If this plan is accepted and enforced I will no longer use the the GGNRA for personal enjoyment - Restricting these areas would cause me to find new areas of off leash dog play, all of which will not be able to handle the overflow resulting from these restrictions.

In addition to opposing restricting these areas, I think it is confounded to propose fencing these areas - it will ruin the fluidity and beauty of the landscapes. It is also ridiculous that this management plan has been proposed without conducting appropriate studies substantiating the reasoning.

I support the GGNRA's management of the original 1979 dog management plan. San Francisco intended that these areas allow

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3129	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044-3516				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 08:15:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... people and their dogs need a safe place to exercise and socialize. Besides the obvious health benefits of outdoor exercise, these areas help bring people together, a chance to know their neighbors and feel connected to their community by sharing a simple and natural common interest. Please don't allow these resources to be further limited.				

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3130	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109-1933				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 08:15:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/11/14. The dog-friendly off-leash areas in and around San Francisco are very valuable and widely used. Please do not shut them down! I'm not even a dog owner and I enjoy going to these locations with friends and their dogs! It's crucial for my friends' health and the health of their animals to get this fresh air and exercise while living in such a dense urban environment. Please don't eliminate these parks - especially on such bogus claims.				

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3131	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94066 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan I love my dog and I vote. I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog				

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Sweeney Milagra Ridge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3132    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3133    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica , CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:19:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



Sincerely,

Danielle Starelli

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3134    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94965

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3135    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:22:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

John Hunsaker

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3136    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san mateo, CA 94402  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:27:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm very disappointed at our local parks and areas being so ignorant and limiting to our dogs. We must acknowledge that MANY households now have dogs and these animals need to be loose and interact with other dogs and run free once in a while. Limiting our parks and restricting the allowed hours to have the dogs loose and without leash will make very unhappy dogs and dog owners. I live in san mateo and in our beautiful park we have a wonderful field that can be used for dogs to run. The times that dogs are allowed to be off leash is from 6-8 am, when people are struggling to get themselves and family ready and out the door! The field sits empty and beautiful most of the time without any usage! PLEASE don't limit dog off leash places (even more than how terrible it is now) for dogsand seriously spend a little more time to accommodate the MANY tax payers that hope for more places to let their dogs loose for better mental and physical health!

MANY THANKS!  
niloo ehsani

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3137    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3138    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fremont, CA 94555  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Cindy Bronson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3139	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94103				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3140	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94114				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3141	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3142    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Granada , CA 94018-1862  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:55:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This goes too far. Dogs with owners in nature is part of the joy of living here.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3143    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 08:58:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Overview:  
I am submitting a comment to request reconsideration of the preferred option for dog management on the section of Ocean Beach between Stairwell 21 and Sloat Blvd (i.e., the Snowy Plover Protection Area (SPPA)). The SEIS lists the preferred option as, Alternative F: Preferred Alternative. Dog walking under voice and sight control would be allowed in an approximately 0.71 of a mile-long beach ROLA from Stairwell 21 to the northern end of the beach. Dogs would be prohibited south of Stairwell 21 to the Fort Funston boundary but would be allowed on leash on the approximately 2.84 mile Ocean Beach Trail east of the dunes adjacent to the Great Highway. I suggest an alternative option to allow on-leash dog walking year-round in this section with off-leash access north of Stairwell 21.

I live in the neighborhood and primarily access Ocean Beach at Noriega St. I have a family with small children. I do not own a dog but have fostered a dog. I have a PhD from UC Berkeley in Environmental Science, Policy, and Management and have a career as an environmental scientist. I am also an avid nature lover. Therefore, I am submitting my comments from the combined perspectives of an environmentalist, a local family, and someone who understands the needs of many dog owners in my

community.

I walk or jog on the beach multiple times per week between Stairwell 21 and Sloat Blvd. I also visit the beach regularly with my kids and have walked our foster dog there (on-leash) for the few months she was with us. Over the years that we have lived in the neighborhood, I have been to the beach hundreds of times - sometimes jogging, sometimes bird-watching, sometimes with a friend walking a dog, sometimes picnicking with my family. One thing that has become clear in all my visits is that the stretch of beach between Lincoln Ave. and Sloat Blvd. is an integral part of the Outer Sunset/Parkside community. While some people may want a policy that promotes their own use to the exclusion of others, I think it is critical to develop a policy that allows the mixed uses of those who live in the neighborhood - and this needs to include those who own dogs and need a place to walk them. My primary comment is that a year-round leash requirement in the SPPA with off-leash access north of Stairwell 21 would allow most of the uses of visitors and the community to compatibly occur, while protecting the snowy plover. Those that prefer an off-leash dog experience could walk, jog, or even drive (if needed) to the area north of Stairwell 21 to accommodate that need. Many people walk/jog the length of the beach to exercise themselves and their dogs - this is only possible if dogs are allowed south of Stairwell 21 (see below comment on why the Ocean Beach Trail is not an acceptable alternative). I recognize and respect that many visitors do not prefer to see dogs chasing wildlife nor be approached by unfamiliar dogs. In fact, this is my own preference. The section of the SEIS on Park Operations explains that a no-dog policy would be implemented as follows: Enforcing a no dogs regulation would require law enforcement documentation of violations in sites where dogs would be prohibited. Although visitors with dogs in prohibited areas would be clearly in violation of the regulation, staff would still be required to monitor the site and issue citations to noncompliant visitors. Violators would quickly learn the consequences of their actions and, over the long term, compliance would result in fewer infractions. Following the initial education and enforcement period, impacts to park operations would be long term, negligible to minor, and adverse. If the GGNRA is willing to enforce and educate a no-dog policy, why would it not be able to do the same for a leashed-dog policy? A leashed-dog policy with better compliance would respect the needs of those who do not want interference from dogs but would still allow those with dogs the needed access to the beach.

#### Alternative for Leashed Dog Walking on the Ocean Beach Trail:

The SEIS suggests that the impact on not being able to walk a dog on-leash on the beach is minimal because dog walking could be moved to the Ocean Beach Trail. Having walked a dog (and small children) on the Ocean Beach Trail, I would assert that it is not an acceptable alternative given the incompatible use by bicyclists who ride too quickly to make it safe to walk there with dogs or children. The path is only 8-10 feet wide (and narrower in spots with significant ice plant encroachment) and has no lines. It is common to have bicyclists come whizzing up from behind with no warning. I have myself nearly been hit multiple times while jogging on the path (note that I do not wear headphones). I don't have my children walk on the path and I have seen small dogs get yanked out of the way at the last minute due to speeding bicyclists. A path with only 4-5 feet of room in each direction and bicycles whizzing by is not an acceptable alternative to the option of on-leash walking on the beach. The SEIS mentions the area adjacent to the Ocean Beach Trail as useful to dog-walking. Clearly those who suggest this have never walked on the trail as it is almost exclusively ice plant and almost impossible to walk on. Relocating leashed dog-walking from SPPA to the Ocean Beach Trail is not a safe option, especially given the numbers of dogs that would then collectively be walked on the trail without separation of bicyclists from the dog-walking area.

#### Compliance:

The SEIS compared on-leash impact with non-compliance in the SPPA to no dogs assuming compliance; however, the SEIS did not provide any justification for the assumption that enforcement of a no-dog policy in the SPPA would have any better rate of compliance. The GGNRA would need to compare a no-dog policy with non-compliance to an on-leash dog policy with non-compliance in order to justify any

claim of a beneficial impact. If the GGNRA intends to enforce a no-dog policy in the SPPA then it would need to compare a no-dog policy with enforcement and compliance to an on-leash dog policy with enforcement and compliance.

#### Environmental Consequences for Special Status Species: Impact of Dogs on Snowy Plovers Specifically at Ocean Beach:

One of the primary reasons given in the SEIS for prohibiting dogs from the SPPA is the need to protect snowy plovers, which I support. The SEIS bases its recommendation on the 2007 Recovery Plan for Pacific Coast Population of the Western Snowy Plover which states, "Dogs on beaches can pose a serious threat to snowy plovers during both the breeding and nonbreeding seasons. Unleashed pets, primarily dogs, sometimes chase snowy plovers and destroy nests. Repeated disturbances by dogs can interrupt brooding, incubating, and foraging behavior of adult plovers and cause chicks to become separated from their parents (USFWS 2007a, 63)." The SEIS then uses studies (e.g., Lafferty, 2006 and 2007), which were conducted in Southern California, to assert that dog disturbance negatively impacts snowy plovers and cites a 1997 study at Ocean Beach of high numbers of dogs chasing snowy plovers. Based on these studies that are either not specific to the area in question or >15 years out of date, the SEIS states that off-leash dogs "can" chase plovers and "could" harm them in the SPPA but provides no factual information to support that this actually happens in the SPPA. While this assertion is theoretically true, the on-the-ground information collected by the GGNRA but not described in the SEIS does not support the rationale that dogs in the SPPA in recent years, leashed or not, have a negative impact on the snowy plovers at this particular beach. The information that I collected by reviewing papers and reports from the GGNRA contained the following information:

"According to the 1996 Plover Report, the annual median number of plovers between 1988 and 1996 at Ocean Beach was 28. Previous counts between 1979 and 1985 showed snowy plover counts at Ocean Beach of 2-14. The 2006 Snowy Plover Report shows an increase in snowy plovers in the SPPA after 2001 to a higher stable median number in the mid-thirties as of 2005 (Hatch 2006). The 2007 and 2008 addendums to this report do not report the median number of plovers but give the maximum number of 49 for the 2007 survey year (the average maximum for 2002-2005 was 48). Regardless of the various dog policies in the SPPA the number of snowy plovers has been stable, if not increasing, in recent years.

"The number of dogs, both leashed and unleashed, increased from 2000-2005 in the SPPA and yet the 2006 Snowy Plover Monitoring Brochure (see Figure 1 in the brochure) shows that snowy plover numbers increased during this time. The 2006 seasonal leash requirement decreased the number of off-leash dogs but the over-winter plover numbers did not increase.

"According to the 1996 Plover Report, the number of people on the beach only explained between 11 and 16% of the variability in plover numbers during the two study years. The number of dogs explained even less of the variability in plover numbers: "the number of dogs per hour on the beach explained only 10 and 12% of the variation in plover numbers for 1995-1996, respectively. Factors other than number of people and dogs, possibly beach slope and width, appear to exert greater influence over snowy plover numbers at Ocean Beach." This was found when the level of leash control was only 10%, according to the report.

"Lafferty (2001) found that plovers in southern California were intensely disturbed only slightly more by humans than by off-leash dogs (28% and 31%, respectively, of the plovers who were disturbed flew) while 61% of plovers disturbed by crows flew.

"Researchers like Lafferty have pointed out that plovers are closer to the dunes - this tends to not be where the dogs are. Wintering snowy plovers are less frequently disturbed than most other shorebirds because (1) snowy plovers are relatively hesitant to move or fly from a person or dog and (2) snowy plovers roost in the dry sand away from most foot traffic (Lafferty, 2001a and 2001b).

"The 1996 Plover Report found that most plovers roost near the promenade between Noriega and Rivera. This is not a popular dog area so there is natural separation. The 1996 Plover Report also stated that snowy plovers are not susceptible to the same degree of chasing as sanderlings and other shore birds.

"The SEIS provides older data from the 1997 report that had higher numbers of dogs chasing plovers but

did not present its more recent data from the 2006 Snowy Plover Report that does not show this to still be occurring very much, if at all. For example, dogs chased the plovers on 4 occasions in the 2005 study period. This is over an average survey year of 39 surveys and 59 survey hours (2007 Hatch Plover status report). The addendum to this report for 2007 (Hatch 2008) states that there were 30 surveys during this survey year with only 1 incident of a dog chasing a plover.

Since the GGNRA has information on dog and snowy plover patterns in the SPPA, the SEIS should present and address this information rather than relying on studies that are not as temporally or spatially relevant. Further, it seems there should be information more current than 2008 but this is not in the references nor mentioned in the text. In my opinion as a scientist, the information presented in the SEIS did not represent an objective review of the information that the GGNRA has available to it. My review of the information that is available from the GGNRA suggests that on- and off-leash dogs can and do disturb snowy plovers in other areas but this is generally not occurring in the SPPA at Ocean Beach. This appears to be the case regardless of whether the dogs are on- or off-leash, primarily due to the spatial separation of where dogs walk/run and where the snowy plovers roost. In the SPPA, data indicate that the level of disturbance by off-leash dogs is similar to that of disturbance by humans, suggesting that a dog ban is no more justifiable than a human ban (although a policy on the control of Corvids may be worth studying). The data also suggest that the numbers of snowy plovers that roost in the SPPA is not related to the dogs since the numbers of snowy plovers are unrelated to the changes in dog and leash policies in the SPPA over recent years. In general, GGNRA data for the SPPA part of Ocean Beach show that the snowy plover numbers are stable and unrelated to dogs (leashed or unleashed). Some researchers (e.g., Fahey and Woodhouse, 1995) have found that leashed dogs have less impact than unleashed dogs in other areas so a conservative approach to snowy plover protection could include a leash requirement, although local information does not suggest that this is actually necessary.

#### Environmental Consequences Other than Those for Snow Plovers:

I also reviewed the environmental consequences listed in the SEIS that did not pertain to snowy plovers. Below is an overview of the consequences listed in the SEIS, along with any pertinent comments.

"Vegetation and Soils: The SEIS indicates no impacts except minor for coastal communities under the current policy. This assumes a benefit from compliance from a no dog policy. Using common compliance assumptions for a no-dog policy and a leashed-dog policy would likely result in no difference in benefit between these two options.

"Wildlife (other than special status species): The only impacts listed are in the section on wildlife in coastal communities. The impacts are similar to snowy plover impacts, although no other species are threatened or endangered. Similar to the snowy plover, there was no information provided to indicate harm to birds or more impact than from humans in the SPPA.

"Special-status Species: See above regarding snowy plover.

"Cultural Resources: No cultural resources to consider.

"Visitor Use and Experience Impact: The SEIS determined that there are long-term moderate adverse impact for those who want dogs versus those who don't - either choice results in adverse impacts on the other. However, the SEIS did not consider a leashed-dog policy with better compliance, which could mitigate adverse impacts for those who prefer no dogs while creating minor adverse impacts for those who want and off-leash policy.

#### "Park Operations:

oThe SEIS states, Short-term moderate to major adverse impacts on park operations would be expected at sites where current dog walking would change from allowing on-leash or voice control dog walking to prohibiting dog walking. Enforcing a no dogs regulation would require law enforcement documentation of violations in sites where dogs would be prohibited. Although visitors with dogs in prohibited areas would be clearly in violation of the regulation, staff would still be required to monitor the site and issue citations to noncompliant visitors. Violators would quickly learn the consequences of their actions and, over the long term, compliance would result in fewer infractions. Following the initial education and

enforcement period, impacts to park operations would be long term, negligible to minor, and adverse.  
oThe SEIS claims moderate to major short-term impacts to implement a no-dog policy and then negligible to minor long-term adverse impacts. As stated above, there was no justification given for why resources could be provided to enforce a no-dog policy but not for a leashed-dog policy.

"Human Health and Safety:

oIn the section on Human Health and Safety, the SEIS states that, "Between 2008 and 2011, a total of 969 pet-related incidents were recorded at this site. Pet-related violations included 89 leash law violations, 77 cases of visitors walking dogs in closed areas, 22 hazardous conditions violations (including 21 dog bites/attacks/aggressive behavior), and 2 pet excrement violations (table 36). Violation of the Ocean Beach SPPA resulted in the most violations (729). No unattended pet violations were documented at this site between 2008 and 2011." The impacts are listed as, "Long-term moderate to major adverse impacts," with a rationale of, "Site experiences high use; a large number of violations, including dog bites/attacks and pet rescues have been recorded."

oThis summary in the bullet above of pet-related incidents is perplexing, as are the conclusions regarding impacts for the following reasons:

First of all, the specific cases listed only add up to 190 pet-related incidents - what were the other 779 incidents? Are we to assume they were irrelevant?

With regards to leash law violations, see the earlier points on compliance which would be greatly minimized if the GGNRA conducted an enforcement program similar to what it has listed for implementation of a no-dog policy.

With regards to visitors walking dogs in closed areas, I do not know what closed areas exist in the SPPA. I am guessing this is related to the area that was closed north of Stairwell 21 when sewage washed up, which would be unrelated to dog management issues.

With regards to pet excrement, anyone who walks on a city sidewalk would think that 2 reported incidences over a 3-year period is a low number. I personally find it unconscionable that anyone would leave pet excrement in any public space but I have generally noticed very few incidences of dog excrement in my hundreds of times in the SPPA. Unfortunately, this is not true of the city sidewalks.

With regards to dog aggression/biting, the risk is actually extremely low. The draft report provided statistics of dog aggression but did not provide total numbers of dogs. Over a 3 year period they cite 21 reports of aggressive behavior but out of how many dogs? I looked through various references for dog numbers. The 2006 plover report gives a rough estimate of 10 dogs per hour encountered. Assuming 12 hours of dog walking time per day, this would result in 120 dogs per day or 43,800 dogs per year. Over 3 years (2008-2011; 1095 days) this would be 131,400 dogs. Twenty-one aggressive encounters out of 131,400 dogs is 0.016%. This is a very low number. Even halving the number of dogs and doubling the number of reported incidences of aggression results in a number less than 0.1%. Moving all these dogs to the Ocean Beach Trail or sidewalks, with less room to spread out, would probably create an issue rather than solve one. Unless the SEIS assesses impacts of displaced dogs on trail/sidewalks, the claim that a no-dog policy is beneficial to health and safety cannot be claimed. Further, it should be made clear what the level to trigger moderate to major impacts is since the levels of violations and aggression seem very low or potentially solved by an enforced on-leash policy.

"Sustainability and Long-term Management: The SEIS states that Alternative F (Preferred Alternative) provides balanced visitor use and the protection of natural resources and visitor safety, and would best meet the objectives for the plan/EIS. I do not agree that the preferred plan offers a balanced approach to Ocean Beach.

Summary:

My objective in submitting a comment is to urge a more balanced review and approach to Ocean Beach. I am not trying to poke holes in the SEIS but rather trying to point out areas that the GGNRA did not fully consider or present, which are resulting in an approach to Ocean Beach that does not meet the needs of the majority of the users as well as other options could. I am not necessarily pro-dog but I feel that a dog ban has neither sound basis nor provides a balanced approach. The section of Ocean Beach south of



Stairwell 21 is, for the most part, not a visitor-focused beach, especially between Lincoln Ave. and Sloat Blvd. For example, there is no parking lot nor any trails. It is part of the neighborhood. I am not suggesting that this means that the needs of the neighborhood take precedence but they must be considered, and if there is an option that balances the needs of the community with those of visitors and special species, then this option should be preferred. My suggested option is: Dog walking under voice and sight control would be allowed in an approximately 0.71 of a mile-long beach ROLA from Stairwell 21 to the northern end of the beach. Year-round on-leash dog-walking permitted in SPPA between stairwell 21 and Sloat Blvd. This offers a balanced approach that provides visitors and the community access while protecting the plovers and resulting in minimal adverse impacts.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3144    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3145    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, the dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and Miwok Trail. She is a beautiful and friendly dog, whose waste we pick up immediately.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Please don't further limit the quality of life of the many responsible dog owners in Marin.

Thank you so much,

Dr. LaMont

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3146    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Livermore, CA 94550  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 09:07:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a former resident of Marin County, continuing user of GGNRA lands, dog owner, and biologist I feel that the threatened and endangered plants and animals that call these lands home should be given preference over the convenience and whim of dog owners. The fact that the rules regarding leash restriction are not currently followed with regularity shows that dog owners in this area too often show disregard for the well being of species and habitats that the National Park Service was created to protect. Even with the introduced new restrictions to dog access, San Francisco and Marin provide more open space and beach access for dogs and dog owners than any other coastal city in the United States of which I am aware. As dog owners in a region that prides itself on environmental consciousness I would hope that many of us would understand the the "not in my backyard" philosophy will cause irreparable harm and must not be accepted here. I request that the park service implement new regulations restricting dogs from some of these beautiful locations, protecting the plants and animals that require them to survive and thrive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3147    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** LAGUNITAS, CA 94938  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 09:15:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3148    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san anselmo, CA 94940  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 09:16:07**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir beach, Rodeo beach loop, costal trail and Miwok trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3149 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3150 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3151 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94965

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3152 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94131

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Lands End, Baker Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3153 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3154    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94132

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3155    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94133

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands, Stinson B.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3156    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Lands End, Baker Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3157    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94115

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3158    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94903

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3159    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3160    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94538  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Halfmoon Bay

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3161    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3162    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Baker Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3163    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 09:47:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in the E. Bay of the Bay Area. There are no beaches that I can take my dog to on this side of the bay. He enjoys a run in the sand and a dive into the water.  
The congestion of our urban areas makes the public lands a wonderful and suitable place for recreation of my dog and me.  
It's interesting that the government wouldn't care about fracking or otherwise destruction of the area, but yet we can't go out and enjoy it when it is available open space.  
Please reconsider this very poor position on land usage.

---



---

**Correspondence ID:** 3164    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Baker Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3165    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Baker Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3166    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 09:54:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, especially in Fort Funston, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own

---

health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. There are many areas that are already restricted to dog in the Bay Area, why extend further?

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Virginie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3167	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 09:59:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off leash restrictions seem to be way too aggressive. Please reconsider putting the new restrictions in place or at least scaling them back.				

Thanks,  
Mark

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3168	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 10:05:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I walk with my dog every week in the GGNRA, and I would like to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.				

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Greg Frame

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3169    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, GGP & Stern Grove

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3170    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 10:14:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Sujata Subramanian

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3171 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94108  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** BellaPelle, Inc. Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 10:15:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let's think about where we came from- -nature, earth, etc. humans have over-populated so we're condensing our natural environment by constructing houses and buildings.

Of course, we have to grow and be mindful of keeping our sacred beaches and parks from erosion and damage but come on- -animals are precious and deserve to roam in nature. Education for humans to pick up their waste (dog waste, cigarette butts, bottles) and such is a good place to start- - not banning dogs from their natural habitat.

If it makes any difference, I'm a small business owner in SF (paying a lot of taxes), I own a home in SF and I did not have children in an effort to be eco-friendly. I clean up after my dog and sometimes after others.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3172 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 10:18:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am not in favor of any restrictions on dogs and their owners for off leash access to parks in SF. This is a city that has always had open space for dogs and their owners, it's what makes SF special! If restrictions are put in place it will ruin a unique aspect of our city. Owning a dog is for people, the dogs and the community. Cities that have strict laws against dogs feel restrictive and unnatural! Please keep SF dog friendly. People sharing the beauty of SF are people sharing life together, it is a true reflection of who we are as San Franciscians !!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3173 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 10:23:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.  
The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

---

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

David B,

San Francisco, CA (30 Year Marina district resident, dog owner, and regular user of Crissy Field).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3174    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly hikes and mountain bikes with my wife, 2 young boys and our dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my entire family for our health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. Please consider that banning dogs effectively bans families since we generally cannot leave our dog home. In today's day-and-age we don't have time to take separate outings to places that allow some members of the family and not others, and then switch.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Scott Snow

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3175    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

99% our family's outdoor activities include hiking with our dog on the dog-friendly GGNA trails. This is a big factor in our lifestyle choice for living in Marin County.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I urge you to not further restrict the few dog-friendly uses of the GGNRA.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3176	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 10:28:05
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,
------------------------	---------------------------

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hawkins

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3177	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94105 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

\*\*\*\*\* On a more personal note, the lack of space for dogs and citizens like me to enjoy the spaces and be a part of the community is appalling. Dogs and responsible owners are engaged with the outdoors and the local communities on a regular basis in no other way that other groups are - we meet regularly, we know each other, and we take care of our surroundings. Given the problems in our open spaces with homelessness, vandalism, and general neglect - shouldn't we PROMOTE a group that cares and involved in maintaining our open spaces?? \*\*\*\*\*

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3178	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 10:28:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the \*\*thousands\*\* of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area.

These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on any new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Claudine RL Co

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3179	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Austin, TX 78759 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 10:29:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dogs aren't ment to be cooped up indoors! They need the beach and water to run and play! If the waste is what you are worried about, add more dog waste areas where there are doggie bags and trash cans. If you ban dogs, you have to ban people. They are the ones leaving broken glass, beer cans, cigarette buds ect. At least dog waste is bio degradable!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3180    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for everyone to utilize and enjoy, including those walking with their dogs, since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas maintained in San Francisco, Marin, with some added in San Mateo, and to assure that present off-leash areas remain on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I have previously submitted a much longer detailed letter including many more substantive and elaborated upon comments. This letter is simply one more additional plea.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Saxon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3181    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

The GGNRA is a very special resource to the community of San Francisco. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It imposes restrictions that will essentially eviscerate the kind of open-space resource historically offered by the GGNRA. Our community's health and sense of well-being will be negatively affected by these restrictions, especially as there are no resources that can serve as substitutes for the GGNRA's walking/hiking trails and off-leash areas.

---



The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Teresa Goodman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3182	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 10:39:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Gentlemen or Ladies,

I am the owner of an Old English Sheep dog that requires a safe space to run and play-herd other dogs. I frequently use GGNRA administered parks, especially Ft. Funston, to enable her to run to her heart's content. It would be a great loss if we were not allowed to use the several GGNRA parks nearby the Bay Area for her runs.

I strongly object to any imposition of "on-leash" rules being imposed on places where free-running dogs is currently allowed.

Please do not restrict the ability of our dogs to run and play freely.

Sincerely,

Rev. Fred Rabidoux

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3183	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 10:41:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3184	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94402 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 10:43:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Alan Brooks

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3185	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 10:44:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I moved to Ocean Beach in 2002. The main reason was the proximity to the beach and Fort Funston and being able to walk my dog by the ocean. As a service-connected (disability rated) Vietnam veteran, I have found that this has improved my quality of life immensely and decreased my PTSD. Not only is the physical exercise beneficial to me and my dog, so is the ability to socialize with other dog owners and frequently other veterans who are dog owners. Please don't take this capability away from us as it will have a major negative effect on our quality of life. Please reconsider your proposed changes.

Regards,

Richard Milner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3186	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 10:44:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dogs are members of our families and there are many 10s of 1000s of families with dogs as a member and we have no where to go to truly enjoy being together naturally and freely. Please dont shut down the few places we have left that allow us to interact in a natural and mutually respectful way.

Yes some dog owners are irresponsbile and yes some dogs are unsocial but the laws should be made to be applied to those types and not to all of us who actually have trained, obedient and social dog family

members.

A society that has no place for people who love animals is not a civilisation. Please let us keep some of our dog liberties but make us responsible for living up to standards. That is fair. Shutting us out is not.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3187    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 10:45:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** What fresh, idiotic hell is this?!?!?

The GGNRA is an URBAN park. It is not in the Sierras. It is not in undeveloped outerlands of Marin County. It. Is. In. A. City.

Instead of shrinking areas where people can let their dogs off-leash, you need to staff those areas so people who don't have control of their dogs are ticketed. Yes, ticketed. The revenues from ticketing would more than pay for the additional personnel.

Don't criminalize dog exercise!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3188    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 10:49:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Matthew Hogan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3189    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3190    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 10:51:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our dog would never be the same! Off leash is the only time he is fully obedient. Its the most wonderful feeling walking your dog off leash in a large area. Praying that this over-the-top regulation goes away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3191    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 10:55:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ellen Offermann

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3192    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Other

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3193 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:01:51**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3194 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** 94112  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3195 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 944124  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:02:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please save off leash areas for the dogs of the urban city of San Francisco!

We need this for healthy dogs and healthy owners. This is a family experience not just for our dogs... My children play with our dog and bond with her. My kids get to learn the importance of meeting new animals and watching the animals run and play.

The experience is giving my children a love of animals! A desire to protect them and be future responsible pet owners. No interaction on the sidewalk with a dog on a leash can give this to them.

Off leash areas are also a decompression time for me. Living in the city is hard! There are lots of intense things to deal with, like traffic, homelessness, litter, high cost of living, large amount of houses/people per sq. mile etc. bBeing able to play with my dog outside in nature and connect with other humans during the process is vital for my survival as a woman, mother, wife, dog owner and citizen of San Francisco!

Please save the off leash areas in Golden Gate National Rec Area!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3196    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3197    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:08:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is

way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Veronika Powlis

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3198	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 11:08:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Francesca Koumarios

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3199	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	resident Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 11:10:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Please keep Ft. Funston an off leash, dog friendly environment. I have been a resident of San Francisco for 15 years. I own a home, work and spend most my money within the city. One of the reasons I put up with the high cost of living is access to wonderful public parks which are dog

---

friendly. Taking this away from tax payers seems unfair and eliminates a big part of San Francisco's attraction. Please think of a way that the park can be shared by all.

Thank you,  
Jenny Hay  
3088 Market St. San Francisco CA 94114

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3200	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS rep				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA in SF, specifically around Ocean Beach near Sloat, Im writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

While I would support some restrictions and the creation of dog free and leash only areas, I feel that reducing the available area by 90% is far restrictive. It prevents me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. Since dogs will no longer be allowed in the vast majority of Ocean Beach, specifically near where I live, I will be forced to drive my dog to another recreation area instead of walking to the beach as I now do. Many other people who live along ocean beach and who have dogs will also be forced to drive instead of walking. This will increase traffic and congestion around other neighborhoods and parks and badly impacts older or lower income people who do not own vehicles. I also feel that fenced areas are a terrible idea because they interfere with the natural beauty of the areas.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Alan Berezin

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3201	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94555 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>					

---



**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3202	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94555				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 00:00:00				

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3203	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94970				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,31,2014 00:00:00				

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3204	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:17:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Fort Funston is an amazing place that my two tiny dogs and I enjoy multiple times a week for play and relaxation. I religiously pick up after my dogs and pay close attention to them while maintaining control of there whereabouts. I do not allow my dogs to run through any of the vegetation at Fort Funston, we stick to the trails and the beach. That being said we have had many incidents with commercial dog walkers. These walkers on a daily basis have 15-22 dogs per person and most times running wild as they please and uncontrollable when an incident arises. My dogs have been injured 3 times in the last few months due to this scenario. I agree with some on-leash/off-leash cooperation. Map 16-A would be great to maintain full off-lease capabilities with limitations in place. For example, number of dogs per person or limiting commercial dog walking times and locations and charging a fee for commercial dog walkers who are making a profit by taking free use of the park. Maps 16-E and 16-F seem to be reasonable. They can satisfy more parties regarding use of the park. If possible to budget for a patrol person in the park, it would help regulate the new policies put in place. Better fencing may also help to keep people out of unwanted areas. I believe a large issue is the commercial dog walking. I hope to see some limits put into place for these parties. I think it has gotten out of control.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3205    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:20:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog at Fort Funston and occasionally at Chrissy Field, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for more than a decade.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Will Burns

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3206    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:20:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't reduce off leash areas in the GGNRA. Dogs need room to play, and it's already so limited.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3207    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94402  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:21:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not limit or further restrict access for the community and their dogs to the GGNRA. These areas in SF, Marin and San Mateo counties are important places for residents and their dogs. Because of the urban setting we live in, having these areas open for people and dogs to exercise in and enjoy is CRITICAL !!! These areas are not National Parks, they are Recreational Areas. Access with dogs is limited in so many other areas and in many schools, parks and open space. PLEASE BE RESPONSIBLE AND PRESERVE THE DOG FRIENDLY, OFF LEASH ACCESS WE CURRENTLY ENJOY. Be certain to have your future plan leave dog access as part of new GGNRA lands and future plans.  
Thank You.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3208    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Ross, CA 94957  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:23:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3209    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:39:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of big change in ggnra. There are more dogs and people who walk dogs. We must address this situation, by adding MORE space for dogs and their people. Restrictions are the wrong approach and will backfire. Specifically all beach areas should allow dogs off leash throughout the ggnra because dogs are the only ones who swim on a regular basis. It's hard to swim on a leash - for the dog and their person. The paths and inland areas near the beach should be for people and dogs so that they can play and exercise together. Also we need new areas for dogs exclusively like we have in the other Bay Area parks. This would allow dogs to run off leash without fear of stumbling onto people pickniking or birds nesting. Some dogs are not well behaved but they and their people still deserve the off leash experience so these designated areas are critical. Of course these new dog play areas (DPAs) would offer conveniences like water dishes, poop bags, trash, signage, parking, and ADA access. Ideally there would be separate areas for big dogs and small dogs, to further prevent any potential for conflict. Now fort funston is already pretty good but could use more signage and water bowls. Crissy field is pretty good too but a roped off dog play area for dogs only would be required. Ocean beach is great but again more signage and a dedicated dog play area would be required.

On a related note, the food service areas like the warming hut and crissy field center could use some improvement. More water bowls, dog parking areas to tie up leashes, and designated seating for people with dogs would be good.

You also need more park ranger training. The rangers don't seem to know very much about dogs or their people. They shouldn't ride their horses where dogs are present. It could cause problems. Also they shouldn't shoot people in the backs with stun guns while walking dogs. But I suppose it's ok to shoot people in the backs when they don't have a dog? Not sure on that one actually. They should be trained how to approach dogs and please ask permission before petting them. And they should carry treats.

I propose that a committee of park users, neighbors, dog walkers, and dog owners be set up to work out the details. This has worked in the other Bay Area parks which have set up dog play areas. The proposals put forth by nps make no sense and should be abandoned because they are a top down approach created without public input. If nps can't manage this dog play area creation process over a 10 year period, then please hand it all over to local rec and park departments who have demonstrated competence in this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3210    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** muir beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:41:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very much opposed to the dog management plan for Muir Beach. Our quiet hamlet and our small community seems to be continually trying to be heard over the vast machine of the GGNP. This s a community, vibrant, environmentally aware and active, and loving stewards of this place we call our home. There has got to be a different mechanism for the continual changes you insist on trying to impose without the proper conversations and dialogue necessary to ensure the well being of the

---

very community that lives here.  
Dogs need trails. Horses need the barn and the beach.  
Please do not limit dog access.  
I am very much upset and angered at this continual battle.

Respectfully  
Beth Nelson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3211    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I am not a current dog owner but walk the miwok and coastal trails almost daily. The dog owners are respectful and responsible, and I support sharing the trails with them. And I support both our national and state park foundations.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3212    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** NA, UN NA  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** Before removing (or reducing by 90%) ccess to dog walking in the GGNRA, the burden of proof is on the NPS to provide site-specific, peer-reviewed studies to show that impacts are caused by dogs!!!! You've NOT done that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3213    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:47:48

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My case in favor of Poop Patrol and the GGNRA off-leash ban:

Finally we have had some substantial rain to wash away the mess from 2013. Miller Ave and beyond, our entire town is littered with dog feces!! In an MV Patch post from way back in June of 2013 entitled Dog Poop Ecology, the author, Obligatory Obloquy, touches on a possible scenario that dog owners have no real intention of dealing with the poop. This bad habit by dog owners of leaving the dog poop behind is suggestive of a mindset that these people's own sh#t doesn't stink. Now I don't believe ALL dog people do this. There are a few inconsiderate dog owners out there that are giving all dogs a bad name.

GGNRA wants to ban dogs from being off leash on selected federal lands. The city of San Francisco opposes the ban because of the fear that the ban will result in overuse of the city parks as dog owners look for alternate places to recreate with their pets. City or federal land, it has really come to a head in that dogs are negatively impacting the environment enough to affect people's experience of these spaces. I love dogs AND I support this ban. It is unfortunate it has come to this. This measure is entirely a result of a handful of dog owners' neglect in dealing with their pet's messes. However, I don't necessarily think the ban will cure the situation entirely. What we really need is poop patrol. Dog owners absolutely need to be accountable for their pets. Those few inconsiderate ones are not just littering garbage, they are littering feces.

Over the course of 2013 I have proudly strolled with my new baby up and down Miller Ave. and through our town. I have become outraged with dog owners and their laziness in cleaning up after their pets. In the June of 2013 article, Obligatory Obloquy suggests dog owners have a pathological disgust for their own dog's excrement, which is the equivalent of disgust for feces in general. I have dealt with my fair share of poop in the last year having a new baby. No exaggeration, I have witnessed my little newborn poop at a great distance of 15 ft. shot over a railing and down a flight of stairs to land on the light switch next to the front door. Granted, gravity aided the great distance. Back to my point, if I left my kid's dirty diapers on the sidewalk, people, dog owners included would be incensed and disgusted. Wrapped in a diaper my babe's feces would be likened to all the little dog poop bags that litter our streets and the great trails of Mill Valley.

What's with people not picking up after their dogs? They even act as if they will in front of witnesses by carrying the little obligatory bag roll on their dogs' leashes. One early morning, I observed a dog owner take a baggy out while the dog was doing his business. My baby in her stroller, me, and another man were the onlookers passing by. Once we passed, the owner and her dog acted as if nothing had happened and left the poo behind. Outrageous!!!! Dog people, you have a civil responsibility!!! Get over yourself!!!

I quizzed a dear friend of mine who recently became owner of a massive Saint Bernard x English Mastiff and whom also lives in a condominium complex. I asked him what he does with the dog's poop when no one is around. Does he just leave it there like it's not his problem? Does he think he doesn't have to pick it up if no one saw the dog drop it? His very civilized response was, "of course I pick it up!!! " Then he quoted the famous basketball coach John Wooden. "The true test of a man's character is what he does when no one is watching."

So who are these people who think it ok to leave their dog's feces on the street only to entangle my unsuspecting baby jogger wheels? Is it only a Miller Avenue problem? Are the apartment dwellers, the one's without backyards, allowing their dogs to crap all over our sidewalks and in our parks? Is it a citywide Mill Valley problem? Are people so elitist around here that they don't think their own dog's s&#t doesn't stink? No, this problem reaches far beyond Miller Ave. as substantiated by the proposed GGNRA off-leash ban.

Every day I see dog owner's breaking rules. ALL dogs are required to be on leash in our public parks of Mill Valley. I've seen people let their dogs run wild in the playground areas with children, even in the sandbox. I don't put my kid in the middle of the dog park for her to play. She doesn't belong there. Dogs are not welcome in the playground. I don't care that "oh, they love babies and that they wouldn't hurt a fly or that my kid could poke the dog in the eye and the dog will take all the ear and tail pulling my kid can dish." I'm not going to allow my child to do that and I would expect a dog owner to recognize that a playground is for kids not animals.

This may seem a bit extreme. Like I said, I do love dogs. I just loathe irresponsible pet owners. Adhering to leash laws would eliminate a lot of problems. Mainly dog poop would be much more trackable. Though this means nothing if a dog owner cannot see past his own aversion to crap. I have to believe it will take a group effort to hold pet owners accountable. I have witnessed some positive group influence at Boyle Park where one dog owner informed another distracted dog owner that his dog had crapped. She courteously dropped a baggy on the steaming pile. He became almost downright indignant as to say, if he didn't see it, it didn't happen, certainly not HIS dog. But with peer pressure, he did pick up the crap.

Believe it or not, another dear friend of mine was recently urinated on by a giant Rottweiler at our very own Boyle Park. Imagine a young mother and her 1 year old son peacefully enjoying a picnic in the grass. All mom could do to protect her baby was hover over him while she took the blow. Old Buddha, the dog, proceeded to lift his leg and pee all over mom's back. Incurable. This wouldn't have happened if Buddha was on leash. End of story. I have heard other reports of off leash dogs snatching food from other picnickers. Another mom park-goer recounted the time a dog ran up and snatched a sandwich from her husband's hands as he was about to take a bite. Situations like this happen all too frequently with dogs running wild in public parks.

Are we supposed to tolerate this behavior? At what point are the dogs taking away our human rights? Believe it or not, there are actually people who are fearful of dogs. An approaching off leash dog is a major threat to a person like that. An off-leash ban is the ultimate and unfortunate result due to a small percentage of selfish dog people. I grow weary of literally watching my every step every time I take my baby for a stroller ride. I know that most are responsible pet owners. I think it their job to assert some major peer pressure. The littering of feces cannot be tolerated!!! Rule breaking pet owners need to be fined. There is a clear need for poop patrol and enforcement of the laws on this issue.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3214	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 11:47:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please save off leash dog areas. The most dangerous dogs are those with pent up energy due to not getting enough exercise and that energy getting redirected in the form of aggression. Restricting off leash will therefore create more dangerous dogs.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3215	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Shelby

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3216	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 11:52:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
William Moss

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3217	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 11:53:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Susheela Vasan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3218    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Martin Rosenthal

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3219    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 11:58:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Martin Rosenthal

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3220	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 11:59:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We have many more unwelcome situations and occurrences than dogs. Clean up the city in other ways like managing the homeless situation. The dogs are usually in close proximity to its owner anyways thus making leashes a moot point.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3221	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94611 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 12:04:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	ALLOW DOG OWNERS OFF-LEASH IN GGNRA. In no other circumstance would NPS try to ban 80% of the users of a park asset. You have a decade's worth of information stating the importance of this park system to the urban population of the Bay Area. The NPS should be able to treat the public better than this mean-spirited, short sighted approach to park management.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3222	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 12:07:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, General Superintendent( Golden Gate National Recreation Area, ( Fort Mason, Bldg 201,( San Francisco, CA 94123-0022( Attn: SEIS				

Dear Superintendent,

As a taxpayer and resident of the directly impacted community, I thank you for extending the time to

---

solicit input on this proposed policy. I regularly use these trails and beaches with my dog.

I write in support of Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, which would restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA.

I urge you to maintain and expand dog-friendly trails and Off-Leash, voice-controlled access, rather than attempting to further tighten the already onerous restrictions.

## 1. Dogs are a benefit for society and our community.

It is critical as the stresses of our lives increase, that we expand the land where we can exercise freely with our dogs - for our health as individuals, our well-being as a society, and our duty to our pets. Recent surveys show that I am not alone; nearly 40% of all Californians are dog owners. Yet families with dogs are permitted access to merely 1% of our parks land here in Marin.

The benefits of daily exercise are well-documented; our First Lady Michele Obama has made it her mission. Running, walking, and hiking together in the open air with our dogs boosts the body, the heart and the soul of us both - keeping both dog and human healthy. It is so very important for us, and even more important for our animals! Enclosed urban dog parks and leash-only areas are simply no replacement for open beaches and parklands where owner and pet can run freely.

Time with dogs is proven to reduce depression and add longevity as we age. Service dogs that provide comfort in hospitals enhance patient well-being. It is also proven that these type of service dogs need their recovery time, in order to serve another day. How do dogs recover? By running, playing and being free. That requires open trails, beaches and Off-Leash, controlled areas in nature - a dogs natural habitat.

Furthermore, as dogs age, just like humans, their joints stiffen. And, like humans, the best exercise for an elder dog is swimming! Free and open beaches provide this opportunity; please maintain the few places we have today to run with and swim our dogs.

## 2. Healthy dogs provide tremendous comfort and emotional support in families.

For many years, my husband battled cancer. When he felt well enough, our dog would get him up and out for a walk in nature. As his caregiver, I relied on our dog - a border collie - to maintain my own health and strength, with daily invigorating hikes in the trails, walks on the open paths, and/or runs on the beach. Without her and our walks in the parks, I don't know how I would have made it through those difficult days. Working out in a gym is simply no replacement for running on open trails with one's dog.

When the chemo and disease sapped my husband's energy, she would sit with him and keep watch. One afternoon, he suddenly took a turn for the worse. Our dog immediately knew something was wrong. She came to me, highly agitated, barking incessantly, until I went to check on him. She was right. I called the ambulance service and we got him to the ER.

When we got back home, she would not leave his side. Some days later, sadly, my husband passed on, peacefully at home. Every night thereafter for more than a week, our dog cried herself to sleep, whimpering and whining in a manner I had never heard before. Clearly, dogs are sensitive creatures, in their own way. Like humans, they need open space, Off-Leash, controlled areas and wide open beaches.

Please enable us to maintain the health to these wonderful creatures by maintaining and expanding our Off-Leash, controlled access to the parks and beaches.

3. GGNRA Parklands are here for recreation.

I strongly support the letter submitted by the Marin Humane Society, including the specific recommendations to maintain our current access on trails and beaches in Alternative A. Responsible, off-leash, controlled dogs should be allowed in as many areas of the park as possible.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a Recreation Area for this densely populated, urban Bay Area. The GGNRA is not a wilderness national park and shouldn't be managed as if it were. (Even Yellowstone allows noisy, polluting snowmobiles!) These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog-walking since the original pet policy in 1979. Please retain this policy.

Marin County provides access to large numbers of urban dog owners from across the Bay Area, particularly San Francisco. As U.S. taxpayers, we Californians contribute more to the federal budget than we receive in return, providing subsidy to those in less vibrant economies. We meet the burden of our own needs through additional taxes paid to our State, Counties and Cities. Any further restrictions would place even greater stress on the few off-leash areas our County can offer, maintain and support.

I have written to this agency before (when such comments ran 3:1 against your plan in 2011) and urge you again today: Please keep and expand our Open Space, Off-Leash Beaches, and Off-Leash and Dog-Friendly areas and trails for dogs and owners to run free together.

Please vote for Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, retaining access in Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

Yours respectfully,

Wendy Richards  
Sausalito, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3223	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach and the Marin Headlands.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area.  
It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

Marin residents, like myself and my family, rely upon this open space.  
It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs, was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I am requesting that you reconsider this policy. It's a major reason we live where we do.

---

-----

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3224    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 12:13:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

David Kemp

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3225    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 12:14:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please save off leash in San Francisco .return to 1979 rules  
Let dogs play fetch in

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3226    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 12:17:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not change the off-leash policies at Fort Funston in San Francisco. It is an invaluable resource for the multitudes of dog lovers in this city. To require leashes in this wide expanse is unnecessary and unfairly restrictive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3227    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mountain View, CA 94043  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 12:20:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Cameron Chapman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3228    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 12:20:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent:

I write to express strong disagreement with the GGNRA proposal to limit off-leash dogs' access to GGNRA-managed property. GGNRA's attempts to change decades of community practice across miles of

---

urban and near-urban trails and beaches are not supported by science or by common sense. Environmental restoration and stewardship are important goals. Land grabs and false assurances to Bay Area residents and visitors are not acceptable tactics.

Please suspend all misguided efforts to delimit access to coastal lands by dogs and their guardians. Reams of paper and hours of staff time should be much better spent. Climate change, ocean acidification, rising sea levels and severe local erosion are all much more urgent topics for expert review and attention.

Sincerely,  
K. Lu  
SF, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3229	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 12:20:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Susan Sutton

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3230	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Santa Cruz, CA 95065 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I travel from Santa Cruz to GGNRA specifically to have the opportunity to exercise and enjoy the outdoors with my dog off leash. The new plan will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan does not take into account concerns and objections of the thousands of people who

submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3231	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 12:24:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not ban off-leash dog walking. My dog loves running around and playing fetch. She is very well trained and very loving towards other people and dogs. She loves children and even insists that small toddlers throw the ball for her. My dog would not be happy if she had to be on-leash at parks and crissy field.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3232	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 12:29:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I'm someone who walks twice daily with my designated service dog in the Rancho Corral de Tierra (Montara) section of GGNRA. When he is exercised, he is calm and can be in therapy mode/perform his service duties. But if he were forced to stay on leash, there is no way he'd get the exercise he needs - - and would therefore not be calm enough to perform the services he is trained for. I moved to Montara 12 years ago for the specific purpose of being able to exercise my therapy dog off leash within walking distance from my house. Now that is being threatened.

Therefore, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to your preferred alternative in the new dog management plan. It is way too restrictive - - no off-leash areas at all - - and it will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and his health.

I have submitted my opposition comments so many times, via email, website and in person - - but never feel heard. I have attended countless forums with the GGNRA and Nat'l Park Service. But the new plan was not modified in any real way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments the first time around.

In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I know you say there is no other National Park with off leash rules like the GGNRA. But GGNRA is not



the same as other parks like Yellowstone. It is a RECREATION AREA in a densely populated urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Chelsea Hardaway  
650.491.0137  
chelsea.hardaway@gmail.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3233	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 12:30:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not add yet more places where we may not bring our dogs. Enough! We are responsible enough to care for our dogs in these spaces!!!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3234	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Santa Rosa, CA 95401 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 12:40:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I do not agree with the proposed ban on off-leash dogs in Bay Area parks. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3235	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 12:56:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

While I strongly oppose Alternative F, and support Alternative A, what I would really like the GGNRA to be focusing on is how to get more people outside, using recreational space designated for that purpose. That would entail finding MORE access for people and their dogs, not less, and not 'no change'. Dogs frolicking in open space is a joy to behold. People go crazy without time outside, away from cars and buildings and urban stresses. Dogs are no different. And recreation for people includes recreation for dogs. Please focus your energy on bringing more joy, not less.

It is a bit distressing that legislating trends toward restricting rather than expanding. Let's create MORE freedom. Let's share the planet.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3236    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 12:56:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not take our privilege to hang out with our dogs in our beloved city! Our dogs are part of our families, and a huge part of our happiness. Most of us are responsible dog owners and do not deserve those privileges taken away from us. Our city is such a beautiful place, with our oceans and parks. I have spent some of my best moments hanging out with my dog in those beautiful places. Let's keep it this way! We are respectful of the environment and of the laws, so let's learn how to co-exist!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3237    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 12:57:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. This seems to be a gut reaction in response to those who are not complying with the leash restrictions, but this will impact thousands of folks' ability to enjoy simple recreation with their dog!

Russ Latham

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3238    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

Best,

Xavier

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3239    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 13:06:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Susan Heit

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3240    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 13:06:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lauren Burris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3241    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94134

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 13:06:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Jennifer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3242    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** old, informed,and not to agile person Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 13:06:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am one of those many older San Francisco residents that has a dog. I keep my dog on a lead, bring bags (for myself and others)and walk.From time to time I like to go to Funston, Crissy Field and other dog parks that my dog can play ball. The restrictions you are proposing are severely restricting us. WHY? Don't we get some fun too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3243    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 13:19:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I have a 5 month old baby. Nothing makes him happier than seeing dogs in the dog park and interacting with them. This is what makes our part of the world unique and amazing. We should have more places where more people can interact with more dogs. So please NO MORE RESTRICTIONS ON DOGS.

For people who don't like dogs, there places for them too (like all city streets, buildings, restaurants, most parks, highways, subways, etc.). If you want more places in GGNRA that exclude dogs, then create an equal number and size of nearby spaces that allow dogs. Keep it balanced that way.

Frank Dean needs to understand that parks are for people, and many people have dogs, so therefore parks are for dogs to a large extent. Possibly he things that parks exist for the benefit of park employees and birds, which is not the case according to the congressional mandate that created the GGNRA (although park employees and birds are welcome so long as they don't interfere with other users). It takes a special kind of moron to look at what people want and give them the opposite. We've got a lot of acreage in the GGNRA! Let's give everyone what the want, not restrict or exclude certain park users!

Conflicts with dogs and people are the result of too many restrictions. Dogs need space to run around, and so do dog owners. If you prevent that, dogs and people get angry and frustrated, like I am right now. Grrr....

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3244	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94124 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 13:21:37
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern,
------------------------	-------------------------

The Dog Management Plan proposed will dramatically and adversely impact dog owners who already have limited recreation areas for our pets. As urbanites, it is important for our pets have access to open environments, GGNRA's plan diminishes our access!

Recreation areas should be for just that, recreation. Dog owners should have the same ability to enjoy the serenity of our rec areas as anyone else.

Please provide the Bay Area people a balanced and positive urban living & increase the number of dog friendly rec areas and follow the commitment laid forth in the 1979 Pet Policy.

Thank you for your time and review.

Best,

Briana

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3245	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Pennngrove, CA 94951 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 13:29:47
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Supervisor Dean,
------------------------	-----------------------

I am writing to express displeasure with the proposed restrictions on dog walking and off leash areas within GGNRA. I would like you to consider the vast number of your local "customers" who are dog owners and who would like to responsibly hike the natural lands around this beautiful area. I have heard

that there are more pet dogs than children in San Francisco.

I hike an average of 3 miles a day with my canine friend and I am drawn to backcountry areas and other places where my super friendly dog can run off leash. Such areas are few, and they should be on the increase rather than the other way around.

Please put the burden on owners to self-police and ensure that off leash dog areas are kept safe, clean, and fun for all.

thank you for your consideration,  
-Mike Weihman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3246	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Tom Stahl

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3247	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94111 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 13:31:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would charge extra for dogs instead of banning them. also impose heavy fines on those who do not clean up after their pets. This will allow the park service to gain additional funds to clean and maintain the parks better. A state ranger once told me that the park systems are not broken, but just broke. You need funding to hire rangers and maintenance crew, who will monitor and clean up after everyone. Because let's face it - it's not dogs but people with and/or without pets that leave the greatest footprint.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3248	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 13:31:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not ban dogs from the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3249    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94118

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3250    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94970

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3251    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94112

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3252 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** 94114  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,31,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3253 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 13:47:06**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not take away off leash capacity for dogs in Rancho Corral de Tierra. I have lived on the coast for 20 years and have always walked my dogs in the areas that are now GGNRA lands. My dogs are well behaved and we enjoy the ability to play and walk for miles of beautiful space. A happy and healthy dog means a happy and healthy human. I think you should focus your energy and efforts on the people riding dirt bikes up and down the hills, ruining the trails, frightening the equine and dog population,

and scarring the hills. Dogs do not create the long lasting damage and havoc that dirt bikers do.

Please keep Rancho Corral de Tierra open to dogs and specifically off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3254 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Marin Headlands, Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3255    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 13:47:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Anderson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3256    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** My name is Maia Rey. I live in San Anselmo, in Marin County. I often visit most of the GGNRA's off leash areas not only with my dog but with dogs that I walk or dog sit. I also frequent Ocean beach where my son surfs and Crissy field. Not only are these areas essential to my livelihood but also to the health of my pet and the pets that I sit. I pay alot of money to live in Marin and the biggest reason that I have always done that is for the open space areas that my family (including my dog) and I have access to. I don't know what the statistics are for Marin, but there are more dogs than kids in San Francisco, and plenty in Marin. I am also an environmentalist and a wildlife lover. However, I believe that the open space areas within and close to urban areas should be accessible to and serve the needs of, the people that live there first. that includes all people with dogs as members of their families and people that don't care for dogs. Because, people have such a wide range of interests, tolerances and intolerances, being in shared public places requires personal responsibility, and an attitude of inclusiveness. Not all people or organizations have these attitudes and this is when we see these people and organizations trying to regulate their biased and intolerant attitudes on the rest of us. This is what GGNRA was originally designed for to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" but I fear that it has become misguided.

I am strongly opposed to the Preferred Alternative because it is way too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County where my husband works and we sometimes go and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fencing to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. It will also destroy the natural beauty of those areas.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. These are some of the attitudes of intolerance and bias that some of the people with power appear to be trying to imposed on the majority of us that they don't agree with.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from those of us who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation, other than a baised agenda, why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. Even if there

was evidence of some impact; people need a place to recreate with and without their dogs. These are not remote areas that we are discussing. These are our back yards.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades. This is an abuse of power and a display of intolerance and a biased agenda.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Please consider my view point and that of the majority of tax paying residents whose opinions you are in opposition to.

Sincerely,

Maia Rey

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3257	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94131				

	United States of America
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3258	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94131				

	United States of America
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3259    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Rodeo Beach and hike the loop as well as let them run on the beach. I also enjoy hiking from my home in Sausalito down to Cavallo and up to the tunnel on the Coastal trail. One of the reasons we purchased a home in Marin was so that we could enjoy the wonderful nature access with our dogs and not to have to get in a car.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I feel there is enough space and trails for those who do not enjoy dogs. I strongly hope that you will consider those of us who do enjoy our pets and allow us to enjoy the GGNRA with them.

Regards,

Heather

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3260    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:00:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** my dog is happiest running and playing on the beach. A lot of people who live in this area don't have large back yards or private area's for their dogs to run free and just enjoy being a dog. It's not hurting anyone, and I only ever see people with their dogs being respectful and cleaning up after their dogs. It's going to be a huge bummer to all the dog lovers in this area and to the dogs that don't have any other way to run around and be happy.

Please save off leash in the Bay Area!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3261    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am a dog owner who has lived in San Francisco for over 30 years and has enjoyed getting exercise with my dog in the natural areas within and surrounding the city. I am strongly opposed to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will cut off access to GGNRA properties that my dog(s) and I have enjoyed for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Legislation that prohibits such a healthy and positive activity as enjoying the outdoors with your dog, is absolutely un-American in my book.

Sincerely,  
Patricia Veitch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3262    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:07:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3263 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94560

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3264 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94131

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3265 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94553

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3266 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:14:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am not a dog owner but I think it's important to have places for off leach walking. I don't want to have so many places off limits to those who need to give there dog running and playing space.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3267 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:15:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've utilized (in a responsible manner, I believe) the off-leash areas at Crissy Field and in Marin County for the past 8 years or so. I am extremely disappointed to hear about this latest attempt to effectively eliminate open off-leash play areas in and around San Francisco, as this is the main way that I enjoy beaches, trails and the outdoors - with my dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3268 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94134  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:15:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep our areas open for our dogs. If you close it down it will devastate SF and it's culture. My dogs depend on free space to run free and get his energy out.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3269 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3270 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner that has lived in San Francisco for over 20 years. We take our dog to Fort Funston 5 to 6 times a week to run on the trails and beach. Our dog has many human and canine friends that we meet and play with almost every day. I get great exercise and get to connect with people who love dogs and nature. Running off leash at Fort Funston gives both of us great joy and a physical release so that we stay healthy and vibrant. My dog is a rescue from the Peninsula Humane Society and is a recovering stray. Many city parks are too close to traffic and are not appropriate for him because of the loud noise and moving vehicles. He feels safe at Fort Funston. I do not want off leash regulations to be tightened at the GGNRA.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3271 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 95035

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

---



**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3272 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:18:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

OPPOSE THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR DOG MANAGEMENT.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3273 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

---

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3274	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94949
-----------------	-------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	
-----------------------------	--

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan
------------------------	--

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3275	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	
-----------------	--

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	
-----------------------------	--

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan
------------------------	--

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3276	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3277    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94112

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3278    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94132

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:**

Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3279    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94131-1611  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, other

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3280    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:34:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We are writing about your engagement in the development of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Dog Management Plan because I am from the San Francisco Bay Area and although I understand you are receiving many letters to open up the National Recreation area to dogs, we are against more unnecessary work by our rangers having to discipline dog owners. The dog situation is out of control here in Marin County. Our trails are filling up with dog feces that are left behind by owners that unleash their dogs in "leash only" areas and look the other way. I love dogs and feel that there are many responsible dog owners out there, but the many irresponsible dog owners are allowing their dogs to run up and down the hillsides here tearing up the natural terrain. There is enough to do, and finances are already tight as it is to have to put more responsibility on Rangers to discipline more dog owners.

I have observed dogs in "leashed" protective sanctuary areas chasing deer, owls, birds and other wildlife, sometimes, to the owner's dismay, actually catching this wildlife in their jaws. After the wildlife has been harmed by the unleashed dog, the owner may put their dog temporarily on leash but there is not a mutual respect for the hiking trails, hillsides or wildlife there. Many dog owners here are actually offended when a person asks them to put their dog on leash in a leash only area.

You should know that the bay area is filled with very wealthy individuals who are used to getting their own way. As written in our local paper, "We have essentially written off attempting to work with the people at the National Park Service, and are going over their heads to Department of Interior and Congress," Bill Bechtell of the Montara Dog Group writes into Patch.

This is typical behavior of many individuals in this area who feel that rules should not be put on them. I am sure that the National Park Service is tired of having to discipline dog owners, I see them writing tickets here all the time to owners who have their dogs off leash the next day again in leashed area, educated individuals that cannot understand why their dog must be on leash and I am certain the Park Service is concerned about the welfare of fragile hillsides and indigenous flora and fauna that is being destroyed by off leash dogs.

In the Bay Area there is a spot that has allowed dogs to walk with their owners on leash. This lasted for a very short time. Now if you walk the area without a dog, and dogs are jumping on you, owners will tell you that if you don't want to be jumped on by dogs, then you shouldn't walk in this beautiful path along the bay that is supposed to be for everyone. On mount Tamalpais, rangers have to ticket off leash dogs all the time. Tourists come from far away to see this beautiful mountain and paths often are littered with dog feces and colored dog excrement bags that were left behind. At Stinson Beach where there is actually a designated dog beach area, owners allow their dogs to run down the beach in the "leashed" area running over a family's blanket who is picnicing, chasing birds or leaving excrement even on the "no dog" side of the beach. In asking an owner to please clean up after her dog, I have been told multiple times how difficult it is to see all the dogs going to the bathroom when they all go at the same time. Ironically, this is usually the case in a leashed area.

PLEASE BE PREPARED THAT IF YOU OPEN UP MORE TRAILS for dog owners, be prepared to have more rangers there enforcing the leash law and having to put extra care into maintaining havoc the dogs are reaking in the National Forest areas.

Sandy and Claudine Murray  
Mill Valley, California

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3281	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 14:35:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. I have an active, obedient dog that needs regular, off-leash exercise.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ms. Maloney

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3282    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:35:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the parks open for our leashed dogs! :)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3283    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:42:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Roberta Carraro

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3284    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94705  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:55:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Wendy Leyden  
Berkeley, Ca

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3285	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a family who enjoys visiting various GGNRA parks with our dog, I'm writing to oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and will prevent our family from recreating with our dog on many GGNRA properties.

In particular, to ban dogs in much of Fort Funston is preposterous, as dogs and dog owners make up the vast majority of park users!

Dogs and children do mix well, as my 3 year old and 9 month old can attest to. And any dog trainer as well as the SPCA can tell you that a free (off-leash), well exercised dog is a better socialized dog.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I also oppose fences to surround or delineate off-leash areas in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens, and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

Sincerely,

Ashley Rogers  
Alameda, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3286    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:55:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Whether you have a dog or not, its a joyful experience to be in the bay area with dogs off leash running free or at the parks the a leash. It allows people to feel a sense of community to the have your friends, family and dogs gather together. If you take this access away these areas especially Fort Funston people will not be use/appreciated as much. All the dog owner will then go to other areas and overcrowd those parks with their dogs. Having these area for me and my dog keeps me happy, sane and rejuvenated. If a majority of the dogs in SF had to start using the sidewalks as bathroom and be on leashes walking around the block I don't think this will be an appealing city to live in. It also may create new behaviors in dogs that will have a negative effect. The dog park areas are a main reason I moved I moved to SF. Move the sewage system away from these park areas not the dogs. I think that is a better solution for the environmental impact.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3287    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Danielle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3288    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 14:59:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lisa Allgeier

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3289	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114
-----------------	-------------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 14:59:16
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not limit off leash running for dogs. My dog is a greyhound and NEEDS to be able to run freely for his health and well-being. His life will be greatly negatively impacted by such restrictions.
------------------------	--

PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS!!!! I literally cry thinking about how this will hurt my dog's life and my own.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3290	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Santa Fe, NM 87507
-----------------	--------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 15:02:09
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a frequent visitor to relatives in Marin County - and one of our constant joys has been walking our dogs on these trails. Please do not close them to dogs. I know it won't count much, but I was the Episcopal priest in Warrensburg, Missouri, where in a court case argued by then Senator Vest, it was asserted that "a dog is a man's best friend." Keep the spirit of that assertion alive, please. And yes, Senator Vest won the trial on the basis of that quote.
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3291	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110
-----------------	-------------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 15:02:54
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

---

**Correspondence:** That's crazy! San Francisco is such a dog city and always has been...why would they ban them in all the areas were they can run and be free. This is cruel and will severely impact the dog culture we have here. Please do not do this!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3292    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 15:03:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** One of the best things about SF is the amount of amazing dogs, and the freedom they have to play. It's so important that dogs are allowed off leash, for their mental and physical health. Dog owners in SF are well aware of the responsibilities for socializing their animals. I've had a dog in SF for two years and have had nothing but great experiences taking her around the city to parks. I can't imagine what life would be like if we were not allowed to do that. It has become our regular family outings. Please don't go backward and instate mandatory leash laws. They are cruel and unnecessarily burden SF residents.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3293    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 15:03:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge you to change your position. As a dog owner (for all my life) who splits time between San Francisco and Marin, I take advantage of the open areas for my dogs to run. I have noticed that the dog owners that take their dogs to dog friendly areas are all respectful of the surrounding areas, and I have never seen an overly aggressive or dangerous dog. I believe that is because the dog owners are extremely conscious of which dogs should be out in these areas. In addition, keeping a dog on leash often times does not provide the dog with enough exercise (speaking from experience), they are usually kept in the house during the day are waiting to be allowed out to explore. San Francisco and Marin are known for their dog friendly atmospheres, please allow us dog owners to continue to explore and have our dog off leash in certain places.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3294    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 15:13:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

I regularly recreate with my dog across all GGNRA lands and restricting access would greatly reduce the value provided by the parks. They were created as a recreation area and San Franciscans love their dogs (more dogs than children in SF). Eliminating off leash would likely reduce the overall usage of the park as pet owners go to the park to walk their dogs. Cant play fetch? Probably not going to the park.

Thank you,  
Jon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3295    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Livermore, CA 94551  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 15:21:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need more places to bring our dogs off leash in the Bay Area not less. My dog loves all the areas in sf where she can run off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3296    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

It is a great privilege to be able to walk with my dog off leash in the GGNRA. I support keeping areas open that currently allow dogs off-leash, as there are already many parks that ban dogs entirely, and fewer and fewer places where families can go with their dogs for exercise. Recently my family and I visited Stinson Beach with our dog, and even during the winter there were many dogs in the off leash areas, all were under control of their owners, and I never witnessed any issues with people not picking up after their dogs. It was a wonderful experience.

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is too restrictive and will prevent me from being able to repeat the Stinson Beach experience I just described.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there has not been a peer-review, or a site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. There is already vast areas of public land where dogs are not permitted, sometimes for specific reasons, but please do not reduce the amount of dog-friendly, off-leash areas already established in the GGNRA.

Sincerely,  
Elyse McIntire

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3297    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive and I don't even have a dog!. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3298    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 15:25:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not close public access to our families. We pay our taxes and believe that we should be allowed to use our public land as much as anyone else. Please reconsider closing these beaches to dogs. they need a place to run and it is getting very difficult to find places that you can go.

Thank you

Ben Nickerson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3299    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 15:27:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ken Mancuso

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3300	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 15:28:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ken Mancuso

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3301	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 15:28:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Gereau

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3302	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Bloomfield, CT 06002 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 15:32:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

Please restore the 1979 Pet Policy for the GGNRA and do not go forward with this dog management plan. So many people get enjoyment from walking their dogs off leash. Given the fact that the GGNRA owns about half of the parkland in SF, it is very unreasonable to end this activity or to marginalize these park users by placing them in pens. The overwhelming majority of dog owners in SF have proven themselves to be responsible - organizing park clean up days, participating in committees to find common ground with the NPS, and keeping their dogs under control. If there are individuals who do not control their dogs, those individuals should be ticketed. The United States does not use a policy of collective punishment and guilt; it holds individuals accountable for their behavior. This proposed plan punishes a large group of park users on the basis of allegations against a few and unsubstantiated allegations about the effects of off-leash dogs. The area was formed as a recreational one and was supposed to be aimed at ensuring recreational opportunities for those in SF Bay area. This management plan goes against that enabling legislation for the GGNRA.

I do not live in San Francisco, but have visited the GGNRA and enjoyed seeing the dogs at Funston. They were few in number and well behaved on the day I visited. It would sadden me greatly to think that the joy of those people and animals has been denied for the benefit of national interest groups and bureaucracy. It would be a shame. Please restore the 1979 Pet Policy!

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3303	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 15:34:30				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Mirit Cohen (& Jasmine, my dog)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3304	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Santa Cruz, CA 95065				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 15:39:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Steve Okamoto

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3305	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 15:44:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Committee Members,

Thank you for taking the time to solicit input from the citizens of our potentially impacted communities. It is a testament to the thoroughness of the committee and its recognition of the gravity of this debate. I would like to start by requesting the committees acknowledgement that our dog owner community is currently already drastically discriminated against in its access to our Bay Area parks. In Marin County, families with dogs are permitted access to merely 1% o our parks land! This alongside the fact the recent surveys show nearly 40% o all Californians are dog owners.

As frequent users of parks, dog owners are often the most committed volunteers to park maintenance and fund raising. In addition, our parks are funded equally by all tax payers, dog owner or not. This discrimination alone should give any fair analysis pause before considering further reduction of dog friendly public space.

Lastly, I would like to address the economic sense of further restricting parks from dog friendly space. Any tightening of dog restrictions would naturally require additional resources for policing and enforcing said policies. With our park systems already under intense financial pressures (park closings, etc.), could our park dollars not be better spent reopening and maintaining our parks system instead of degrading the experience of some the parks systems biggest advocates and supporters?

In closing, I ask you to please reconsider any changes to our current dog friendly park space. It is unfairly over-limited as it is and to add to this discrimination makes little sense as it relates to economic factors and general equality.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3306    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 15:50:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet



policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3307    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 16:01:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my opinion that any new regulations and restrictions to dog walking policy in the GGNRA should reflect fairness to responsible dog owners.

Understanding that there are always outliers in any population who disregard the importance of rules protecting the environment and public safety, I am concerned that the majority of dog owners who take time to train obedient dogs will be unfairly punished.

The transgressions of the few careless or disrespectful dog owners should not necessitate a broad punitive policy mitigating the freedom of considerate dog owners who pick up after their dogs and keep their dogs under control in public when off leash.

I believe enhancing policing and fines for irresponsible dog owners is a better alternative to curbing the rights and freedoms of all dog walkers. When trained to obey, dogs need not be a hazard to the environment nor the individual and such freedom perpetuates a healthy relationship between the public, their dogs and the GGNRA.

Sincerely,

gary hennemuth

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3308    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 16:03:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet

---

policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Elise McRoberts

I moved here because this is a dog loving city and now why would you try to change that?! THIS IS APPALLING!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3309	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 16:14:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello...				

I am writing as a responsible dog owner hoping to retain my ability to allow my dog to thrive, off lease, at Crissy Field. As with most complex issues, compromise seems the logical approach.

At Crissy Field, dogs on leash on the path and East Beach so families and joggers are unmolested by off-leash dogs. On the West Beach, allow dogs off-lease to romp and play and give and experience joy. This is not too much to ask.

In the Presidio, dogs off-lease at and after dusk.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marvin Weinbaum

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3310	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Montara Dog Group Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 16:22:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I'm a 30 year resident of the Bay Area, and for all that time I've had dogs and have enjoyed walking with them on the many trails and beaches that have been open to them - more and more of which are being restricted and no longer welcome to me. As such I strongly oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative which would severely restrict and further limit areas where we can go. The GGNRA is an urban recreation area, not a National Park, and should not be treated as such. I have walked my dogs, both on and mostly off-leash, in the Rancho Corral de Tierra area and Fort Funston for the last 27 years, and have not once had a problem with hikers, mountain bikers, or horses, or with other dogs. Responsible owners like me leash up whenever necessary, and clean up after our dogs, leaving no adverse environmental impact. There have been no factual studies of dog impacts to the areas in question - and as the area has been open to dogs for decades the habitat is obviously surviving, and thriving, in its current state. Under the proposed plan there would be nowhere in San Mateo County GGNRA lands for off-leash walking. Rancho has been off-leash for decades - that is the status quo, and it should be maintained. The

---

document presented by the GGNRA does not correctly describe the current situation at Rancho, and has not adequately allowed for monitoring existing and future activity. I support the No-Action Alternative - leave things as they are and do not restrict us further!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3311 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 16:25:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the off leash land of the GGNRA Off Leash. Dogs need to run free. We in San Francisco are responsible dog owners. We value our relationships with mans best friend.The thousands of dog owners rely on the continued off leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3312 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I take my dog to Muir Beach and the surrounding trails on a DAILY basis. Loosing access would mean having to DRIVE to an area outside of the GGNRA.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

As a local resident I have not witnessed any issues with having dogs off leash on the beach or on-leash on the trails. I have NEVER witnessed a dog directly interacting with wildlife. I have on many occasions, however, witnessed tourists that are bussed in on NPS buses by the thousands annually, harass wildlife such as seals, otters and birds.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

`e Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3313 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 16:57:17**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Hello there,

I am writing in regards to the new laws surrounding leashes in parks in SF area. I am a volunteer with the SPCA. I bring my dogs into children's hospitals, old folks homes, and mentally disabled clinics. My dogs provide peace and tranquility to people who need it. When they are off leash at parks they also provide this same helpful emotional response to those around them. Allowing for these k9s to be off leash in these areas is what gives our City pride and makes it the the City that it is. I understand federal laws are suppose to be all encompassing for all Cities in the US, but these laws are not appropriate for San Francisco or it's residents. We are a warm and welcoming city. And allowing dogs to be in our parks is part of the reason why. I strongly disagree with these new laws and I truly hope that you as our representatives do the right thing. Thank you for the consideration.

Irving Samuel Brown

415-310-8026

1416 Grant Ave #30

San Francisco, CA 94133

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3314	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 17:00:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Steven Rappaport

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3315	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 17:04:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Allyson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3316 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 17:14:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing in support of dogs and their owners. I can't imagine Crissy Field where dogs have to be restrained on leash. I have been bringing my dogs to Crissy Field and the beach for the past 16 years. The pure joy that I see in my dogs eyes as they romp on the beach and in and out of the surf truly warms my heart. I am so disgusted that the GGNRA cannot seem to come up with a compromise. There needs to be an area where dogs are allowed off leash. There is that second small stretch of beach where the families do not typically gather, favoring the first beach in front of the parking lot. What is the issue? The plovers? The plovers have the whole coast of California to choose from! And not all dogs chase birds...mine certainly don'tâ€they are happy to fetch sticks in the water, chase their frisbee and play with other dogs. Stinson Beach has it figured outâ€one part of the beach is no dogs and the other part is dogs!

PLEASE do right by the dogs, their owners and other people who just enjoy seeing dogs and people SO HAPPY!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3317 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 17:14:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in the Bay Area most of my life and only in the last 7 years have owned a dog. I am an avid walker, jogger, bicyclist, and over all outdoor nature fan. Through the years I have been up and down the northern coast and feel very connected to the national, state and local parks. I'm a fire captain by trade and understand the need for rules and regulations to make access fair.

With this said, I feel immensely that a reduction in off leash area in our beautiful Bay Area is such a non-justifiable proposal. Dogs are such an important part of our family and my 6 year old daughter walks and exercises with the whole family. We get such a tremendous enjoyment and connection with our community and neighboring communities by walking as a family in off leash areas. It creates a tremendous feeling of pride and allows us to not only bond as a family but bond with other walkers who may or may not have dogs. When our small dog runs and interacts with other people and other dogs, his spirit and being contributes to what the Bay Area is truly about. Please do not reduce the space that dogs are currently allowed off leash.

Even before I owned a dog, I never felt that off leash dogs were an issue. I've never had a negative experience with dogs prior to owning my dog and the only bad experience I had while walking my little 10 pound mutt was with another owner who was not being reasonable about his responsibility. This is only one occurs de in well over 7 years in an area that there are more dogs than people. I consider this pretty darn good as I've had a few more run ins with other parents who weren't watching their children at the playground and were being too rough with the kids around them.

Again, I am asking please do not reduce off leash access for dogs. I believe it would severely have a much greater impact (overcrowding the off leash areas) and make the community even more divisive between dog groups and the NPS.

Thank you for your time.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3318	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 17:21:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	For most our dogs are a part of our family and there is nothing better than having space for off leash walks/hikes. It's the highlight of our human and dogs days. Banning this joy is just tragic.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3319	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 17:26:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi,				

My husband and I begin every morning at 6 A.M. by taking our labradoodle, Charlie, to Crissy Field. We treasure the quiet moments in the morning, walking on the beach, watching the sun rise, feeling the sense of community while we engage with other walkers and dog owners as Charlie runs free on the West beach. Often we return, mid-day, to the beach to throw a ball into the water and delight in Charlie being able to swim. He is well behaved and has never been other than a delight to all who enjoy his exuberance and freedom being off leash.

I am very comfortable with designating one area of the beach, West Beach, to being an off leash area and prohibiting dogs from East Beach. I have voiced this for some time and believe those individuals with

children, people picnicking, people who don't appreciate dogs or those fearful of dogs should have an area where they could go and not have to deal with dogs. It would make most sense to reserve East Beach for this purpose and to designate West Beach to being off-leash. I believe this would be the fairest compromise.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3320    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 17:27:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do NOT allow dogs off-leash in the GGNRA. Off-leash dogs are more likely to wander from owners and harm sensitive habitat, as well potentially attacking on-leash pets, as well as hikers. Public health and safety, as well as that of sensitive habitats, first please!

Greg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3321    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 17:30:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in favor of most of the provisions of the NPS preferred alternative F, however, I do not believe this alternative properly protects the interests of plants, wildlife or visitors in the Marin Headlands, or at Crissy Field.

The Marin Headlands trails have a diverse mix of plant and animal species that should be protected from the presence of dogs. It is uniquely possible at the Headlands to experience complex ecosystem diversity including chance encounters with animals unusually near a major city. The presence and/or recent presence of dogs whether on or off leash seriously limits those opportunities and degrades the visitor experience, to say nothing of the potential harmful influence of the presence of dogs on these plants and animals. I would urge you to consider a no dogs policy on Marin Headlands trails. Under Alternative F dog walkers would be free to let dogs off leash along the beach there, and that seems compromise enough.

Even though Alternative F prohibits dogs in the wildlife protection area it allows dogs, in some cases totally off leash, into areas adjacent to, and used by resident, migrating and vagrant birds. It also allows dogs onto beach areas where the potential for future interaction with marine mammals is high. ROLAs in the airfield area are too close to protected areas, and the airfield has already hosted a number of migrant and rare vagrant bird species that would be impacted by the numbers of dogs and owners drawn to designated ROLAs in that area. I would urge you to consider more restrictions on dogs at Crissy Field including the elimination of ROLAs along the main airfield.

Thank you for considering these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3322    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 17:39:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

This is the main place in my home area that is easily accessible to me.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Swan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3323    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 17:40:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider your plan to eliminate dogs from the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Dogs are already banned from 99% of the GGNRA - there is no need to further limit their presence.

As a medical professional, I know how important it is - for both physical and emotional health - that people stay active and enjoy the outdoors. Dogs have been shown to improve physical fitness and provide multiple psychological benefits.\* Dogs encourage people to get outside, be active, and enjoy this area of natural beauty that has been set aside expressly for that purpose.

The GGNRA is set aside for the people of California, the United States and the world, and we desire to enjoy it with our dogs. Do not take away our ability to do so.

\*I encourage you to read the literature: for example, Wohlfarth, et al, "Dogs motivate obese children for physical activity" or Krause-Parello, et al "Human-canine interaction: exploring stress indicator response patterns of salivary cortisol and immunoglobulin A." Krause-Porello writes that "interactions with canines may help to reduce the biological effects of stress that influences human health," while Wohlfarth found that "the presence of a therapy dog has the potential to increase physical activity in obese children."



---

**Correspondence ID:** 3324    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 17:40:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Nel Ellwein

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3325    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 17:42:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose your plan to restrict the use of GGNRA by dogs and their owners. I have used the Crissy Field area four days a week for thirty years for walking and jogging and have never encountered a problem with a single dog either on or off leash.

I am particularly concerned that you are proposing to restrict the on-leash areas and am curious how you have come to believe that you have such authority. With regard to maintaining the current off-leash areas, I'm sure there is a win-win solution that could be implemented. For instance, there are features of the so-called Boulder Plan which could be used to hold dog owners accountable and make your task easier without having to do away with most existing off-leash areas.

As a San Francisco resident with a dog of my own, I am very concerned that your restrictive plan will place an undue burden on the City Park system with regard to dog usage.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3326    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 17:59:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would be very upset about the drastic reduction in areas where I can let my very benign, obedient and small dog off leash. It is more recreational, less stressful for both, me and the dog, to be able to take a walk with off leash. My dog does not even have a bowel movements as readily when confined by a leash. Imagine how you would feel!

Dogs cannot play when they are on leash. I cannot afford the time and money to drive long distances, to be able to walk my dog.

Please do not restrict current off leash areas !

Thanks, Tatjana

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3327 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:03:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an outdoor enthusiast, conversationalist and dog owner, I want to ensure that our public spaces continue to be open for off-leash dogs. I do think education around bird safety, and waste are important, but I rely on places like Chrissy Field and Fort Funston to exercise with my dog.

Please don't shut these essential places down to dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3328 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

I am a resident of Muir Beach and a dog owner, and I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to my neighborhood beach, Muir Beach and the surrounding leash-friendly trails in the GGNRA. If the Alternative F plan is implemented it will have a devastating effect on the many residents of Marin County and the surrounding areas who currently use the available dog-friendly GGNRA open spaces in a responsible manner.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area, including the many people who have dogs in the Bay Area. The GGNRA is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,  
Ellen Callaway

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3329	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog lover and bird lover, I have read and agree with the following statement from the Golden Gate Audobon Society about dog management plans for the GGNRA.				

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€¢ We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.  
â€¢ Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.  
â€¢ Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3330	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 18:05:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern:				

I support restricting dog activity wherever possible, including abolishing any off-leash exceptions in the GGNRA and tightening any and all existing rules regarding dog - - and, necessarily, dog owner - - conduct.

As an avid devotee of the GGNRA trails and beaches, I can say without reservation that my dog and dog-owner encounters as a runner, hiker, biker, and beach comber are overwhelmingly negative. From getting rushed by dogs both on and off leash, invariably jumped on, scratched (to the point of bleeding), and having my clothes torn, my picnics absconded with, my little kids growled at and pounced, and my trail shoes more often than not besmirched with dog poop, I am awash in major dog vexation. The trails are sullied, the environs trampled, the wildlife and people barraged with bad behavior - - both canine and human - - and anyone enjoying the GGNRA must constantly remain on the defensive, lest an "Oh, he's really friendly" dog seemingly leap out of nowhere to rattle the quiescence and beauty of the trails.

Dog is NOT my copilot. The natural splendor of the GGNRA is. Please, protect both the landscape - - and the nature lovers endeavoring to bask in it.

Sincerely,

Kris Malone Grossman  
Mill Valley, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3331	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	berkeley, CA 94707 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 18:07:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please have some empathy for the struggles of wildlife in an urban environment. Dogs are great company and fun for human beings, and most dog owners are responsible citizens. But please realize that there are enough irresponsible dog owners in the bunch to create a problem. Please, please keep the dogs-on-leash law on the books. Let the birds and other wild creatures can have some peace and safety in our urban parklands.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3332	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 18:08:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Ahoy NPS:				

My old black lab Sasha lived to 16 and a half, and we often visited the various areas of the GGNRA. Sasha was always on a leash. That dog would obey every command I gave her, and would come when called, but I always left her on leash because the wildlife in the GGNRA was more important. In Sasha's later years we avoided Fort Funston; off-leash dogs have spoiled what was once a beautiful dunes habitat. Off-leash dogs are a menace at Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and a dozen other locations - - none of which I have been comfortable bringing my children to. I understand that the GGNRA is a recreation area, but when some say that that word - - recreation - - trumps any interest in wildlife or conservation they are forgetting the basic tenants of good stewardship. The land and the flora and fauna are not our toys. Even in a recreation area, they deserve a great deal more respect than we currently give them. Some idiot dog chasing birds along Ocean Beach is not recreation - - or if it is, then it is the basest form of recreation. Please treat our parks, or lands, our flora and our fauna, and yes please treat our dogs, with respect, and

ban all off-leash dogs in the GGNRA.

Thanks, Thomas McCarthy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3333    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:09:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to submit a comment in support of the implementation of stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I treasure the GGNRA not only for the recreational opportunities that it affords, but also (and especially) for the habitat it provides for wildlife. In particular, nesting, migrating, and wintering birds rely on the habitats in the GGNRA to survive. I have witnessed harassment of wildlife by off-leash dogs several times in the GGNRA, and I have been harassed myself by off-leash dogs. In fact, I avoid areas in the GGNRA where dogs are allowed to run by their owners. I strongly urge the NPS to designate more trails and areas (e.g., beaches) as off limits to dogs. Furthermore, I recommend that the areas in which dogs are not allowed be clearly marked, and ideally, fenced off to prevent dogs from crossing into protected areas. I do not feel like we can rely on dog owners to restrict their pets. I strongly urge park officials to enforce regulations concerning dogs in the GGNRA more consistently and forcefully. There are currently over 20 miles of trails, etc. available for dog owners. I realize that dog owners have a powerful voice. I also realize that dog owners love their pets and often extend privileges to them that ultimately infringe on the rights of others (humans and wildlife). I urge the NPS to fulfill its obligations to people who do not own dogs (and do not wish to be harassed by dogs) and to wildlife. I strongly urge you to implement the proposed dog-control plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

Thank you very much,  
Andrew Rush

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3334    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** JeepNey Projects Worldwide Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:11:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a concerned citizen regarding the issue of dogs running wild in city parks and Nat'l Parks in San Francisco and elsewhere. I often go birding in golden Gate Park, the Presidio, Ocean Beach, El Polin Springs, and Glen Park Canyon. In all of these places I see dogs running through wildlife habitat chasing birds and trammeling native plants and shrubs and owners willfully letting them. Dog owners and walkers often disregard signage that states they are to be ON LEASH! Some of the owners are respectful and apologize when this is pointed out. Some are hostile.

On Ocean Beach I see dogs chasing the Endangered Snowy Plover!!  
Please find a solution and limit dogs and dog owners and dog walkers from ruining the parks, wildlife habitat and harassing wildlife.

Thank you, David Tomb

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3335    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I believe in all of the above statements, even though I am a dog owner who abides by the rules in parks and on sidewalks, whether at Pt. Isabel or Berkeley's Aquatic Park or my local parks.

I believe in all of the above, even though I am a dog 'savant' who works with all sorts of dogs at Berkeley Animal Control Services, walking them safely around Aquatic Park in Berkeley.

Dog lovers and dog guardians who are real animal lover know that stray dogs can kill or hurt wildlife. In any case, the arguments for unlimited access are almost purely subjective and don't take into account the need to protect wildlife.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3336    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area:

1) We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

2) Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

3) Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

Sincerely,  
John Klopacz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3337    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:16:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Steve Capell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3338    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:20:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep Crissy Field and all of the National Park in San Francisco off leash, free for dogs to run and hike with their owners. Dogs need a place to run and exercise what cannot be done in enclosed urine flooded, flea infested dog runs in the parks.

San Francisco dog owners are responsible, and keep their dogs under control.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3339    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94017  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:20:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Cory Wallace

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3340	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94613 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 18:22:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I love dogs, but in the context of national parks, I think native wildlife must take priority over companion animals. I support the GGNRA's efforts to limit dog walking, especially off-leash, in areas needing protection.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3341	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94703 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 18:22:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm writing in support of Alternative D: Most Protective of Resources and Visitor Safety.				

I am a frequent hiker and birdwatcher on GGNRA lands both in San Francisco and in Marin County. Additionally, I am a wildlife biologist.

1. We are familiar with the numerous examples of dogs flushing wildlife within GGNRA. There are multiple studies proving that bird stress hormones levels rise even when birds do not run or fly away from the stress-provoking situations. In other words, the impact on wildlife by large concentrations of dogs is likely even greater than we realize.

2. As a wildlife biologist and birdwatcher, being able to observe wildlife is one of the richest experiences our national park lands offer. Over the years, I would estimate that 50% of my wildlife watching in NPS lands open to dog walking are cut short because canines have flushed the wildlife I am trying to observe and enjoy.

3. Listening to dog owners yell at dogs supposedly under voice control is very unpleasant. As a birdwatcher, my ears are constantly working at interpreting bird vocalizations. I recreate on NPS lands to enjoy natural sounds, not to listen to intrusive shouting.

4. I have had an especially difficult time on the Bolinas Ridge trail above Olema in Marin County. If I

---



recall correctly dogs are permitted, but only on leashes. I frequently and cheerfully asked dog owners to keep their dogs on leashes and have twice now been subjected to abuse including not just an angry tone of voice but also multiple unrepeatable expletives. This is my public land,, too!

I respectfully ask that the NPS support Alternative D, although I would prefer that dogs were outlawed completely from GGNRA. Thank you for consideration of my views.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3342    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:26:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service, in order to address both the needs of dog owners and of wildlife, needs to adopt effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We all must share the habitat. Birds- a few of them are endangered - should be free of being chased or killed by dogs, dogs need a place to run free, and people, who do not want to interact with dogs should be able to go for a walk.

I respectfully ask that there be clearly marked areas for off-leash dogs with boundaries of some sort and areas that are for wildlife and people with no off-leash dogs. The areas that restrict dogs to leashes need to be patrolled so that the leash restriction is enforced. It is unfair to the birds, wildlife, and some people to have no areas that restrict dogs. This is exactly what occurs if there is lackadaisical enforcement. It is also unfair to push the enforcement responsibility off on the general public who may not be equipped to deal with aggressive people or dogs.

GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward having a balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3343    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3344	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland , CA 94605 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 18:31:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think it isn't too much to expect people to keep their dogs on a leash in the park. They should be glad the dogs are allowed in the park at all. This is not THAT dog's habitat, but it is the habitat and home of many of those other creatures who are there when people and their dogs visit.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3345	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Napa, CA 94558 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.				

---

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas, if any, should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes. Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

---

I am generally opposed to dogs, period. Especially in large public areas where dog owners, for some reason, feel it is ok for their dogs to roam uncontrolled, disturbing wildlife and other citizens.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward protecting wildlife and meeting the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, particularly with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas, if indeed such areas are deemed desirable at all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3346    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:37:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA is in a an important position to balance the uses of its parks. While dogs are increasingly popular and need recreation space, supporting our special wildlife is equally important. Over the years I have seen how dogs have severely eroded Fort Funston's grounds and how dog lovers enjoy watching their pets chase foraging birds on the beaches. How will Kildeer and Snowy Plovers lay eggs with romping dogs everywhere? Knowing how hard that is on the wildlife makes me deeply sad. Some species are getting driven out of San Francisco.

Stand up for restricting dogs from the best wildlife areas and draw distinct and clear boundaries and police them. Educate people about the damage to habitats by unaware pet owners and other visitors.

I think there should be some beach are available to dogs in San Mateo County, but protect our wildlife as much as possible. It is our precious natural heritage that cannot be replaced.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3347    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Davis, CA 95618  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Audubon Society, Amer Veterinary Association Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:39:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a retired veterinarian and animal owner. However I am concerned over the irresponsible and intrusive behavoir of many dog owners. I was at an exhibit (not for dogs) and had to trip over ill behaveddogs and stepo over dog feces which were not picked up.

I am a granfather and do not allow my grandsons to run amoke in public places.

Please limit access to dogs on leash only. I am tired od watching dogs chase sea birds in our parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3348    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica , CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3349    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:46:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs are great. Having said that, there's a time and place for everything. Allowing dogs to run off leash in National Parks or any park where wildlife exists, is inappropriate and endangers the health and safety of said wildlife. Two burrowing owls have been killed at Cesar Chavez State park in Berkeley. The irony is that habitat has been provided within the park for the owls to nest... only to have them lose their lives to off lease dogs. The bottom line is that all dogs should be on lease at all times. The only exception for this would be in enclosed areas where wildlife and other people are not prone to disturbances of any kind. I find it maddening and irresponsible that dog owners often ignore the off leash ordinances that do exist and that are clearly posted. There are 2 reasons for this One, many dog owners have a sense of entitlement. Two, there is no enforcement.

In any case, I support any and all limitations that the GGNRA attempts to put in to place that go toward the protection and well being of other species. These limitations will also go a long way in keeping the parks clean.

Good luck!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3350    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:47:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs on lease in special dog areas only. The dogs have the entire city, they don't need to be let loose to terrify birds and other wildlife which must be protected.

Monday I was walking in Crissy Field. There was a great blue heron in the marsh. A dog kept barking at it, scaring the creature. If it was not fenced, the dog would have attacked the bird. The bird is only protected behind the fence and is not free to roam, as dogs are always running around that area.

Manage the dogs, protect the wildlife!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3351    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:50:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties since 1997.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Michelle Fallone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3352    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:50:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the Park Service in its Draft Dog Management plan. I am a dog owner and I think that pet owners need to acknowledge the fact that we need to protect the natural flora and fauna that call our parks home. It would be different if all pet owners and dog walkers were responsible and there were less of them, but that is not the case Also, not everyone who visits our park appreciates the ever present dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3353    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:52:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs should be leashed in marked areas. Many dog walkers pay no attention to signs or keeping their dogs on a leash and under control. I am often blocked by dogs that jump up on me. As a 78 year old, this is a constant hazard.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3354    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:52:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 12, 2014

Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent Dean,

Hello, my name is Marnie Wright and I have lived in San Francisco since 1977. I have always had a dog or two and spend at least 2 hours a day with them in The Presidio, Crissy Field and the Marin Headlands when I can. I cannot imagine not being able to enjoy these areas with my dogs. I walk, bike, rollerblade in these areas with my dogs as well as have them swim in the bay. Being able to do this with them has added so much to my life and theirs. I have made so many friends, met several boyfriends and a husband because of these experiences.

Please do not limit the areas where we can enjoy this beautiful land and water with our 4-legged friends. The Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS arrangements are not fair and deeply flawed. Since the GGNRA 1972 plans were intended for long term use, it seems that this specific recreational use should continue for years for come. I am all for supporting the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential. The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Please take a balanced, fact-based approach to the environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Marnie Wright

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3355    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 18:55:20**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dog owners are an organized and noisy group, but they don't reflect the views of the majority of those of us who love and appreciate the GGNRA. As a dog lover, I still think that:

dogs need to be more carefully regulated in the GGNRA;  
off-leash areas need to be fully enclosed;  
clear and effective enforcement is necessary for success.

The plan rightfully protects fragile species and habitat while still allowing dogs and their guardians to enjoy the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3356 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 19:00:42**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I think that it is WAY past time to let everyone enjoy the GGNRA, not just people with dogs.

I like dogs (I had one for over 15 years), but I didn't let Tippy jump up on other people; I didn't let Tippy shove his nose into someone; and I didn't let Tippy get into fights with other dogs. I cleaned up after him, and respected others' rights to enjoy the park we were in.

I have young nephews and I routinely avoid taking these boys to areas and parks where dogs are not controlled. These parks and areas have dog poop almost everywhere and make playing or picnicking not very inviting.

I also worry about dogs jumping on the boys or even attacked by unleashed dogs.

I have been attacked by unleashed dogs, bitten by a few, and often with the owner saying "oh he's friendly."

Open spaces are funded for the enjoyment of everyone, not just a few. I am strongly in favor of requiring dogs to be leashed, in greatly limiting where dogs may be off leash, and in citing dog owners who violate those rules.

These simple and responsible actions will allow all of us to enjoy our parks and open areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3357 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** El Granada, CA 94018  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 19:13:32**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I had the opportunity to meet you personally at three of the GGNRA Dog management meetings. Herewith i am reaffirming that as a long term resident of the coast i have been walking generations of my dog companions in the GGNRA for three decades. It has been a recreational, energizing and healthy time for us, also rewarded by the resulting socialization with neighbors and the community. This has been the character of our region.

As such, again I'm expressing my concern and opposition to the 'preferred alternative' described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is frighteningly restrictive and would prevent me and my dog from many years of the healthy recreation, enjoyed over so many years.

It is my appeal for you to hear us, to listen to our request to maintain the GGNRA a RECREATION AREA as opposed to the planed drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Remaining hopeful of your understanding,  
Cordially,  
Mike

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3358	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 19:13:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Unless there are dire consequences for allowing dogs to have free range of the GGNRA parks, dog owners should have the freedom to allow their dogs to run freely. It appears that passing legislation would have higher, unnecessary costs than just keeping these areas of recreation at the status quo.				

I understand that there are isolated events where dogs may interrupt the breeding/nesting of endemic birds, but for the most part, dog owners are very responsible in controlling their dogs.

Please understand that having a dog on-leash is NOT the same as having a dog off-leash. Dogs should be able to run around by themselves without the constraint of leashes in these great outdoor areas. Keep in mind that dog owners also enjoy the freedom of watching their dogs roam around happily.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3359	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 19:24:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support a more balanced wildlife and dog management plan. WE NEED BETTER DOG MANAGEMENT. Please do your best thing for nature! As someone who enjoys the quietness of				

---



nature and observing rare and migrating bird species - I hope that you will protect our wildlife areas.

thank you!

Sean

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3360    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.  
We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.  
Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.  
The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3361    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94707  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 19:34:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Some part of the shoreline adjacent to Crissy Field should be dog-free in consideration for the aged and children who may be afraid of dogs. The Presidio is a National Park is owned by the people of the United States and not by the dog-owners of the adjacent neighborhood,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3362    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Private user Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 19:35:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I regularly go to Ocean beach to walk. I have never ever seen a dog on leash. I regularly see dogs chase birds. I also have seen on numerous occasions where someone just buries their dogs poo in the sand!!! Excuse me, but little kids and adults like to dig in the sand. These people seem to think it doesn't matter. Our City has become over run with dogs and there does need to be controls on where they can be off leash and it needs to be enforced, please. I am afraid of big dogs and I therefore

---

avoid Crissy field (which used to be my FAVORITE place to run and hang out with my kids - no more) and Fort Funston.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3363    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Tax payer & Park user Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My wife and I are avid hikers and birders who extensively use the GGNRA trails and outdoor space from Pt Reyes to the Presidio to Sweeney Ridge. There is seldom a time that we are out for a day of outdoor recreation when we do not come into contact with dog owners who are violating the requirements that their pets be absent or on a leash to protect the wildlife that lives there.

Whether it is on Ocean Beach, Muir Woods, or Pierce Point we have to constantly remind some of our fellow recreationists that they have certain responsibilities to leave their four-footed at home so that we all can enjoy the outdoors that we share. Our entreaties are inevitably met with a sheepish response that they just didn't know that dogs were not allowed in this particular part of paradise.

Whether or not their apparently disingenuous response is an honest one, it has become very clear to both of us that the National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Specifically, we need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs, and they must be clearly marked as such.

Also, when there are off-leash areas, they should be well delineated by using signage, ropes, fencing or, ideally, clear natural borders such as bushes or streams.

And finally and most importantly, GGNRA officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously. Dog owners must be made aware of where their pets are not allowed, and what the penalties are if they do not adhere to those rules.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing where needed for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3364    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Sequoia Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 20:01:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I'm strongly in favor of a peaceful, dog-free nature experience in GGNRA

Please institute limitations on dog areas, and fencing for off-leash areas.

I support better dog management and safe, sustainable use of the GGNRA!  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3365    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 20:02:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** First and foremost, the GGNRA should be for the people to enjoy the native flora and fauna found there. Not to be terrorized by dogs racing around off leash. Dogs and their owners have gotten out of control. Please enforce some semblance of dog control. Parks are for people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3366    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 20:05:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** From my perspective as a board member of the state Audubon program, I can share that there's been substantial research into the frightening decline of dozens of once-common bird species. One of these is the Snowy Plover, but other species also use our beaches and parks.

Each moment of stress wears down any organism, whether it's human, avian, canine. Much of the stress is natural and part of our surviving life. Some is unnatural, such as glass-lined skyscrapers or cereal-based dog food or heavy metals in our seafood.

Wherever possible, we all benefit when we reduce unnecessary stresses on ourselves and those with whom we share this planet. A simple way to do this is to allow threatened species the privilege of winter roosting on our beaches, or the protection from nest predation, or the reduction of building lighting at night when neotropical species migrate through our Western skies.

I ask that the NPS listens to conservation specialists and wildlife supporters as we attempt to speak for those without human voices, asking that measures be taken to minimize the harm done to birds by dogs off leash.

Thanks for this opportunity to comment,

Mark Mushkat

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3367    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Respectfully submitted.

I love dogs and enjoy greeting them when I'm out walking but, there are some places that are just not appropriate for them off-leash and that is within th GGNRA. I have personally witnessed birds being routed out and chased by an off-leash dog while the owner is totally obivious to it or the poop that it is leaving behind. The area being considered for no off-leash is small compared to the amount of areas that are available to them. Please allow the wildlife of the GGNRA to exist without the invasion and trauma of dogs off-leash.

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

Sincerely, Jean Reinys

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3368	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Anne Rogers

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3369	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94104				
	United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 20:13:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in support of the continuation of the off the leash at Crissy Field. My wife and I go there a lot and we really enjoy the exuberance and pleasure to dogs show when they're running around. They come up to us sometimes but our only problem is getting licked and that a wonderful thing. Let them run free, please.

Thomas and Victoria Berman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3370    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530-1539

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 20:15:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'll keep it very short and simple. I do not hike where dogs are allowed on trails. Dogs reduce the chance of seeing wildlife, they make noise that detracts from the sound of quiet and of nature, they leave feces on the trail, and they require attention to judge if they could cause harm when I meet them on a trail. Domesticated animals, like dogs, put a stress on wild animals and do not belong in non-domesticated places.

Please add my comments to your records.

Thanks,

Kevin Kingma

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3371    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 20:18:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** GGNRA is the only US National Park that allows off-leash dogs, one would assume because much of it lies within the borders of San Francisco, a city with an astonishing number of dogs in it, and an astonishing number of dog-owners. Well and good. But certainly any rational person will admit that a National Park is not reserved for the use of off-leash dogs. And yet that is the effect of allowing unrestricted off-leashing dogging. Free-running dogs relentlessly chase birds and other wildlife. They are hard-wired for it. Free-running dogs relieve themselves anywhere, often out of sight of owners would normally pick up their animals' waste. Free-running dogs bother people who are not particularly amused by dogs; they sometimes frighten children and sometimes jump on them; they can create an atmosphere of rambunctiousness and chaos in a place to which many people retreat to enjoy a few hours of peace and natural quiet. Therefore, it seems obvious that dogs should be controlled in this National Park. Their off-leashing should be done in a prescribed fenced-off area. Professional dog-walkers should not be allowed to use a tax-supported park for their businesses. And even leashed dogs should be kept out of certain sensitive areas at certain seasons - for instance the snowy-plover area between Noriega and Taraval Streets. And finally, somehow the GGNRA should be better patrolled. ALL law-abiding people should be

able to enjoy a National Park, and the wildlife in it should protected. I believe this is contained in the National Park Mission Statement. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3372    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 20:19:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in San Francisco for 60 years and Sausalito for the last 1 1/2 years. I have been a dog owner for the last 6 years and am very familiar with Crissy Field, the Marin Headlands, and Mt Tam. I have always respected the leash requirements in the Presidio (ex., the Ecology Trail, the Bay Ridge Trail, and the route from Julius Kahn to East Beach. No problem. I do have a problem with East and Central Beaches. East Beach should be off leash until 10:00am. Central Beach from the bridge to the snowy plover fence should be off leash all day. The Promenade should be on leash all of the time. I know you can rationalize off leash in the morning, but there are too many walkers, especially older folks. Now here is the solution. Lower the hammer on violations and DOUBLE the fine if the dog is not licensed. You might cut some slack for out of state visitors. Sausalito strictly enforces the bike laws and guess what? The word gets out in the biking community and everyone follows the law.

I am ambivalent about Fort Funston. I refuse to take my dogs there because of all of the dog walkers. This could be solved by limiting the number of dogs. For slubs like me that have 1 or 2 dogs we would have an area to go to that allows us to have a good off leash experience and minimize the damage.

The Marin Headlands is easy. Put an off leash time at Rodeo Beach. There are student groups there during the week. Off leash should be allowed until they would be going down, say 9:00 or 10:00. The only other change would be to allow dogs on leash on the Bobcat Trail so you could go from Fort Cronkite to the Alta trailhead. The number of dogs should be limited to two. This would give responsible dog owners the option of using the Coastal, Miwok, and Bobcat/Alta trails RESPONSIBLY. Once again, put the hammer down on the violators and double the fines for unlicensed dogs.

FYI - When the temperature goes up, I stay away from the beaches. Too many people and children. Don't forget that these are urban areas. Dogs do very little damage. Take a look at Crissy Field after a holiday. People are the problem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3373    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service

While I am generally a supporter of your activities and actions, I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Trail and the Rhubarb Trail, which are two relatively contained and limited trails closely bordering roads and homes and subject to intensive use already.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. We all pay taxes for the right to use recreation areas and while it is fine to enforce restrictions in some areas, these areas get a lot of use and are enjoyed by many - - we are using them for the recreational purposes. I am happy to support recreation areas, but some diversity of activities should be supported.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3374	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 20:23:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am a native San Franciscan and a dog lover. I am also a member of the Golden Gate chapter of the Audubon Society. I support leash laws at the GGNRA because I feel concerned about the degradation of the quality of habitat for flora and fauna due to the many many unleashed packs of dogs that roam the area, many of them under little supervision. I think a long leash is a fine compromise and really the only reason people are against it is that they feel too lazy to walk their dogs at a good clip to exercise them. Also, the dog walkers walk a dozen dogs at once, to rack up fees, and they probably oppose leashes because they want to make the maximum profit by having multiple dogs with them each walk. I hope that the self-entitlement of the dog lobby gets a little reality check - there are wild things still that need our protection - our city cares about the environment - and we can easily coexist if they will abide by leash laws. It is also a quality of life issue for those of us who enjoy walking in the area - roaming packs of dogs cutting across the dunes detract from the beauty of the landscape and disrupt the ecosystem.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3375	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94610-2107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:**  
The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes and Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3376    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 20:29:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed alternative. These areas have forever been a place where dogs can roam free. I know my dog is happiest when she can run freely through the sand and water at the beach. I have always encountered responsible owners who take responsibility for their dogs.

The new proposal is way too restrictive, and will prevent my dog and me from enjoying the daily walks that I have come to love and cherish.

Please keep these areas leash free!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3377    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 20:30:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service:

I am writing to convey my views on dog access to the GGNRA.

I respect the life of all living creatures.

I am a dog lover who urges that dogs be required at the very least to be on leash when visiting the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Dogs have many places to roam and enjoy being out of doors. They live in peace in the comfort of our homes, where they are allowed to eat, rest, sleep, and mate, bear and raise their young.

Wild beings do not have those privileges. Indeed, their habitat grows smaller by the minute. They cannot eat, rest, sleep, mate or bear or raise their young in peace. These wild beings need a voice among us to speak on their behalf.

This dog lover wishes dogs were barred from entering the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We have many doggie-parks and other places for our pets.

Wild creatures- -Snowy Plovers, Great Blue Heron, and other wild beings- -are limited to habitat that is getting smaller and smaller. I very much hope that the coming generations of human beings are able to see these beautiful beings who today still live within viewing distance.



I urge the reasonable course: do what we need to do to allow wild creatures the safety and comfort of their homes in the GGNRA while we and our pets live in peace in our homes and designated parks.

Thank you for considering my perspective. I very much hope you share it.

Respectfully,  
Judith M. Frank

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3378	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 20:35:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent Frank Dean,				

I am writing you to oppose all of the Preferred Alternative F's in your dog management plan. I am asking that you go with Alternative A in every recreation area. It is my opinion as a resident of the Bay Area, not a visitor as you like to call us, that things are perfect the way they are. According to your own statistics, dog incidents account for such a small percentage of the problems. To funnel dogs to smaller and smaller areas is a sure way to cause problems. But I have a sneaking suspicion that that's exactly what you want. Problems with dogs so you can completely ban them from our recreation area. Shame on you. As a woman, I would not feel safe hiking trails without the protection of my dog. And it is down right absurd to think people should to leash dogs while on the beach. That's like taking your kids to an amusement park and not letting them go on the rides. Maybe you'd do that, but I certainly would not. Dogs do not damage the environment, people do including your own Park Service. So I want to make it very clear, do not go through with this insane dog plan. We live here, this is our backyard not some national park. And while I am on the subject, please stop referring to this as a national park because it's a recreation area that backs up and in some cases intertwines with our neighborhoods. It needs to be managed differently as much as you might not like it. We are a stubborn bunch so if you think you can outlast us, think again. We have dog on our side.

Pam Herz

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3379	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 20:36:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to state my strong opposition to the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan eliminating off leash dog areas. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

I am a proud and active citizen of the beautiful San Francisco Bay Area. We take our dog to Fort Funston

every day and often also go to Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. Dexter is a young, active dog who loves to run along the beach and among the dunes. He plays well with others, people and dogs alike. We are very responsible and make sure to maintain his shots and clean up after him.

I can't imagine not being to take him to Fort Funston and watch him play in the waves while we enjoy the beautiful sunset. Seeing how happy he is, and indeed all the dogs and dog people at Fort Funston, gives me joy and a clear perspective.

Walking Dexter on a leash would be a completely different experience. He and I would be miserable. We couldn't play, I couldn't stop to admire the scenery. We'd both get a lot less exercise. An essential part of why my family loves this city would be gone.

Please reject this unnecessary and overly-strict plan.

Thank you,

Isabelle, Brendan, Alex, Sam and Dexter the Dog

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3380	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 20:37:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I absolutely love to take my dogs to these beaches in San Francisco. What's more is that these are their favorite places to play. They love to splash in the ocean and fetch balls on the sand. I would be so upset if I couldn't let them play off leash, because it's simply their favorite thing to do.!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3381	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 20:48:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet

policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Gavin and Bane

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3382    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach Trail and Miwok Trail. It is a fantastic time where we can both enjoy the beauty of Marin, exercise and it feels great to spend quality time with an animal. It's what being a pet owner is all about.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3383    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 20:51:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am 13 years old and I strongly oppose alternative F because I have a dog, and if you prohibit dogs on most trails then there is no way he can get exercise and have fun. I don't think it is fair to ban a whole species from certain areas. They don't even have a say in it. It's not right to ban them. I don't think it harms the environment because if we hadn't domesticated them, dogs would be running free through nature. It's natural for them. Us humans harm the environment way more than dogs. If you think that dogs would harm the birds, they won't, because last time I checked, birds can fly. I have never seen a dog catch a bird, so I don't think that's the problem. What I think the problem is, is that alternative F is making it so dogs can't run free anymore. I strongly like the way things are now, so there is no justifiable reason for making any changes.

---

Thank you,  
Jackson Fimrite

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3384    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support and hope that the National Park Service adopts stronger and more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I enjoy hiking in the GGNRA and taking out of town guests to hike, birdwatch and picnic. We need a more balanced approach to use. I have seen off leash dogs chasing wildlife, defecating in waterways, and off leash in leashed areas.

1. We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.
2. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.
3. I request that park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. Thank you for it. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3385    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 21:07:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** my parents dislike dogs and when i told them about this, they said they would like dogs to be banned. but i think dogs should be more free and not stay on leashes when they go out to the park. they should be able to run and get some exercise and do what they want. if dogs stay on leashes, they wont be able to get exercise and wont enjoy going to the park anymore. their owners wouldn't enjoy playing with their dog at the park because they have to stay on their leashes. kids that would want to have a dog wont be able to play with them and chase them around. with dog on leashes, dog's and kid's fun with dogs would be gone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3386    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 21:07:10

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a senior citizen with disabilities. My primary form of exercise and socializing is daily walks with my two dogs. I am very responsible about it. I clean up after my dogs, I keep them under voice control and do not allow them to destroy any natural habitat. Your plan to limit where I can walk my dogs will greatly inhibit my routine with my dogs causing me to have to drive many more miles to get to places I can legally walk my dogs off leash. It will limit the distances I can walk to get much needed exercise as most off leash dog areas are very small and will certainly become much more crowded if large expanses like Ocean Beach and Fort Funston are eliminated. Your excuses for eliminating places like Ocean Beach are spurious at best. Most dogs walk or run at the ocean's edge not in the dunes. In fact, the space is so vast that there is never a problem with over crowding and little to no damage to the environment that I can see. At least, not by dogs. Certainly, people leave behind a lot more trash and do a lot more damage than dogs do. I strongly disagree with the GGNRA Plan to limit or even eliminate off leash dog recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3387 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 21:10:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly disagree with this petition and hope that it doesn't come close to being passed. This is a ridiculous proposition. I take my dog to Chrissy Field every weekend, and as a boarder collie in a city, he needs someplace to run around. There are already limited areas for dogs to run off leash. The city has done a horrible job of creating dog parks, so where else do you expect them to get exercise after being cooped up for most of the day?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3388 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 21:16:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We spend almost every weekend walking our dog along the beach as a family. I strongly disagree with the new proportion to enforce leashes on dogs. My dog would not be able to roam freely and exercise! The new proposal is way to restricting. Please think about how many bay area families this would affect. The new law would be much more harmful than helpful. Please keep the area off leash for dogs!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3389 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 21:19:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I want to voice my opposition to Alternative F-the preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access in the Golden Gate National Park. My understanding is that there hasn't been a

single peer-reviewed, site-specific study, as required by law, that supports this plan. How, then, can such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas pass legislation?

I regularly walk my dog on the Miwok in the Golden Gate National Park behind my house. The new restriction would limit that access to my dog and the many dogs in the area, forcing their owners to walk their animals in more densely populated areas where problems between dogs and other recreation users could arise.

My understanding is that restricting this area to dog walkers also conflicts with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's original charter to safeguard this area for people and pets alike.

For these reasons, I support Alternative A, the no action alternative.

Sincerely,

Molly K. Hartle

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3390	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Ms. Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 21:19:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the National Park Service's new rules that would better protect wildlife in the GGNRA and provide more opportunities for a peaceful, dog-free nature experience. People in the general Bay area already have many places to take their dogs to run and play. Dogs do more than just scare away wildlife, they kill wildlife, their owners neglect to clean up properly after them which creates a dirty smelly environment, which also can spread disease. Dogs can be aggressive to children as well and may fight with eachother. In general they disturb the peaceful quiet use of the GGNRA and threaten the very wildlife we go there to enjoy. Their effects on the area will worsen over time as well. Additional staff may be needed to clean up after them which also raises costs for the GGNRA unnecessarily. I hope the park service will stay strong and protect wildlife, whose unfettered habitats shrink more and more each day.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3391	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 21:24:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly support the draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the GGNRA. I have lived in San Francisco for most of my life, and have enjoyed countless visits to the this jewel of the Bay Area. What a wonderful area for hiking, picnicking, strolling along the shore, lying on the beach, and enjoying the sights and sounds of the natural world, just a short way, but so far from the hubbub of the city.				

---

I am grateful to the NPS and to the dedicated volunteers who have worked so hard over the years to secure and maintain the GGNRA. It is vital that we protect this beautiful natural environment, including the vulnerable birds and other creatures who require the park's habitat for their survival.

An important reason why people visit parks is the serenity and beauty there. Many dog owners are respectful of others and many dogs are well-trained. But San Francisco also has its share of irresponsible dog owners, and out-of-control dogs. This can be a threat, not only for our varied wildlife, but also for our citizens, especially children and seniors. Also the presence of too many dogs degrades the natural environment of the park. We all deserve a place where we can relax and enjoy our precious coastline without being disrupted by unruly dogs and their natural instincts to chase after wildlife - or people. Pet owners who can't control their own dogs also endanger other dogs, so leash-only areas are important for them as well.

For the sake of dog owners and non-dog owners, we need better enforcement of the existing rules concerning dogs, and better signage. And we need more designated dog-free areas, perhaps with barriers around dog run areas, so dog owners will be more aware where they can bring their dogs - and where dogs are prohibited or leashes required.

The draft regulation and enforcement would be a great step towards providing better balance between the various uses of the GGNRA. It would help to preserve natural areas and protect wildlife, while allowing designated areas for people to bring their pets.

Thank you for your efforts to consider the needs of everyone who uses the GGNRA. It is not easy, but the draft regulations will improve our beloved parks for San Franciscans and visitors from around the country and the world.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3392	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Golden gate audubon Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 21:24:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the stricter rules regarding dogs in our parks. Dogs do disrupt/ harm birds and I am in flavor of restricting off leash in sensitive bird habitat.				

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3393	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 21:28:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** This is a horrible new proposal. This open space would be horribly impacted by restricting dog access and imposing leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3394    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Ellen V

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3395    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I cannot stress enough how much this plan would negatively affect both my quality of life and my dogs. I



relocated to SF because of my love of nature and hiking with my dog, and the accessibility in the area, and I have been such an advocate of our great parks, which are, and have historically been family friendly. I implore you to keep them that way knowing that over 50% o households in SF have dogs and they outnumber children. GGNRA is a much needed oasis for city dwellers and their dogs,

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Simonson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3396	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Albany, CA 94706 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	myself Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 21:44:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We frequently visit the GGNRA for walks. We feel that the free run of the place by dogs does a distinct disservice to the environment of the area.				

I think people and environment take precedent over man's best friend.

Work for the furture.

Thanks,

Kaz Mori

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3397	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94611 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 21:45:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been a GGNRA supporter for many years, and probably visit each of the parks at least once a year. I am also an avid birder. I visited the Sutro Baths last year when the vagrant river otter was there. I was shocked when I saw some visitors let their dog tromp along the waters edge, following the movements of the otter without regard to causing stress upon the terrain or the animal. I live in Oakland near Redwood Regional Park, where we have one of the few off lease trails in the system. The result is a bunch of dog owners who don't clean up after their dogs, bike riders who's dogs run 1/2 mile ahead or behind them, and major erosion of areas adjacent to the off lease areas, by dog owners who ignore the signs.				

My point is that I think with our increased density of recreational multi-use areas, we have to limit dogs, especially off lease. Dogs running wild can knock over the elderly and small children, they trash habitat for birds and small mammals.

From my experience, dog owners don't follow instructions on signs. A better tactic would be to fence off lease areas and let some trails be no-dog trails. I understand you have 21 miles of off lease area. That sounds great, so let's limit now or decrease if you have some trails where there are enough complaints to

justify a change.

I think it is possible for everyone to just get along, but sad to say, this means in different areas sometimes.

Thanks for working on this tough policy!

Elaine Geffen  
Oakland

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3398    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 21:47:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To the National Park Service with regard to the GGNRA Dog Management question:

I am a retired teacher who enjoys the outdoors. I hike and bird throughout the state and enjoy wildflowers, wild animals and all the wonderful things that surround us in natural California.

It is a fact that off-leash dogs and what is left to us of "nature" are NOT compatible.

It is also a fact that too many dog owners (I am sorry to say) are not very responsible and do not pay much attention to signage. Fido's pleasure seems to be their only value.

So many of us would like to be able to enjoy the outdoors in our parks and not be confronted with dogs on the loose, with little bags of abandoned dog waste, and with the disruption of wildlife that are the hallmarks of too many uncontrolled pets in a limited space.

If native plants and wildlife are to have a chance in our parks, areas where off-lease dogs are permitted must be clearly marked and infractions must be noted, cited and fined.

We will be able to do this, as we were able to stop people from spoiling the air with smoking, if the Park Service and its allies mount a broad, serious campaign to bring everyone together to keep what's left of our beautiful state- -beautiful.

Dogs in their place, and the rest of the place for the rest of us!

Thank you,  
Anne Kelley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3399    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 21:53:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I disagree with limiting any off leash dog walking.

I feel it is silly. I often walk my dog on city streets without a leash which proves she is in control. Making me walk my dog on a leash in a park is just superfluous. The argument of protecting wildlife in a city is plain ridiculous. There is plenty of open space beyond city limits for wildlife to flourish.

I also believe that limiting all the areas dogs into designated areas for off leash walks is not practical.

---

There are far too many dogs to be able to be in such a small area.

Even if it is made illegal to walk my dog without a leash at Land's End, I would willingly disobey.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3400    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Justine

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3401    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:04:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Unleashed dogs threaten birds and other wildlife. Restraint should be at the strictest standards of the NPS so that all wildlife, plants as well as animals, have as much protection as possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3402    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94704  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:07:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please retain (and enforce) leash laws. The GGNRA provides habitat for many creatures whose presence is likely to be significantly diminished if dogs are allowed to run free and explore as dogs like to do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3403    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:09:34**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please give wildlife a break! They have so few places that aren't destroyed or over run by humans. This National Park is supposed to provide some precious little habitat for wildlife. Humans do not need another place to let their pets run free. That's what dog parks, backyards, neighborhood parks and other urban greenways are for. Not the ONLY sort of wild space that remains in this urban landscape. Dogs and humans have lots of options, they just want more, at the expense of every last species. Where else do our last struggling wild species have? Where? We have already taken every other place and pushed these last few tenacious wild species to the brink of extinction. Why can't our National Parks be their last refuge? That's exactly what National Parks are supposed to be. We don't have much time left to coexist with, appreciate and help wildlife before unforeseen global events change the playing field in irreversible ways, maybe leaving us alone with our pets. Wildlife has already gotten the short end of the stick at every turn. This is a ridiculous "battle" when the answer is already known, written in law and ethically obvious. Please help wild animals to survive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3404 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:09:40**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposal does not show what the true environmental problem is that we're trying to address. Nor does the proposal analyze the impact to the broader bay area / sf environment should the nps proposal be enacted. Consequently, this plan is unbalanced and unworthy of approval.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3405 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:12:44**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA branch of the NPS is completely ignoring its enabling legislation and renegeing on promises made to San Francisco when we gave city parkland to the GGNRA in 1973.

The GGNRA has (conveniently) forgotten that it was created for the "maintenance of needed recreational open space." A Report issued by the House of Representatives makes it clear that the GGNRA was created to address concerns about a lack of recreational open space in San Francisco. It noted: "In San Francisco.... the opportunities for outdoor recreation in broad open spaces are severely limited." It also said: "This legislation will ... [establish] a new national urban recreational area which will concentrate on serving the outdoor recreational needs of the people of the metropolitan area." And "The objective of H.R. 16444 is to assure the preservation of open space presently prevailing within the proposed recreation area, to provide public access along the waterfront, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available to the region." During the hearings various recreational activities within the proposed GGNRA boundaries were listed and those included off-leash dog walking.

I have been walking with a well-mannered dog on these lands that you were tasked with managing for the benefits of SF citizen since 1972 and at Ft. Funston since 1978. At FF I have not seen the GGNRA make any improvements. The roads, benches, trails are in derelict condition and the construction of restrooms

has been promised for the last 10 years. You've only succeeded in fencing off areas and putting up misleading signage supposedly for "our safety" or to protect the bank swallows - the latter based on faulty science.

Please live up to the original legislation and manage these urban lands as Congress intended. Please put aside your "Big Brother" tactics or at least take them elsewhere.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3406    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Carolyn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3407    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

At Crissy Field I have seen dogs chase rare plovers and catch them and other bird species in the lagoon, chase the blue heron and it is horrific not to protect these areas from harm to wildlife.

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas. Thank You!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3408    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and on the Coastal Trail. As a resident in Muir Beach, I rely on the Coastal Trail and Muir Beach as a means to exercise my black labrador.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. There has not been any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. If people would prefer a beach with no dogs, there are places like Stinson Beach that can accommodate more visitors than Muir Beach and offer people a no-dog experience. Please leave Muir Beach and the Coastal Trail accessible to our canine companions.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3409    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94612  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:22:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Writing in defense of birds. Please require leashed dogs. They can be off leash elsewhere.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3410    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94708  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:28:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To: NPS  
Re: Dog Plan Proposal  
FM: Robert Flasher

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners. I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of

fencing for off-leash areas.

I'm shocked that dog owners don't appreciate this exception to standard NPS rules. Parks are for people. If the people want to bring dogs, the NPS needs to protect the resource, other dogs, wildlife and people from irresponsible dog owners. All of us responsible dog owners already keep our dogs on leashes and are very appreciative of the opportunity to do it in the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3411    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:29:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Debbie Kiraly and Tucker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3412    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:33:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I am deeply offended by this reduced space for dogs to be walked on or off-lead. As a resident of the City of Alameda where dogs have little to no space in which to really have a good walk/hike, I was appalled to hear we will lose the federal parks too. For many people urban people who do not have cars in which to take their dogs to big parks located several counties away, how can you justify your decision? I find it shocking that you use the wildlife card as your main reason for this decision. We know this is hooley because you shoot any mountain lion that comes within 30 feet of a housing community. I also have a difficult time believing it is people that you are trying to protect. We all witness the numbers of people who use the parks. If anything I would think you would rather limit those people numbers because we

know people cause more damage to the parks and habitats than any one animal. I suspect the truth lies in the cost of disposing dog by-products. Well, sorry that isn't going to cut it either. Suck it up! Dogs are here to stay and continue to be a healthy life-style choice for many humans! Please stop limiting their space based on false, trumped-up facts!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3413    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:33:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Kim Domerofski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3414    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:38:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please enact and enforce stricter rules for controlling dogs. More areas need to be off-limits to dogs, especially off-leash dogs. A minority of irresponsible dog owners unfortunately will ruin the recreation area for everyone else and will destroy the wildlife. Please do not allow this to happen. Make and vigorously enforce restrictions on off-leash dogs. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3415    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:40:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA is not a National Park and should not be managed as one.

NPS needs to prove to Bay Area citizens it is capable of managing a Recreation Area. All evidence is now in the contrary.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3416    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:42:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I walk my dog Buster a lot in the GGNRA, particularly in Crissy Field since I live so close to it. I am strongly opposed to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA new draft dog management plan. I don't understand why it is so restrictive. There are already so few places to walk a dog off leash and this plan is reducing that even more.

I agree with Nancy Pelosi's comments that ""There is a long history of off-leash dog recreation in San Francisco which began before the transfer of land from the city and county of San Francisco to the National Park Service.". Let's keep that tradition.

Please let Buster continue to go off-leash in the same areas at Crissy that he has access to today. He's a rescue dog that I adopted a year ago and I've seen him go from a dog that shook in fear for the first few months to a happy go lucky dog that gets so excited to go off-leash. He's 18 pounds, always under my voice control, and he knows what 'Let's go to the beach' means. Please don't curb his access.

Thank you,  
Lynn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3417    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:47:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am a senior citizen who greatly enjoys walking my dog off-leash at Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, Mori Point and the Marin Headlands but Fort Funston in our favorite dog walking area to which I look forward to visiting every afternoon and have since 1978. Just thinking about not walking with my dog off-leash at Funston saddens me as there is such an extraordinary community at Funston. Yes, it is mainly made up of fellow dog owners who treasure a place where we and our dogs can get good exercise, where we can socialize with other dog owners but also with non-dog people who may come to see the views or the hang gliders, but they are

delighted by the fun array of dogs. Your proposed restrictions which plan to corral us into two dog areas will completely ruin this amazing experience.

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

For all they give back dogs require very little. They ask for little more than food & water, a head scratch, and a nice run/walk. I walk my dog every day at Fort Funston. He loves his walks. We love being there with him and our "dog friends. Our off-leash walks are an important part of my life. The people we meet there are part of our lives. Please expand, rather than close down, the wonderful outdoor places where we can be with our dogs off-leash. These places and experiences are what make San Francisco so special and our out-of-town visitors so envious.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3418    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:54:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in Marin for over ten years and I am totally in awe that our freedom of hiking with our dog is being threatened by the National Park Service. We live in Tam Valley and I take runs daily from our house to the Oakwood Valley trail. I love running with my dog and feel extremely safe when he's with me. Our golden retriever will be turning ten in a few days, and I have thoroughly enjoyed using all the wonderful trails in Marin. We work very hard in our family to support the taxes in this area and I am completely floored that the National Park Service would have the ability to outlaw one of our family members to an essential part of our community. The parks and open space in Marin should be allowed to be used by family members and their dogs. I urge you to reconsider the opposition to dogs on the trails. You need to understand that the community desire to continue allowing dogs on the trails!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3419    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Dolphin Club, SF International Ocean Film Festival Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 22:55:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Folks- -

I have walked at Crissy Field for almost 30 years and have always been uneasy about unleashed dogs on the east beach. In warmer weather, and low tides, lots of toddlers enjoy wading in the shallows. Lots of

---

dogs also enjoy dashing around either in search of a ball or just for the hell of it. It is a bad combination. On the west beach, that is not a problem. There may be children enjoying the beach but generally they are up toward the grassy dunes and not in the water, which along that shore is not shallow enough for them to invite play. The Park service plan to allow off-leash dogs on the Crissy west beach makes sense, but not, of course, in the snowy plover's protected breeding area. Off-leash dogs have never made sense to me on the east beach- -a serious dog-toddler encounter waiting to happen, usually due to the dog's admittedly delightful exuberance. The two just don't belong together on that beach. Moreover, once the dogs are given unleashed freedom on the east beach, they are much more likely at low tide to go under the foot bridge over the lagoon's outlet into the Bay and chase the many birds that feed and spend time there. Behavior I have seen a number of times. The calls of the owner are to no avail.

In letters to the Chron, those opposed to the proposed regulations frequently say that dog walkers "should" have their canines under voice control. Bicyclists should not ride on the sidewalk, cell-phone users should not use their devices when they are driving, and so on. We are not talking here about shoulds. We are talking about what in fact happens. In the last decade, on the west Crissy Field beach, I have twice been confronted by hostile dogs, ears back, neck hair bristling, a snarl forming on their lips. Luckily one owner came to get her dogs, without a single word of apology or concern. She had that reputation on the beach, as did her dogs. The other also came to get her dog and apologized, a rarity in my experience, dog owners almost always blaming the frightened person and not their dogs in such unpleasant encounters.

It is a rare dog owner who sees his or her dog as a canine whose bite can injure someone, especially a child. Their dogs are members of the family, almost as prized as a child. Their reactions to the proposed new regulations reflect that distorted, but understandable, view of their canines.

Keep unleashed dogs off East Crissy Field Beach.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3420	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 22:56:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off leash dog areas in the city of San Francisco are very important to me and to many residents of SF who would not have a place to exercise their dogs and enjoy nature if these changes were to take effect. My quality of life would significantly suffer from this reduced off leash dog access to ocean beach, fort funston, and crissy field. Please listen to the residents of San Francisco and reconsider these devastating changes.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3421	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94703 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 22:59:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	More areas in GGNRA closed to dogs are needed. Allow the birds to have more undisturbed areas. Birds are very sensitive to noise and movement. Marilyn				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3422	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 23:12:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of new rules in GGNRA for increasing protection for wildlife. Though personally dog-friendly, and though I agree that dogs need space to run and enjoy themselves, I absolutely do not believe that they should be allowed off leash in every park or open space.

There must be a reasonable compromise, in which dogs get their space to frolic without chasing or otherwise harassing the increasingly beleaguered wildlife of the Bay Area. This is not even to mention the many human beings who don't particularly like dogs, and don't at all like being sniffed by them or jumped on by them.

Of course, stronger wildlife protection measures will also require serious enforcement. Even the rules currently in effect are rarely enforced, and many dog owners behave as though any restriction on their animals is an unacceptable violation of their personal freedom.

By all means designate areas in which dogs can run off leash; but please also designate and ENFORCE areas where dogs must be either leashed or even prohibited.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3423    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-3446

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 23:23:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Deborah Deegan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3424    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Leandro, CA 94577

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 23:29:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern:

I am a dog lover. And I am also a lover of wildlife. There is no reason at all that both cannot be accommodated in National Parks. But there needs to be separation. Dogs can be hazardous to wildlife and vice versa. Please make sure there are separate, fenced places for dogs off leash. Why should it be necessary for dogs to have the full run of the entire Park? Let's find ways that dogs and wildlife can co-habitat the area without harm to either. And please take a balanced approach to accommodating those who love each or both.

Respectfully,

Barbara A. Coe, Ph.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3425    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 23:37:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As longtime residents of Marin County, I and my family have spent a lot of time on GGNRA land. It is a place where we can enjoy the beauty and quiet of nature. We are also avid birders and conservationists. Although we own dogs, we do not take our dogs walking on GGNRA land because we do not want to frighten the birds or other wildlife. Our walks in GGNRA have often been sullied by dogs running around off-leash, dogs approaching us in a way that is overly friendly (I do not want to be jumped on or aggressively sniffed by any dogs, but especially not strange dogs), their owners yelling to them, and the countless piles of dog poop that dog owners don't bother to pick up, or the plastic bags of dog poop that dog owners leave by the side of the trail.

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

I am in support of park officials need enforcing the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

Dr. Alexandra Matthews

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3426    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 23:43:51

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Please allow protections for endangered and threatened animals and plants where people, dogs/horses can not enter. There are ways to allow beaches to be shared without damaging the future of small defenseless birds whose limited energy is easily compromised by running/barking/sniffing dogs or jogging/walking people ... Certain areas must indeed to set aside to protect the animals who have no one feeding, walking, protecting them. PROTECT THE SNOWY PLOVERS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3427 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 23:45:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Please allow protections for endangered and threatened animals and plants where people, dogs/horses can not enter. There are ways to allow beaches to be shared without damaging the future of small defenseless birds whose limited energy is easily compromised by running/barking/sniffing dogs or jogging/walking people ... Certain areas must indeed be set aside to protect the animals who have no one feeding, walking, protecting them. PROTECT THE SNOWY PLOVERS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3428 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 23:55:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are no off leash areas in San Mateo county so We really enjoy going to Fort Funston and Crissy Field. We have been going there for years and am very sad that most of the land will be taken away for off leash dog walking. We have 2 very active dogs that require running space. When you limit the areas there will be very close encounters with people and dogs that probably will cause many confrontations and problems. Our exercise will also be limited which doesn't help our well being. We respect the wild life and have not crossed the fences put up at Fort Funston. The majority of people who walk there are dog owners and we wish we could keep the space for our dogs and ourselves so we can all stay mentally and physically healthy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mr. and Mrs. Sylvia Samuolis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3429 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:08:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Parks Service needs to adopt stricter policies related to dogs on park service land. These policies must be enforced. Natural habitat and wildlife should be protected from domestic animals. No off-leash dogs!

**Correspondence ID:** 3430    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:09:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love the GGNRA and I also love dogs. However, I feel that preservation of the GGNRA should be the greater priority over the convenience or preference of dog owners. The GGNRA should be kept in as pristine condition as possible. Dog owners have choices. The flora and fauna do not. The dogs seem pretty happy as long as they are playing outside. The birds and other animal residents are not happy when they are harassed. The native grasses and other plant life do not need more stress in their environment. I also understand that permitting dogs under the current regime was intended to be a test only and not become the status quo. I don't think the opposition to the dog management plan acknowledges the import of that.

I urge you to implement the proposed management plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

(Note, my mailing address is different from my residential address.)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3431    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Katie Harbaugh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3432    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:29:13**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I am both a devoted bird lover and a dog lover. I belong to the Golden Gate Audubon Society as well as being a long-time dog owner.

My view is that federal officials managing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area should take a balanced approach to various human uses in the park. This certainly means protecting certain critical areas where endangered bird species are known to breed. For example fencing off the beach along Crissy Field where the Snowy Plovers nest to protect these birds from off-leash dogs is good park management. However it would naive to believe that keeping dogs out will allow the Plovers to thrive. Predation from natural predators like raccoons and certain raptors as well as climatic factors may destroy this habitat for Plovers despite our best efforts. It's still the right thing to do.

But what is good for portions of the Crissy Field beach front is not necessarily good for the GGNRA generally. Fencing off areas should always be a last resort. Specific and compelling reasons are required before deciding to close areas to recreation. The beach front, dunes and cliffs within the recreation areas are human habitats treasured by picnickers, bathers, beach combers, surfers, dog walkers, hanger glider enthusiasts, birders etc. It is fundamental to remember that the GGNRA is a place where people go to recreate. It's public space that belongs to all of us. So in all cases err on the side of open space, not fenced in zones. This means continuing to provide dog owners plenty of places where their pets can be off leash. But of course off-leash dogs must always be under voice control of their owners. Dogs that do not obey voice commands to their owners should not be off their leashes anywhere in the the GGNRA or for that matter any place outside their owner's domicile.

I am confident that decisions regarding the uses of the GGNRA will be made to maximize sustainable human enjoyment of this priceless place. Remember it is first and foremost a human habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3433 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Los Altos, CA 94024  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:36:40**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I am against restricting any of the Fort Funston area currently off-leash (including voice control) to dogs, against restricting Crissy Field areas any more than they are now, and against restricting any other areas in San Francisco any more than they are now.

Historically, Fort Funston has been off-leash for decades; I see it none the worse for wear than lack of basic care by park authorities and people themselves.

Park negligence has let sand pile up on many of the asphalt paths for the past year, and fences fall into disrepair.

Lack of supervision on people by park authorities has led to their being careless with this wonderful park resource.

I've seen children climbing on and hacking away at the sand cliffs, with no parental control.

I've seen people without dogs climbing down the cliffs to the beach, off trail, and becoming stranded in the process.

I visit Fort Funston often with my dog; I have NEVER seen dogs fight one another or bother people.

Better fencing and supervision would keep people and dogs out of sensitive habitat.

---



Though I don't visit other dog off-leash areas south or north of SF, I am against plans to completely ignore decades of off-leash area precedent in those areas.  
These are historically recreation areas adjacent to dense urban centers; they are not wildernesses. They are resources for the populace, and should be maintained and supervised for broad usage, just as urban facilities are.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3434    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:42:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I spend as much time as I possibly can at GGNRA locations Crissy Field, Presidio and the Marin Headlands. I love being able to see a huge variety of birds, and even sometimes wildlife (not as much now as 10 years ago). The GGNRA is their home and it is our responsibility and particularly yours, to be stewards of their home. That requires protecting them from the intrusion of domestic pets, e.g. dogs. I have watched people allow their dogs to chase egrets from the lagoon and when I mention, kindly, that dogs aren't supposed to be there, they just say, "Oh, the birds will be back." Or when someone is running their dog off leash in the plover protected area just south of the Warming Hut, they have no concept or consideration that their dog is threatening the existence of the plovers. They pay No attention to signs. I love dogs. But they need to be kept away from wildlife areas. Period.

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3435    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:44:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I don't currently have a dog in my household - because my landlord won't allow it. But I love dogs and the joy they bring. Personally, I see Fort Funston as one of the happiest places to go in the bay area because of the off-leash dogs frolicking in an open safe space. My cheeks hurt from smiling after a stroll in that area watching all of the pups having a wonder-full time. I'm an avid hiker and love meeting dogs and their companions on trail. The fact that there are so few trails or open/park spaces where dogs are welcomed is a huge issue to me. I believe most dog guardians are extremely conscientious

---

and respectful and that dogs should be allowed almost anywhere humans are. Please do not ban dogs from our treasured public lands and spaces.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3436    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94703  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:47:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Because of the frequency with which I see unleashed dogs in the the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, I believe that the National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies for this area.

I am a frequent visitor to the GGNRA, both on foot and by kayak. I am vocal in insisting that fellow kayakers avoid disturbing birds and other marine organisms along the shoreline and I expect dog-owners to have the same respect for our natural resources. It pains me to see dogs running off leash after flocks of shorebirds, some of which are in the process of migrating from arctic Canada or Alaska to the southern cone of South America. Being chased by dogs depletes the energy reserves of these birds engaged in one of the most spectacular behaviors we can observe on our planet.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

Off-leash areas should be demarcated with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

Park officials need the resources to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed dog management plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3437    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 01:34:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

I regularly walk with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is ridiculously restrictive and

---

will prevent me and my dog, Mario, from recreating on GGNRA properties as we have for the past 35 years for our health and wellbeing.

The new plan was definitely not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

THIS IS KEY: In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. This simply put looks like a major land grab of the Federal Government from my perspective.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be first recognized and viewed with validity by the GGNRA and then formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I also oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is also ridiculously restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. It doesn't appear that the GGNRA has truly done it's homework in regards to it's impact studies. Or the findings are inconclusive and the GGNRA is withholding the true findings to further it's own agenda.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. Particularly in San Mateo where it has been revealed that the GGNRA has taken all of the land away from any off leash purposes.

We pay taxes, lots of taxes in the Bay Area and to have this happen is disgusting. I am sure that if you put the taxes that dog owners pay towards open spaces that there would be more than enough money to cover any costs. The GGNRA's actions are mean spirited and biased against dog owners or maybe just dogs. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The fences have created a hostile environment for dogs as there is simply not enough room for them. The territorial factor impacts the freedom of movement for dogs that are not territorial. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. And this last sentence is the most ignorant offensive piece of law enforcement I have seen in ages. The Federal Government is taking most all GGNRA properties and closing it off to tax paying dog owners because it deems not enough people are complying with leash restrictions. That is what is wrong with your agency.

I want to respect you but it appears that you have allowed yourself to become a puppet instead of a law enforcement officer. And at the last meeting with Rep. Jackie Speier, I felt like you really blew us off with lip service as to you doing your homework in regards to off leash land in San Mateo. It appears that you are simply waiting for retirement instead of protecting and serving the public in your current capacity.

Sincerely and Respectfully Submitted,

Joan House

**Correspondence ID:** 3438    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94144  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 02:05:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the plan! As a frequent Crissy Field and East Beach user with my beloved furry companion, restricting our use would negatively impact the quality of our life. There are insufficient off-leash areas for dogs in San Francisco. Packs of professional dog walkers already make fenced in areas too crowded. Fenced in areas at a national park will destroy the whole ambiance of a natural park for all to enjoy. Keep the pet policy as is!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3439    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 02:12:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in San Francisco since 1975. The parts of the GGNRA that are in and around San Francisco are unique in that they are part of an urban landscape. Rules that make complete sense in a wilderness area do not compute in a city. I walk my dog at Ocean Beach and I follow the rules. She is off-leash and under voice control only North of Gate 21. Ocean Beach is very convenient for me. Not so for people who live in the Marina, or North Beach or even the South Western Sunset District. For them Crissy Field or Fort Funston are the convenient places to go. The rules in place there are fine and should be enforced. Further restrictions should not be made. If they are, the impact on the remaining off leash areas will be huge and more than any of them can handle. The off leash areas in the city parks are few and far between and also very small. Dogs need to run. Even the smallest need exercise that is not restricted by a leash. Do not change the status quo!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3440    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94708  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 05:16:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I enjoy the GGNRA as a liocal gem. As a walker and grandoarent, i want to be able to explore the area without concern for loose dogs that can run after me or my small grandkids. I am a long time dog owner and recognize the need to exercise dogs but for the safety of public visitors and nature, dogs need to be exercised in enclosed areas. My dogs if loose would routinely chase any birds or waterfowl on the ground, it is in their wiring. We are losing our local birds as a result of encroaching in their habitats. Loose digs further threaten the survival of indigenous and migrating birds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3441    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Montero

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3442	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94901
-----------------	-------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3443	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	95682
-----------------	-------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,29,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3444    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 95831

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3445    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, other

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3446    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94131-1611

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Storm Grove, Golden Gate Parks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3447    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** S.F., CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 07:02:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.  
We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3448    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Stinson Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3449    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94018  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

---

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3450    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, other

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3451    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3452    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** 94565  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3453    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94523  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3454    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

---

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Stinson Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3455    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94901

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3456    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94112

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Marin Headlands, McLanen Park

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3457    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94965

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3458 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Gabrielle Taylor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3459 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** 94114  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field,  
Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3460    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog  
management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash  
access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash  
areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it  
deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field,  
Marin Headlands, Bernal Heights duboce

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3461    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog  
management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash  
access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash  
areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it  
deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field,  
Marin Headlands, Duboce

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3462    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**

---

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Montero

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3463    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3464    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3465    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3466    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3467    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3468    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94018  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, El Granada

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3469    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3470    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Ocean Beach

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3471	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94107
-----------------	-------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Pacifica/South

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3472	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94960
-----------------	-------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.



The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3473    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94127

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3474    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94941

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3475    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94903

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3476    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

Please keep off leash areas. Please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3477    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

---

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3478    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, near Grey Whatle Cove/Pandra

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3479    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94131-2830  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Glen Park

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3480    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3481    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: McClaren Park

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3482    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3483    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94114

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3484    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94131

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 07:59:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not close these wonderful parks to dogs. This will create tremendous over use of the neighborhood parks. If you have never seen dogs playing at any of these venues you need to spend a few minutes doing so. These are the happiest dogs on the planet. Not to mention some pretty happy dog owners watching them at play.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3485    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94933

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands, West Marin

**Correspondence ID:** 3486    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94080

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3487    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94618

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3488    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94010

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3489    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94044

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Mory Point

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3490    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94044

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Mory Point

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3491    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94114

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3492 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3493 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94103

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it



deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3494 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Balboa Park

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3495 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94014  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3496 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94015  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3497    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3498    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3499    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Sharp Park

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3500 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3501 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3502    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3503    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3504    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3505	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94903-1512
-----------------	------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3506	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	
-----------------	--

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Rodeo Beach Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3507    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94904

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3508    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94941

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Stinson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3509    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Albany, CA 94706

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

---

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

THERE ARE FEW PLACES TO STEP LIGHTLY INTO NATURE. OFF-LEASH DOGS DISTURB THIS.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3510	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	berkeley, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.				

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

I look forward to each excursion into the GGNRA to explore the history and wildlife. Off-leash dogs impact my enjoyment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3511	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94960 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan I love my dog and I vote. I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

---

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3512    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 08:28:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs need off leash areas to exercise and socialize !!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3513    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

I regularly take my dog to the GGNRA with which my house shares a border. I treasure that I can walk outside of my house with my dog and hike the headlands daily, including the Miwok trail, the coastal trail and oak wood valley. During my time on the trail in the last month I have taken note of the number of people hiking with their dogs and those without. 85% o people encountered were pleasurably walking with their dogs and enjoying the great outdoors with their pets. The GGNRA is a treasure to us all and we implore you not to take away this valuable resource we all so greatly appreciate.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3514    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

---



**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3515	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94941
-----------------	-------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3516	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94960
-----------------	-------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Stinson, Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3517    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94933

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3518    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach, Rodeo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3519    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94705

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 08:34:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I am a life long dog aficionado and have owned dogs throughout my adult life, but I also love wilderness and wild things, and I therefore support the proposed restrictions on free ranging dogs in the GGNRA. I love to walk with my dog off leash, but I know from personal experience how hard it is to control a dog by voice when it is excited by another dog, or, worse, bird or animal. I have watched my own dog chase birds along the shoreline while I ran after it, calling to no effect. I have watched other dog owners let their dogs chase birds without making any effort at all to stop them. The bay is a tremendous resource for migratory birds and year round residents birds. These birds suffer enough already from threats to their environment and even very existence. Dogs, on the other hand, are doing just fine in the Bay Area, thanks to their human support. Dogs and their humans have ample opportunity in the Bay Area to enjoy leashed and off leashed adventures outside the GGNRA. However, the birds' habitat is increasingly restricted.

Thus, this decision really is a no-brainer: the wilderness and wildlife protection values decisively overwhelm the value of giving dogs more off leash opportunity. Please adopt the proposed off leash dog restrictions for the GGNRA.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3520	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94403				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3521	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94121				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field,  
Marin Headlands, Land's End

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3522    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94118

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3523    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field,  
Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3524    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94080

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3525    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Excelsor Dist (McLaren Park, Crodoer Park, G.G. Park).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3526    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Stern Grove

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3527    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3528    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Marin Headlands, McLaren Park

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3529    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

---

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3530    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Land's End

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3531    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 08:50:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a 30 year Marin resident I am all for tightening the rules on dogs within the GGNRA. We need to think 'people first' and keep dog use tightly controlled and limited to a very specific areas within the park. And dogs must be on leashes at all times in all public areas, no exceptions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3532    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3533    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 08:55:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Julia Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3534    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 09:12:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,



there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

JD Kent

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3535	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 09:15:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Margaret Wensch

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3536	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94703 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 09:23:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner, but I do not feel that either I or my dog will suffer if off-leash dog areas are restricted. People who own dogs in an urban area should accept that most of the time, their dogs should be leashed. And if we are also trying to accommodate wildlife in this urban area, clearly the "rights" of dogs and their owners should give way to the well-being of wildlife. Dogs do not need a huge area to run in. Ohlone Park in Berkeley is probably about an acre, and there is room for many dogs to romp and play. If dogs owners don't want to keep their dogs leashed most of the time, they should either move to the country or not have a dog. This is the reality if we want to protect wildlife, which I do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3537    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I strongly feel that we need to be more protective of our environment. It is the responsible thing to do. It is what supports us. AND it is no secret at this point in time just how interconnected everything is! Yes, there are many responsible dog owners and there are many who are not. I have walked many trails where dogs are off lease doing what dogs do...run, chase, dig etc.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes. Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3538    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 09:25:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Please don't ban off leash dogs from the bay areas most beautiful sites. Letting my puppies frolic at muir beach & Chrissy field brings joy to everyone around. Don't take this away. I'm sure we can find a compromise for the snowy plovers. I also do not see why dogs are banned from many trails and the beach at Tennessee valley. Please open more trails and beaches to on leash dogs and keep the few we have off leash. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3539    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA-specifically Crissy Field, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from walking with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. Having grown up in San Francisco, I have seen the Presidio, and Crissy Field in particular, transform into what is truly a jewel in the crown for San Francisco. Being able to walk my dog off leas there where he is safe and can run free is my favorite part of the week.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. In addition, when I walk with Riley and his pals, we see many respectful and careful dog owners enjoying the beach and fields, which would otherwise be empty. The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Mills (and Riley)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3540 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 09:43:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

James Rogers

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3541    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** oakland, CA 94608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 09:46:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the pending changes involving dog restrictions at the GGNRA. Please retain the original guidelines established in 1979. I vote, I love and own dogs, I am not a "dog extremist". I simply want my dogs to enjoy the freedom that they always have in these locations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3542    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 09:50:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,  
G. Starck

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3543    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 09:53:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.  
The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,

---

there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Pauline Irawan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3544	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 09:53:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to all of the areas of the GGNRA trails and beaches.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you,

Vicki Randall

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3545	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

One of the things I love about living in SF is the freedom I have walking my dogs in appropriate places - - it's one of my hobbies and great pleasures in life. My 2 dogs are well-trained and enjoy their time off-leash as much as I do. Today, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me

from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. Think about if you restricted all dogs to the same places how unhealthy that would be for them - - all caged up together.

The discouraging part of all this is that the "new" plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area - - again one of the things that makes living in SF so desirable. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Winn Ellis

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3546	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 09:57:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There are as many dogs as kids in this area. Those dogs bring joy, love, comfort, therapy, community, tolerance, and health benefits to hundreds of thousands of people.				

To take away the spaces they can romp and roam in with their families is bad planning, bad public policy, bad for families, etc.

You will see a HUGE drop in usage in those areas. It is not going to be something where suddenly people will show up because dogs are not around. It will be empty land.

Please please please reconsider and think about all the living beings that use the land. They are families.

Triston

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3547	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Kentfield, CA 94904 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRA Leadership Team,				

I have lived in the Bay Area for going on 14 years and have always had a dog (or two) as part of my family. I lived in San Francisco from 2000 to 2003 and have lived in Marin ever since. For all of these years, my family and I have regularly enjoyed walking, running and playing in the spectacular GGNRA and Mt. Tamalpais open space. We are happy, healthy residents thanks to our ability to routinely get out

into the fresh air and inspiring natural beauty of our mountains, beaches and parks.

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent our family from reasonable and critically important healthy recreation with our dogs.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please act wisely and with compassion,

Beth Gumm

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3548	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 10:04:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog owner I regret the need to reduce access to trails and beaches. However, I think that the plan is timely and necessary to protect the natural resources in the area. Too often out-of-control dogs are allowed to chase birds, rabbits and other wildlife in a National Park. While recreating is a part of the park, harassing natural resources is not. Despite vocal opposition to the preferred plan, especially in areas like Ocean Beach there needs to be some compromise to ensure space for threatened and endangered species. Without which, I fear that all dog access for all areas will come from the courts. I really like to take my dog out, but the preferred plan does provide a few areas for dog recreation. I realize it will be unpopular to implement the plan but I urge you move forward with restricting dog access.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3549	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 10:05:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Having the off leash area is a must! It's a great San Francisco tradition to walk our dogs, and take our kids and enjoy our Beach. Everyone can get along. 's				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3550	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:12:35**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider leaving some public lands open for dogs to be off leash. It's a shame that some owners do not clean up after their dogs, which affects the rest of the responsible dog owners.

Where we walk, there is a garbage can at both ends of the trail and garbage bags to pick up poop. This is near the Mill Valley dog park and the Oak Valley trail near Tennessee Valley. If there could be rules for picking up after our dogs, that would be better than taking all off leash privileges away.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3551 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:17:40**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I oppose the idea of severely restricting dog access within the GGNRA. Citizens who own dogs need an off leash area where our pets can run free and get a bit of exercise.

I do support ticketing irresponsible dog owners who allow their dogs to roam into areas of habitat restoration or nesting birds. These few bad apples do not represent the vast majority of dog owners who respect nature and posted restrictions.

Thank you,

daniel Cox

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3552 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Henry Montgomery

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3553 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA, deserves the same grade as its designation- F!. I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I take my super nice, big, friendly, life-saving dog to Rodeo Beach, Fort Baker, Stinson Beach, and Ocean Beach. And please consider San Mateo beachgoers as well. Plan F would eliminate all off-leash GGNRA space there.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Where is the evidence that these additional restrictions will provide a public benefit? By benefit, I don't mean more cash from writing tickets to fund dog police.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you,

Peck Comstock

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3554    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm tired of not being able to go anywhere in the GGNRA without dogs running everywhere. Enough's enough. Fort Funston in particular has become a de facto dog park with nary a leash in sight.

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes. Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3555    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:27:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Linda Messitt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3556    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:27:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern:

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. If you must regulate dogs on Muir Beach, do so only at high volume times, not the vast majority of the time when the beach is practically empty. If you must require leashed dogs on Homestead Ridge, adjust the trails to include trails completing the loop into the off-leash-allowed Homestead Valley Land Trust trails that begin at Amaranth at the West end and the fork before Waterview Drive in the East.

I am not a dog owner, but a Mill Valley native, and frolicking dogs have always been a part of Muir

Beach. Dogs off leash have always been a part of the Oakwood loop and the Homestead Valley ridge. When I hike, I welcome the chance to greet the dogs I meet on my way. When I walk on the beach, the freedom of dogs running and greeting other dogs is an integral part of the wild and wonderful beach experience. In 50 years of hiking the GGNRA hills, I have never had a bad encounter with an off leash dog. In this time, river otters have returned to Redwood Creek and Rodeo Lagoon even with dogs off leash near by. People, not their dogs, are the pivotal element in preserving habitat through their advocacy and behavior. These people are the ones who fought to preserve this open space. Their good will and commitment to the land is enhanced by their use of it and many of them have or love dogs as an extension of their love of nature. And we believe that dogs must be able to run free.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Please, please do not turn our natural surroundings into a museum with nature behind walls of rules and regulations. Instead, leave it as a living testament to the commitment of this community to conservation and a dynamic relationship between people and nature.

Thank you,  
Marabeth Grahame

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3557	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 10:28:54
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have lived in SF for 13 years. My husband and I are avid urban hikers. I am not an expert on natural environments and can only speak from personal experience. And, I really I want to emphasize that I am not a dog hater; I love seeing them run and play off leash. The thing is, there are so many dogs in the city; with so many wonderful dog owners bringing their pups out for exercise it seems to me that the natural environment is unable to cope. I drove past Fort Funston for several years before I finally made it there for a hike. I was so saddened by the experience I have never been back. This wonderful sandy ocean-side natural environment was so overused that it smelt strongly of dog urine, and it was a breezy day. How is the possible? I have had this experience in sections of the Presidio as well. And, in regards to the safety of plant and animal (including the hiking human) I believe that many people consider that themselves in control of their dog, but with so many dogs off leash - if every dog is only badly behaved once per visit the impact is be huge. A misguided dog stumbles upon a nesting area, runs up to a fearful walker, or digs up a young plant trying to grow. I live on the Panhandle and I hear dog owners everyday say, "oh, I'm sorry, he usually listens better," as that dog aggressively approaches another dog, or runs at a child, or digs a hole in pursuit of a real or imagined gofer. I desperately want dogs to have a safe place to run free, it is a quality of life issue for the animals of this city. Environmental management is key. As citizens of this planet we must have some foresight and consider the implications of our actions and the impact of our pets, who we must not forget are foreign creatures to the Bay Area natural environment.
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3558	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

---

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:31:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Melanie Wise

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3559 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94014

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3560 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:32:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the dog management plan which prohibits off leash dogs from key areas of the GGNRA. I support a balance of uses for the area with a strong enforcement policy that will allow safe and enjoyable use for all park visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3561 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely, David Kinkela

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3562    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:36:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Rebecca McMullan Dog Owner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3563    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94044

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3564    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94112

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3565    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94044

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3566    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Good Morning-

I live in San Francisco, work in San Mateo, am a responsible dog owner and registered voter. I take my dog to most of the GGNRA locations for exercise/activity -as do my dog walkers. Please hear my voice.

\*I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

In addition:

\*The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Kind Regards-Stephanie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3567	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 10:43:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lauren Creamer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3568    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94044

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,04,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3569    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:43:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Good Morning-

I live in San Francisco, work in San Mateo, am a responsible dog owner and registered voter. I take my dog to most of the GGNRA locations for exercise/activity -as do my dog walkers. Please hear my voice.

\*I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

In addition:

\*The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Kind Regards-Stephanie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3570    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:44:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Good Morning-

I live in San Francisco, work in San Mateo, am a responsible dog owner and registered voter. I take my dog to most of the GGNRA locations for exercise/activity -as do my dog walkers. Please hear my voice.

\*I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

In addition:

\*The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Kind Regards-Stephanie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3571    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:44:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Good Morning-

I live in San Francisco, work in San Mateo, am a responsible dog owner and registered voter. I take my dog to most of the GGNRA locations for exercise/activity -as do my dog walkers. Please hear my voice.

\*I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

In addition:

\*The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on

vegetation and soils.

Kind Regards-Stephanie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3572    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:44:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Good Morning-

I live in San Francisco, work in San Mateo, am a responsible dog owner and registered voter. I take my dog to most of the GGNRA locations for exercise/activity -as do my dog walkers. Please hear my voice.

\*I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

In addition:

\*The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

Kind Regards-Stephanie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3573    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94933  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3574    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94949

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3575    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Max Abrams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3576    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94107

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3577    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3578    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3579    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94903

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3580    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:50:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Bill Binenstock

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3581    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94930  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3582    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:52:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Monica, I live in Cow Hollow, and frequent Crissy fields and Ocean beach monthly with my family's black lab. When my family dog is staying with me I bring him to walk off leash at these beaches as I have a tiny backyard and my dog loves playing ball in the water. When it's just me I go for walk on these beaches as I love seeing all the dogs running and playing off leash. I vehemently oppose the Preferred Alternative as it is far too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. Furthermore, the plan acknowledges there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375). A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote made by NPS staff. Fences that will surround the areas will be an eye sore and greatly detract from the natural beauty of these beaches and parks. This is a horrible plan that does not represent our community.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3583    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94949

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Hamilton Area

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3584    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:55:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Please adopt Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to trails in Marin County, especially those in my Homestead Valley neighborhood.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3585    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3586    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:55:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3587	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94123				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. 2 dog bites in 10 yrs?

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. it will make areas look gross!

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.!

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3588	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Kentfield, CA 94904				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 10:57:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Heavy restrictions already exist in the GGNRA area and Mt. Tamalpais for dogs. I adamantly oppose further restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3589	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94109				

United States of America



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3590	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94103				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3591	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94941				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, other

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3592    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94122

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3593    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94122

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3594    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94129

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3595    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3596    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3597    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:**

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3598    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Joe Johnston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3599    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3602    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Biwesh Pradhan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3603    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3604    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3605	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Suju Shrestha

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3608	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I walk almost 3 times a week with my dog, Bodie, and her pals at either Chrissy Field or Baker Beach. This is an opportunity for both of us to meet and socialize with friends and get some much exercise. This ritual provides a healthy mindset for the rest of the day and week.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Susie Lee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3609	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 11:21:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3610	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 11:22:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3611	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	self Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 11:27:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As a person who has run and biked on GGNRA lands for decades, I want to support the very sensible GGNRA plan for dog management. Time and time again, I see dogs off leash in places where they are supposed to be on leash. I have learned that "under voice control" is a fictional state. I have seen plastic bags of dog poop scattered along trails. I have encountered dog owners who aggressively insist on their rights to break the rules. A friend of mine broke his hip after an off-leash dog ran in front of his bicycle on the Railroad Grade. The dog owners ran off.

Dog owners are organized and very vocal; they also vote. I hope you will ignore the Marin Supervisors' request to water down your plan- they are listening to the dog owners' organizations and not to the unorganized hikers, runners and bikers who prefer to enjoy nature without being bothered by ill-behaved dogs and their undisciplined owners.

Please stick to your guns, GGNRA, and thousands of us human beings will be grateful- to say nothing of the birds and animals that will live on without being chased and hounded.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3612	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes, and Park officials

---



need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3613    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 11:28:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Brian McDonald

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3615    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3616 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3617 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** north beach tenants committee Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 11:48:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** SF probably has more dogs than children now, so the management for the benefit of both is mandatory. I am a dog lover but chose not to have one in the city which seems to me not to be suitable for either the dogs or the land.

Crissy Field is a treasure that certainly should be protected.

I am not familiar with the state of the GGNRA in Marin.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3618 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

---

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3619 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3620 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94062  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, other

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3621 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 11:52:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I endorse the Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

The 1979 GGNRA dog policy was an experiment supported by the park's Advisory Commission and allowed by our first superintendent. It had no official status in Washington and was in contravention of NPS policies which requires that dogs be kept on leash in any national parks where they are allowed.

This dog experiment worked from 1979 until the early 1990s. The population of the Bay Area was 4.5 - 5 million people, the coastal park lands formerly under Army jurisdiction were being discovered by the public, and there were far fewer dogs in the Bay Area. But problems grew as the population grew to 7 million, as Army fences came down and trails were made so the park lands became more accessible, and as many more dogs visited the park.

The GGNRA's enabling legislation states that the park administration is charged with preservation of the GGNRA lands for public use and enjoyment, Preservation of the natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values of these lands and their recreational and educational opportunities are each and all important. This park serves several million national and international visitors annually as well as local visitors. The visitors come for many reasons including sightseeing at the Golden Gate, hiking, bird watching, nature study, school classes, quiet contemplation, playing with children, picnicking-- and for many more reasons. Dog owners are only one group of the millions of visitors to the GGNRA lands.

Usually habitat and wildlife of the land to be included in a national park are analyzed before a park is authorized. This did not happen at the GGNRA because its creation was politically urgent. Only after the park became a reality were most species and their habitat identified, and that took several years. Endangered species were located-- 38 of them -- more than in almost any other national park. Habitat requiring protection for these species was identified and where needed was restored. It was the disappearance of rabbits and birds from Fort Funston that caused the public and the park's rangers and administrators to recognize that it would be necessary to further regulate dogs.

It became evident in some parts of the park that dog owners did not respect the rehabilitation that was being done. I saw dog owners at Fort Funston deliberately toss balls for their dogs into newly planted areas marked for protection. On Crissy Field many dog owners did not keep their dogs under voice control and had conflicts with visitors and other dogs. My young grandson did not like dogs jumping on him, and the dog owners were not apologetic about it-- it was the dog's right to do so; what was wrong with us? Crissy Field is one of the sites in the park where there are many visitors from other countries, and many of these visitors do not expect and are afraid of encounters with dogs.

There also have been conflicts of dogs with horses in several places. There also have been many serious incidents annually requiring U.S. Park Police intervention or ranger rescue of dogs and sometimes owners from cliffs and other dangerous places.

The GGNRA is a national park in an urban area and has high visitation. The recreation of dogs and their owners has to be managed and restricted to allow for the enjoyment of all park visitors. All national parks are administered under the same rules, no matter what their title, but an exception has been called for here. The Special Rule that the park has devised for these lands is intended to meet some of the traditional needs of one group of park users. It cannot meet all of their desires. The Special Rule has had extensive public process. The park's administration has worked with the public for 13 years to craft regulations for dog owners that will give them opportunities not granted elsewhere in the National Park System.

The freedom to walk dogs along some trails on leash and to play with them off leash in defined areas of the GGNRA is not an entitlement. It is a special privilege. The dog-loving public needs to collaborate and

cooperate with the National Park Service to make the privileges of this Special Rule work well for all visitors to the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3622    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3623    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3624    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3625	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 11:56:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS,				

This is to comment against the proposed further restrictions on walking dogs off leash within the GGNRA. There are already too few areas within the GGNRA in which dogs can be walked off leash. Off leash walking is necessary to the health of the dogs and their human companions who live in the Bay Area. If off leash walking within the GGNRA is further restricted as proposed, it is less likely that dogs will be able to run free. As a result, they may become anxious, stressed and aggressive while on leash. This is not good for the human community. Further, the majority of dog owners are responsible, law abiding, tax paying citizens who should be able to enjoy the public lands which they help to support freely with their beloved pets.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ellie Roman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3626	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94062 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>					

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3627 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love all animals, including cliff swallows and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3628 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94127

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3629 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94949

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands, Mt. Burdell/ Marin

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3630	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	95125
-----------------	-------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3631	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94014
-----------------	-------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.



Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3632    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3633    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94015

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3634    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3635	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94134
-----------------	-------

	United States of America
--	--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3636	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94131
-----------------	-------

	United States of America
--	--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Ocean Beach

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3637	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach Loop and on Alta Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Erika Larson, Sausalito

The test of courage comes when we are in the minority. The test of tolerance comes when we are in the majority.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3638    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3639    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94110  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3640    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County, Marin and San Francisco County, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

As a professional dog trainer in San Francisco, I am keenly aware of the behavioral effects on dogs who aren't getting enough off-leash exercise. The preferred alternative will result in significant behavioral impacts on countless dogs in San Francisco who will be confined to dog parks, many of which are already over crowded. This means the preferred alternative will result in SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS to SF Bay Area parks, increased noise and congestion, and dramatic negative impacts on the quality of life of dogs, their human guardians, as well as humans who don't own dogs.

There is no sound environmental or other reason for what amounts to an effective ban on off-leash dogs and their humans in GGNRA lands.

Please do not approve the Preferred Alternative.

---

Sincerely,  
Lisa Manolius

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3641    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044-2302  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Marin Headlands, Mori Point, Sweeney Ridge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3642    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94947  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3643    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**

---

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3644    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:21:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my opposition to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area draft dog management plan.

I am a person who often visits our national parks, as a holder of an annual pass. I understand the purpose of dog restrictions in many of our wonderful national parks like Yosemite and Yellowstone.

But I strongly oppose such restrictions in the GGNRA. As a Recreation Area, it is an essential place for city dwellers looking to escape the confines of the city. The areas under the GGNRA are easily accessible and fun. They are for people to use. I understand the need to protect the environment, but there are so many places in the Bay Area for that purpose. We need to maintain the areas that allow San Franciscans to relax, have fun, and just be!

I am also concerned that the GGNRA's shifts in policies (and attitude) could curtail other recreational activities that city dwellers need in the future.

San Francisco originally transferred these lands to the GGNRA under the condition "So long as said real property is reserved and used for recreation or park purposes." The GGNRA has a recreation mandate, which includes people's ability to exercise off-leash with their dogs.

The GGNRA is lovely, but let's not lose sight of its purpose - - it is a recreation area for an urban area. These trails and beaches have been designated as "dog friendly" since the original policy in 1979. They should remain this way.

Thank you,

Maggie Biroscak

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3645    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3646 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Belvedere, CA 94920  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in Belvedere, California. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Crissy Field, Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Trail, Muir Beach, and Stinson Beach, for the past nineteen years. I exercise there with my dog off leash and under voice control both for my own health as well as the health of my pet. I oppose the preferred alternative for these areas because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the 2013 SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area, not a national park. The GGNRA was built and designed for dog walking from its inception, to better the quality of life of San Francisco metropolitan residents by making dog walking a well-established priority. In fact, Congressional reports at the time referred to dog walking specifically as one of the uses for the space when the GGNRA was created.

the 2013 SEIS was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the DEIS released in 2011, opposing the proposals in that plan by a margin of 3:1.

The SEIS document admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show how these areas are affected by the presence of dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), and instead cites anecdotal observations made by National Park Service staff. However, such anecdotal claims have no validity and cannot be used to set policy. I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer-reviewed studies (as required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3: 1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive- -there is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy as well as off-leash access on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. And, I urge the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3647    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94134-1333  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:23:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the health and wellbeing of countless dog owners and their dogs depend on these places for exercise, socialization, and exquisite recreation. They are why I have chosen to be a dog owner in SF. Please do not allow these resources to be taken away from all of those who cherish them.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3648    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Sincerely,  
Denise Donald

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3649    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123-3422  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:25:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I also oppose the fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwel com e. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

---



-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3650 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94015

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3651 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611-2252

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:26:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it appears absurdly restrictive. The manner in which the study was conducted was clearly biased and skewed against dog owners. Dog owners have a right to enjoy GGNR with their pets in a responsible manner. Simply restricting our access is not acceptable for any tax-paying resident of the Bay Area. Our pets need a place to run free off leash--it's imperative for their health. Also, at a time when the country is facing a public health (obesity) crisis, our government entities should not be erecting barriers that make exercise less accessible.

Remember, dog owners are among the most ardent environmentalists I know. They care deeply about GGNRA. Let's find a better solution than simply banning us from the crown jewels of the SF Bay Area--please.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3652 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:26:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Denise Donald

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3653 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127-1608

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:26:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... My family (including our dog - Chase a labrador) use GGNRA every weekend. We are members of GGNRA and hope that you will take this input and vote to continue to allow dogs to be able to use these public spaces.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Karoly Dyer

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3654 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Baha Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3655    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110-3843  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:29:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it diminishes the off-leash areas for dogs.

--:--:--

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3656    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:**  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3657    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116-1335  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:31:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...I have 2 dogs rescued from San Francisco shelters (used to have 3), and 2 children ages 3 and 5. We own our home in San Francisco. We walk the dogs at Pine Lake, Fort Funston, Golden Gate Park, Golden Gate Heights park and other areas in San Francisco. We depend on large off-leash areas to exercise our dogs. Between my wife and I, we spend at least 2 hours each day walking our dogs. Dog walking is essential to our quality of life in San Francisco. We both moved to San Francisco in 1992 and have lived here continuously except for 2 years when we lived in Petaluma. The single most important reason for our return to San Francisco from Petaluma was the lack of off-leash dog walking areas in Petaluma and the availability of off-leash dog walking areas in San Francisco. In fact, while we lived in Petaluma, we would drive to San Francisco at least twice a week to walk the dogs at Fort Funston or other off-leash areas in San Francisco because there was no place to do this in Sonoma or Marin. San

---

Francisco is a unique place for walking dogs. We appreciate this and do our best to be good.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3658 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94940

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3659 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sunnyvale, CA 94086-6324

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwell com e.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are com plying with the leash restrictions.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3660 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94538

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Half Moon Bay

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3661 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-2115

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:33:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/11/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because my family uses these facilities with our dog several days a week. There is precious little open space available to dog owners in the Bay Area, and the state parks prohibit dogs from entering. It's of great importance to me that we can continue our family traditions with our dog.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3662 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3663 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94949

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3664 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Ross, CA 94957  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:34:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Janell Ciatti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3665 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

---

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3666    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Ross, CA 94957  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Joe Ciatti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3667    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Menlo Park, CA 94025  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

B Nash

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3668    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94937  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Pt. Reyes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3669 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** BURLINGAME, CA 94010-5603

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:37:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan because it is just too restrictive. GGNRA is happily used by people and dogs, daily and in many, many areas. The fences will hinder wildlife and create problems in many lovely, half wild areas.

Why didnt SEIS list the many com ments from regular citizens who walk there? I walk several places in the GGNRA, and have for years, with my dog & kids, and have never had a negative encounter with any people, with or without dogs. People, dogs and recreation are all peacefully co-existing. It is a beautiful thing and that the SEIS report didnt tell that story is ABSURD!

From looking the lopsided reporting, why make major changes? Formalize he 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County & on new lands that the GGNRA acquires?

Before people walked their dogs regularly at Fort Funston, the area was populated by hoodlums & drug dealers. People were afraid to use that park. Now it is used, as recreation, for thousands of people.

If you lived in this area, YOU would be walking your dog at Crissy Field, Muir Beach or Fort Funston. Dont pass a law you can not enforce and people will hate.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3670 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94931

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---



management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3671    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94131-1246  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:37:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose the (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will directly affect my health and quality of life in negative ways. My dog and I take daily outings to public recreation locations including Ocean Beach, Ft. Funston, Lands End, the Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach, and others.  
If I were unable to exercise with my dog, my Type 1 diabetes would be much harder to manage and I would likely die much sooner as the result. Please preserve open space off-leash areas in the GGNRA!!

-.--.-.  
sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3672    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** PACIFICA, CA 94044-4338  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:43:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...taking away land from dogs is like taking away water from fish. Many of us have our dogs on voice com mand and total recall, please don't ruin it for all of us. We're good people that just like walking our dogs in the open land.

-.--.-.  
sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3673    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-3508  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because as someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I find it is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3674    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115-4345  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:47:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I want to enjoy my national and city parks with my best friend!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3675    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010-5772  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:47:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...  
the SEIS did not do a complete study, of dog owners, walkers or site specific studies. Their plan and alternatives are TOO restrictive, I oppose the fence ideas and their monitor base management! It's unfair and blind to the needs of the people and dogs of California!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3676    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Menlo Park, CA 94025-3712  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:48:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...GGNRA is not Yosemite or Yellowstone. It is a recreation area within a highly populated urban area and enjoyed by residents of SF and others who live in the bay area and we want to enjoy our outside time with our dogs.

---

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3677 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115-4518  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:48:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is based off no actual damage caused by dogs and at its core, ignores the integrated culture of dogs and dog owners in our com munity. Based on their dismissal of dog owners voice, the SEIS should not be given power to "use its judgement" over fence and leash laws - as we all know where that could lead us, based on their unwillingness to work with dogs, dog owners, and dog walkers.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3678 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124-2335  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:49:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because we are in great need of open space for our dogs and all the dog owners.

This is what makes living in San Francisco so special, the beautiful open space available to explore with our family and friends. Our dog's are part of our family. They deserve fun, time to run, open space to feel free and happy.

Please don't take this away from them Or us as owners. The best part of my days is going to a safe off leash dog ares, breath fresh air, watch my dog have fun, interact with other dog owners.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3679 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-2135  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:49:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...I think everyone (including dogs and their owners) should be able to use these beautiful resources unhindered. Please do not s.elect.ively discriminate against a certain population of the voting public. It's not good and it's not right.  
Thank you.

---

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3680 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-1312  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:49:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the area is a valuable haven for the many dog lovers who want to enjoy the outdoors with their pets. Please do not change the existing policies.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3681 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117-1619  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:50:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it's ludicrous! There is no good reason dogs shouldn't be allowed to play fetch! Stop trying to change San Francisco. It used to be this amazing place with heaps of culture and it's be com ing like any other city. Get your panties out of a bunch and let people and dogs be!!!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3682 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-7672  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:50:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I have a dog that should enjoy not being on a leash all day. That's torture to an animal, especially in a city with no backyards for dogs to run around in

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3683 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122-3330  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:50:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I cherish living in the Bay Area where being outdoors with my dog is an

---

integral part of why I live here. It is essential to have off-leash spaces and recreational areas where dog owners can go. Thank you!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3684    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122-2718  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:51:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is too restrictive and will keep me from using the GGNRA areas as I have over the past years. I enjoy going for long walks with my dog on Fort Funston and other GGNRA areas and the new plan will significantly limit my ability to do that.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3685    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112-1234  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:51:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it puts too much restriction on off-leash dog areas for no valid reason.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3686    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3687    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Marin Conservation League Board Member Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is a letter to the Marin Independent Journal the editor is planning to publish this week> (Week of February 9) in response to the Marin Board of Supervisors 2/11/14 resolution to GGNRA.

The Board of Supervisors is telling federal park officials the county doesn't care that GGNRA spent a decade working on the proposed Dog Management Plan.

With the Board's last minute action prior to the closing of the comment period, the directors admitted they did not take the time to properly review the proposed rule making. Nor did the Board take note of the dozens of published, peer-reviewed studies showing that domestic dogs can and do indeed impact wildlife and sensitive habitats in numerous ways.

As a special interest group, for quite some time, involved dog owners have been loudly, and in some cases obnoxiously protesting the GGNRA proposal regardless of the science and thought behind them. In developing this resolution, the motivation must be related to growing tired of listening to some of the owners of our estimated 100,000 dogs in this county whine about "their rights" to allow free roaming on federal and county parklands.

How can their resolution be taken seriously when even the title was changed at the last moment? The resolution loses its legitimacy when passed without serious consideration of the facts.

I love dogs just as much as any other owner but the Board must speak for the long-term protection wildlife first and foremost. That was largely lost in the discussion. With so many dogs in the county, we particularly need rules that address the protection of our remaining wildlife corridors.

To the Feds, please give the board resolution the appropriate weight it deserves!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3688    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

---

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3689    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1245  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I walk regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, and find the preferred a.lter.native described far too restrictive - it will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3690    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-5738  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:54:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...Whether you have a dog or not, its a joyful experience to be in the bay area with dogs off leash running free or at the parks the a leash. It allows people to feel a sense of community to the have your friends, family and dogs gather together. If you take this access away these areas especially Fort funston people will not be use/appreciated as much. All the dog owner will then go to other areas and overcrowd those parks with their dogs. Having these area for me and my dog keeps me happy, sane and rejuvenated. If a majority of the dogs in SF had to start using the sidewalks as bathroom and be on leashes walking around the block I don't think this will be an appealing city to live in. It also may create new behaviors in dogs that will have a negative effect. The dog park areas are a main reason I moved I moved to SF. Move the sewage system away from these park areas not the dogs. I think that is a better solution for the environmental impact.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3691    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3692 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94960

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3693 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** oakland, CA 94619-3607

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 12:57:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... This is a popular community attraction and one of the few places that you can bring your dog to the coast. Please do not close our beaches to our families

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3694 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 13:03:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Terry Ingram

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3695    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Golden Gate National Recreation Area,  
As a resident of Marin, I enjoy to spend time in our beautiful recreational areas. Its even better when I get to enjoy them with my trusty companion Max the Dog. I regularly take Max to Muir Beach, the Homestead/Four Corners Area, Orchard Fire Road, Pacheco Fire Road, the Rodeo Beach loop. Muir Beach is by far our favorite.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.  
Thank you for your time. I truly hope you take this comment into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3696    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dogs in many of the beautiful GGNRA parks, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive, and will prevent me from being able to enjoy the kind of quality outdoor time my dogs and my family need together for our collective health, the way we have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin Counties and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Richard Malone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3697    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3698    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3699 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** 94131  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, SF Beaches

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3700 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** 94118  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Other

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3701 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3702 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3703 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

---

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3704    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3705    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 13:16:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Re: Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Look, I know you guys hate homeless people and want to punish them for having dogs sometimes, but do you have to punish all San Francisco dog owners, and their dogs, just to hurt the people you hate? Seems a bit extreme.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3706    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 13:16:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lindsey Baldwin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3707    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94707  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 13:18:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Though I don't have a dog, I love dogs and have dog friends in my neighborhood.  
I also am a lover of nature and the birds and animals and plants  
of the wild.

To protect them and others like me, who enjoy peace and quiet, please  
set aside strictly enforced dog free areas.

Sincerely,  
Ann Kadyk

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3708    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog  
management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

---

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3709    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94112

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3710    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94015

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3711    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:**

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3712 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,13,2014 13:27:18**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a senior citizen who very much enjoys visiting all the major national parks. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area is not a national park nor was it ever supposed to be. It is a city park in a very dense population for people and their pets. This needs to be the primary emphasis of any plan for park management of the GGNRA. The proposal, as it is written, shows little evidence that this requirement has been taken seriously. I oppose the plan completely. Start over on something more reasonable!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3713 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** 94401

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:****Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3714 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Ocean Beach

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3715	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 13:29:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and severely limits recreation and exercise options for dogs in our urban environment.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Mamata Kene

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3716	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	95035 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3717    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 13:35:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the proposed new rules regarding extending areas restricting dogs to leashes - - other than designated fenced off-leash areas - - in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I frequently have been disturbed to watch off leash dogs chasing birds from feeding in their natural habitats at Tennessee cove or racing after rabbits along various GGNRA trails in Southern Marin.

Moreover, on two occasions in recent years I have been with a young child who has been traumatized by being pounced on by an enthusiastic over rambunctious off-leash dog that did not respond to its owner's verbal commands - - once last summer when a child I was with was almost five and on another occasion with a child who was probably four at the time.

Thank you and best wishes,

Julie Bongers

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3718    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks my dog daily in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It will diminish the quality of my life and certainly for my dog's life.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3719    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94066

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Sweeney Ridge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3720    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94010

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3721    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:**

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands, Mt. Tam

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3722    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94115

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Presidio

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3723    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 13:46:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Baker Beach, The Presidio, San Francisco

I suggest that off leash dog walking under voice control continue to be allowed on all parts of Baker Beach. If restrictions are made please consider off leash dog walking on the north or south ends of the beach where there are natural cliff boundaries and less use by humans. Another alternative I suggest would be off leash dog walking allowed weekdays or weekday mornings when there are few beach users other than people accompanied by dogs. I have attended the GGNRA dog walking open house meetings and have discussed my concerns personally with Frank Dean, General Superintendent, and other NPS staff.

I run my Border Collie off leash under voice control three days a week at Baker Beach in the Presidio in San Francisco. We live about twelve blocks away. She likes to run near and in the surf with the other groups of dogs that frequent the beach. We usually visit weekday mornings.

The preferred alternative for Baker Beach does not allow for off leash dog activity. I do not feel there is significant disturbance to flora or fauna near the surf area where the dogs prefer to run and play. NPS staff reports that I have reviewed seem to agree. There is little use of the beach by walkers (other than dog walkers), fishermen, and picnickers on week day mornings, as the weather year round at Baker Beach is usually cool and foggy. Sunny warm and clear days are rare. Typically on weekday mornings there are fifteen to twenty people maximum and often less on the entire beach and about half of the people are people accompanied by dogs.

Currently off leash dog walking under voice control is allowed on all parts of Baker Beach, as it has been for many years. It appears to me that at Baker Beach in the Presidio there is no significant impact by dogs off leash on the flora or fauna or on humans. No NPS staff reports that I have reviewed show otherwise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3724    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 13:47:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sin San Francisco gave so much land, For Funston, to the GGNR Ther should be no restrictions on dogs allowed to run free. If you are worried about damage to the endangered birds perhapl you should get rid of all the crows and ravens that eat there eggs.

Seriousley, Dogs and people can enjoy the same areas without restrictions. Dogs just like shildren and adults need space that is "free" for them to walk, rome, run in/on.

Have some consideration for those of us that do pick up after our dogs and do control them off leash. I have never seen anyone that had a dog off leash that could not control the dog. People that can't control there dogs DO keep them on a leash, as responsible dog walkers

sincerely

Ingo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3725    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

---

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field,  
Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3726    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94401

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field,  
Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3727    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94005-1249

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field,  
Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3728    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94979

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3729	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 13:54:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Leslie Edelman  
Oscar and Lizzy too!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3730	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94010				
	United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3731 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3732 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 13:56:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The NPS proposal is deeply flawed and it is a drastic change that will displace many thousands of users who reside in a dense urban area that offers few recreational opportunities for responsible guardians with their dogs.

The current use of these spaces constitutes an evolved best use of the areas - a traditional use that was in place when the lands of the GGNRA were given to the NPS to managed as an urban recreational parks, not pristine wilderness areas. It works; there are few issues; 99%+ isitors use responsibly; even the NPS statistics support that there is less than one dog related issue per 20,000 visitors.



Please do not take away our dogwalking areas - the citizens of SF and their dogs need and love these recreational areas and the rangers can use their time much better than enforcing offleash dog laws (because there will be offleash dogs regardless and us responsible owners may not be there to insure that all owners pick up after their animals or to pick up stray feces and litter). Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3733    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3734    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3735    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94044

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Rockaway Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3736    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94945  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3737    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Sweeney Ridge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3738 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94066

**Outside Organization:** United States of America  
**Affiliation:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3739 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-3254

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 14:07:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is cruel to keep dogs in apartments and on leash their entire lives!!!

People and pets which make us happy, healthy, productive and responsible should live in harmony!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3740 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-3657

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. Hello,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3741	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115-1719				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 14:08:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because some of the joy I receive in being a responsible dog owner living in the bay area is to have designated areas where my dog can run, leash free.				

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3742	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	sausalito, CA 94965-1899				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 14:09:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I have a dog and believe their freedom as well as my own is being jeopardized				

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3743	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,06,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan I love my dog and I vote. I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog				

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, other

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3744    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94005-1249  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3745    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 14:13:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is outrageous to even attempt to restrict dogs from these public lands.

Changes otherwise are to deny the fact that we are a pet centric society and people with dogs want to enjoy them in their natural habitat - which is not their yard or their city streets. Off leash dogs under voice control are a staple of dog and dog owner enjoyment alike.

Proponents of these changes provide no evidence whatsoever that A) these areas need any sort of further protection from dogs, or that B) changing access to dogs will have any environmental impact whatsoever. Dogs are far less invasive and destructive than people, horses and mountain bikers.

This is pure and simple environmental politics playing with our free access to the lands which we as tax payers own and pay to support. The hardcore environmentalists and preservationists do not own these lands and they are the minority on this issue - because they are wrong. They would like to ban everyone except for those who share their same belief system from all public recreation lands. The National Park Service does represent their narrow view .. they represent the majority will.

Teddy Roosevelt himself would be disgusted with this proposal the unwarranted restriction of citizens

---

free use of public lands ... and he would proclaim loudly the same from the back of his horse .... with his dog running off leash at his side!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3746    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** jackson, TN 38305-3309  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 14:13:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

-.--.-

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3747    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602-3507  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 14:13:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I've been a responsible dog owner for decades. I train my dogs. I pick up after them. I respect other people and animals at the parks. We're not having any greater impact on the environment than any other beings over the centuries. And we love being outdoors enjoying nature, each other and everyone else around. I'm sick of the discrimination against dogs and dog owners.

-.--.-

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3748    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94945  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3749    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 14:16:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I certainly agree that there should be stricter controls on the use of the open space for dogs off leash. The dog population is growing by leaps and bounds, especially in SF. Let us be mindful that there is very little national park space in the area and we must preserve what we have.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3750    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 95209

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Sweeney

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3751    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94115

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3752    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Sweeney Ridge

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3753    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 95209  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3754    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

---



access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3755    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

Katharine Snyder

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3756    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Novato, CA 94947

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 14:22:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F.

Your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA is punitive. This area is NOT a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. The GGNRA was established to provide recreational activities to local residents. That includes the ability to enjoy the tiny 1% st aside for us to enjoy with our dogs. Access for all users - including people and their dogs - was a cornerstone of the original 1979 charter.

You are discriminating against a whole segment of the population here in my area by threatening to shut the dog-friendly portions of the GGNRA. Your new regulation would be very heavy handed when you consider only 1% o the GGNRA is accessible to dog owners in the first place. We rely on having some places to go where we can enjoy our beautiful open space with our dogs.

I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. This is our backyard and should be managed for our benefit - 1% fr dogs and all.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3757    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 14:22:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

No balance in the "preferred" plan at all. Pure and simple anti-dog, anti-dog owner. The Park Service might prefer that dogs and their owners did not exist - - but that is not reality! Give use fair access our our public lands!

Strongly Support Alternative A: No action. Things are just fine the way they are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3758    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3759    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94908  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3760    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3761    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94947

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 14:29:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3762    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94115

United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Ocean Beach & Presidio

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3763	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94531				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3764	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94123				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 14:30:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** OpposeThe Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan

Dear Sen. Barbara Boxer, Sen. Dianne Feinstein, and Rep. Nancy Pelosi:

I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...public access to open and recreational landscapes should be maintained and increased, not

decreased or restricted.  
Do the right thing...  
Sincerely,  
SF Marina Walker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3765    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 95035

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Sweeney

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3766    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 95209

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3767    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 95330

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Rancho Corral de Tierra

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3768 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I take my dog Stella to almost all of these parks every week. She is a loving black lab mix who needs to run like any other dog and they need their freedom to run off leash. Taking this away will devastate this city and honestly make me want to move away. I have been here for years and am a responsible dog owner who loves this city and DO NOT want our parks to become strict tourist motivated areas. Please help keep our great city great.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3769 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94960

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

---

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Beaches

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3770    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3771    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3772    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** 94010  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3773 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94957

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, varied

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3774 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 14:46:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is



way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Carey Johnston

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3775	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 14:46:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and surrounding areas

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3776	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 14:48:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** One of the AMAZING things about the city of SF is the dozens of well-mannered, beautiful dogs you get to see on the street every day. It's one of the things I noticed when I first moved here, and visitors always comment about how awesome that is. It's a part of our culture to have this, and companies across the Bay Area have embraced this by allowing employees to bring their dogs to work. As someone who is not a dog owner, it's something that brings me pride in where I live. It improves the experience of the city, and makes people more cohesive. People are more open to talking to dog owners and having those small interactions makes everyone's experience better!

Let's keep public spaces available for dogs, because after all, a public space is a place for people to come together and feel a part of their community.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3777    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** January 31, 2014

Golden Gate National Recreation Area:

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed GGNRA Dog Management Plan. I have lived in San Francisco for 20 years and as a dog owner, have enjoyed Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, city parks and other GGNRA areas where I can have my dogs off-leash. Dog walkers I have hired NEED these areas and others (Chrissy Field, etc...) to walk the dogs that 40% of San Franciscans have!!! I am dismayed at the proposed leash-only areas. GGNRA is NOT a wilderness area. It's "recreation" area. And this includes pets! To take away what we have now would be catastrophic.

I fully oppose this new plan. Please consider the impact this will have!!

Thank you for your time.

Beth Allen  
1538 Fulton Street Apt. B  
San Francisco, CA  
94117

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3778    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** NA, UN NA  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** 1-30-14

To Board #1 - The work has been done - the yelling is over - whatever the outcome of THIS process - make it clear, unambiguous (sp?), clear-clear-no fudging, enforceable enforced. Empower everyone to keep each other accountable. (more to follow) Thx

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3779    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** NA, UN NA  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,30,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Fort Funston

YOU NEED TO START From the Original 1979 Pet Policy.

WHERE ARE THE SITE SPECIFIC PEER REVIEWS THERE ARE NON THERE IS A LAW THAT  
REQUIRES THIS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3780 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Lex F. Campbell (homeowner)

Bobbi Lynn Jones (homeowner)

310 Dolan Ave

Mill Valley, CA 94941

25 January 2014

Superintendent,

Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA)

Fort Mason, Building 201

San Francisco, CA 94123,

Attn: Dog Management SEIS

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input regarding the Draft Dog Management Plan Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). Primarily we are writing to support the current and future NPS efforts to create, implement, and enforce stricter management policies regarding both leashed and off-leash dog use in our GGNRA parks. Short of fully banning offleash dogs from GGNRA areas, specifically, we support NPS Preferred Alternative (F) as it pertains to Crissy Field, Oakwood Valley, Marin Headlands Trails, and Tennessee Valley.

For years we have noticed multiple problems with dogs in many areas of the GGNRA (Crissy Field, Oakwood Valley, Tennessee Valley).

On multiple occasions we have witnessed and/or experienced the following at specific GGNRA areas:

" Children under two years of age, including our own children, being knocked down by unsupervised/unleashed running larger dogs at Crissy Field East Beach.

" Leashed/unleashed dogs in areas where dogs are prohibited, particularly Tennessee Valley Trail and Tennessee Beach.

" Bagged and un-bagged, dog waste left on the beaches, trails, sidewalks, and lawns at all of the above areas. One of the worst areas is Oakwood Valley Trail where dog owners seem to mock the rules by consistently abandoning bagged feces along the trails.

" Contrary to some popular arguments regarding the usage of the parks for needed dog recreation, many users merely bring their dogs to the parks for toileting, period. We would estimate that the usage for this purpose alone accounts for approximately 33% or more of the dog visits. Ask yourself this simple question: if this activity is inappropriate for someone's own property or yard, why is it appropriate for a public park with limited shared space?

" Incredulous, unsympathetic, or aggressive responses from dog owners or supervisors when they are politely confronted about the misbehavior of their pet.

These examples strongly indicate that public safety and health are currently at serious risk by the misuse of our parks by dogs, dog owners, and dog walkers. The general condition of our parks and continued beneficial use by people with children also is at risk. In short, the parks are being used as glorified dog

---

runs and toilets at the expense of the general public, and most particularly children.

In summary we have the following suggestions as general policy objectives:

" Segregate dog use, especially off-leash dog use, from other user activities at the parks.

" At minimum, leashes should be required where dog owners, dogs, and others share trails or recreation areas (e.g. beaches).

" Designate and segregate off-leash areas away from heavily used areas of the parks (e.g. East Beach at Crissy Field).

" Implement more aggressive public education programs, enforcement, and penalties for violators of regulations.

For all the ink, time, and money that has been wasted on this issue we have yet to see a reasonable and effective argument for why off-leash dogs should be allowed to romp freely in heavily used GGNRA lands and trails. Most arguments boil down to the assertion that as a "recreation area", pet owners should be able to "recreate" with their dogs. Under this dubious rationale I should be able to set off firecrackers within the park areas because it is one form of recreation. Of course someone's recreational preferences do not make them appropriate or right for public parks.

It is evident that dog supporters are highly organized and motivated to overwhelm the NPS officials with support for their preferred policies regardless of the mission and role of GGNRA parks or the diminished experiences of the neighbors. We hope you are astute enough to recognize this shrewd ploy and understand that democracy is not a mob rules proposition. We hope the facts and reasonable long established Federal rules that prohibit off-leash dogs in our most important parks and trails will prevail.

A role of our National parks is to provide safe, peaceful, and accessible places for human recreation. One would envision these qualities as the primary if not sole purpose of our National parks. However, this legacy is at stake. We hope the GGNRA will make some effort to restore our parks to their proper role.

Sincerely yours,

Lex Campbell

Bobbi Lynn Jones

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3781	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Walnut Creek, CA 94597-3127				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 15:08:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Stella Virvitch

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3782	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 15:12:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please LIMIT ACCESS of domesticated animals and pets from our parks, give wildlife a chance to thrive!				

Thank you,

P. Weaver

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3783	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Christopher Church				

PO Box 18  
Montara CA 94037  
January 27, 2014  
Mr Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Attn: SEIS (Dog Walking)

Dear Mr Dean,

Thank you for circulating the dog-walking SEIS and extending the comment period. I will be focusing my comments on Rancho Corral de Tierra near Montara and Moss Beach, but before I do, in line with the prefatory remarks of the SEIS, I would like to ask about basic assumptions and the contrast between enabling legislation and the purpose of the GGNRA.

In order to preserve for public use and enjoyment certain areas of Marin and San Francisco Counties, California, possessing outstanding natural historic, scenic, and recreational values, and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (hereinafter referred to as the "recreation area") is hereby

established. In the management of the recreation area, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall utilize the resources in a manner which will provide for recreation and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall preserve the recreation area, as far as possible, in its natural setting, and protect it from development and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and natural character of the area. -Public Law 92-589, 92 Congress, H.R. 16444, October 27, 1972

#### PURPOSE OF GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

The purpose of GGNRA is to offer national park experiences to a large and diverse urban population while preserving and interpreting its outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values. - p. i  
How are GGNRA "national park experiences" consistent with enabling legislation that makes no mention of these? If instead the purpose is consistent with enabling legislation, the 1979 Pet Policy and a fair assessment of the no-project Alternative A would be more compelling than any of the action proposals considered in the SEIS, which all seem to denigrate any dog walking that deviates from strict interpretation of 36 CFR 2.15, the dog-walking regulation that applies to the various scenic destination national parks such as Yosemite, which are different from the recreation area.

If non-compliance to regulation is the problem the SEIS makes it out to be at the Rancho, what can rules look like that encourage compliance by permitting what is naturally taking place? Most controversially, what can be done to allow off-leash dog walking while keeping environmental quality? Setting aside just two acres between city streets as proposed in the most expansive Alternatives C or E doesn't seem like enough space, given that at least 30 acres are needed now, and the Rancho consists of over 4,000 acres. Unfortunately even these meager alternatives are not preferred, and are therefore not likely to be adopted.

If it is found to be impossible to normalize most of the present activities in the "Field" north of Montara near Farallone cutoff and Old San Pedro Mountain Rd, Farallone View School and Second St (multi-use, hiking with unrestricted dog walking, bicycle and equestrian access), then reasonable alternatives might be identified in the SEIS as the best way to improve compliance when implemented. One alternative location that was overlooked or rejected is the former "Hayfield" near Park Street adjoining Montara and Moss Beach parallel to Sunshine Valley Rd.

Under private ownership for a considerable period, hiking and dog walking appeared to be unrestricted in the Hayfield, similarly to the Field. POST gated the Hayfield and the connecting San Vicente Ridge Trail in two places and also bermed some of the trails in several places to prevent off-road vehicles from entering. POST also provided the public opportunities to obtain a permit for leashed dog walking into these lands, which I took advantage of.

Most citizens concerned about hiking conditions near the Field and Hayfield were likely not part of initial stages of negotiated rulemaking for the SEIS (p. 12), as the Rancho was under POST or private property at the time. Given the history of the GGNRA and the 1979 Pet Policy, it appears these fields would have been considered for off-leash dog-walking under voice control if these places were part of the GGNRA early on, as the Rancho directly encloses compact suburban neighborhoods under leash law, and as it happened, these two fields were accessible for unrestricted dog walking for decades before the federal government was fortunate enough to purchase the Rancho. Long ago, my entire family walked up to three dogs at a time off leash in both areas, as it was easier and more enjoyable, and possibilities of conflict were rare and manageable. In 2000, I took into care a terrier rescue dog, and off-leash dog walking was inadvisable in view of his protective instinct. Since he is always on leash when out, it isn't practical to take him to the Field, because conflicts easily arise between approaching off-leash dogs and the leashed dog. The Hayfield and San Vicente Trail provided a reasonable alternative, as most dogs are leashed, especially after POST managed the Rancho.

The status of the former main highway through a corner of the Rancho, Old San Pedro Mountain Road, is still significant and not considered in the SEIS. Since it is not abandoned, it is a special trail corridor even now, no matter the outcome of the SEIS. For example, during the federal government shutdown in 2013, Old San Pedro Mountain Road was still "open" as a County Park per check with County Supervisor Supervisor Horsley, despite inaccurate signage to the contrary.

The unincorporated towns of Montara and Moss Beach were mapped at the turn of the 20th century, and the Rancho was then in agricultural use. The agricultural land use started to change as McNee Ranch became a state park and more people visited the lands enclosing the towns, but as recently as 35 years ago, no trespassing was still enforced behind the barbed wire fence north of Old San Pedro Mountain Road on lands under lease to a rod and gun club. In both the Field and the Hayfield, signs of former grazing and agriculture still show. An aerial photograph from 1940 on display at the Montara Post Office in recent years shows the entire Hayfield and lower reaches of San Vicente Ridge as being mowed. Rapid ecological succession is now taking place with eucalyptus, broom and cotoneaster invasives and non-native Monterey Pine and Cypress as newcomers. Chaparral in upper reaches above both the Field and the Hayfield is advancing into trails formerly kept open by off-road vehicles. The Field seems to have recovered as viable coastal terrace prairie habitat, even hosting endangered species mentioned in the SEIS. The Hayfield, however, has not done as well, as it might be drier in summer or in some other way unable to recover natural biologic diversity as quickly as the Field.

Since upland areas of the Rancho are dense chaparral and inaccessible due to poison oak except by trail, the available area beyond the two fields for dog-walking is limited to a few trails including those extending over the Montara Mountains through a variety of lands near the Field and the furthest reaches of the San Vicente Ridge trails above the Hayfield. It seems unreasonable to bar leashed dogs from this handful of trails, as the SEIS identifies no major impacts from dog walking.

In the Field, there have been dog waste collection cans for years. Montara Dog Group volunteers have maintained six such for cans over five years. This decent effort reduces a modest impact at no cost to the public. Dog use at the Hayfield is by comparison insignificant, and considering historic disturbance in the areas suitable for dog walking, any impact from dog waste could be considered to be negligible. Both areas have a full complement of wildlife, including mountain lions and coyotes, which are both a hazard to the neighborhoods they surround. This suggests dog access in the Field and the Hayfield would actually be beneficial to the community by making a peaceful stand against wildlife intrusion penetrating the greenbelt into the streets and properties of vulnerable citizens whose taxes are contributing to financing the greenbelt. Also, the two fields become an attractive nuisance if substantially declared off limits. Vegetation near trails is impacted as much if not more by maintenance than dog incidents. For example, routine mowing along trails, creeks and fence lines may hurt bunch grasses more than all dog incidents. Perspective of impacts of dog walking in comparison to hiking, horseback riding and bicycling impacts seems to be missing in the SEIS, nor is there perspective offered on dog wastes in comparison to the wastes left behind by trail horses or wildlife.

Significant Hayfield areas could be found to be appropriate for off-leash dog walking in tradeoff for closing the Field to this in case of finding environmental sensitivity. Also, the San Vicente Ridge areas have potential to be an important on-leash dog-walking recreational area with magnificent views of Montara and Moss Beach surrounded on three sides by the ocean and many of the various Montara Mountain peaks. The Hayfield is disturbed and has extremely sturdy non-native annual grasses rather than native perennial bunch grasses, and the lower reaches of San Vicente Ridge are being given over to invasive species unless more neighborhood decent support can be found to control them and visitation is welcomed. The Hayfield offers the possibility of an expansive 8-acre off-leash dog walking range that might raise fewer environmental concerns than the Field, and could be a reasonable Alternative C or E tradeoff in a revised final SEIS that elevates these alternatives to "preferred."

Sincerely,

Christopher Church

cc:

U.S. Senator Diane Feinstein

U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer

U.S. Representative Jackie Speier

U.S. Representative Nancy Pelosi

U.S. Representative Jared Huffman

State Senator Leland Yee

State Assemblymember Jerry Hill  
Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell  
National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis  
Regional Director, NPS Pacific West Region Christine Lehnertz  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IX Jared Blumenfeld  
San Mateo County Supervisor Don Horsley  
Crissy Field Dog Group Chair Martha Walters  
San Francisco Dog Owners Group Chair Sally Stephens  
Montara Dog Group President Bill Bechtell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3784    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Fort mason, Building 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent,

For years I have been walking in the GGNRA. I actually attended classes given by Ida Geary on the Presidio before it was the GGNRA. I have always hoped that there would be a Management Plan for dog walking. I am in support of the Dog Management Plan and hope the plan adopted will adhere to the NPS management policies and practices protecting park resources and providing a quality experience for visitors to the GGNRA.

However, I don't feel that it is appropriate to allow commercial dog walking on National Park Lands.

Best Wishes,

Jean Conner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3785    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Walnut Creek CA, CA 94597-3127

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 15:20:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,



there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Bill Virvitch

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3786	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 15:22:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3787	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 15:29:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Table 9 "Summary of Visitor use" is a joke! A fabrication with no provided supporting evidence. Most of the "data" in it is based on is subjective and collected by observers with an observational bias. This is the worse, most bias piece of so-called science I have ever seen.				

---

It is pointless even discussing the details because it is all so far off base. I challenge any UNBIASED observer to station themselves at any of these areas and conclude the the dog use is "low" or "low to moderate". NO WAY! Low to Moderate at Rancho Corral de Tierra??? Who are you trying to fool? Practically everyone there has one or two dogs!

Any report based on what is in Table 9 is JUNK. Please go and spend MY tax dollars doing some real science, then I might take your recommendations seriously. Do nothing until then!

Thank-You, A. Taxpayer with A. Dog

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3788	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

I live 4 blocks from Ocean Beach and walk my dog there, on and off leash, almost every day of the year. While I understand the GGNRA's concerns about wildlife, in order to truly protect wildlife in an urban area, you would have to greatly restrict people, in addition to dogs, which none of the alternatives proposes to do. Ocean Beach is very much an urban beach. It is used by all kinds of people for all kinds of reasons. While walking my dog I have seen (and usually picked up and disposed of) the following: used diapers, syringes and other used medical waste, drug paraphernalia, used condoms, tires, furniture, clothes, mattresses, aluminum cans, dead birds, human excrement, and all kinds of leftover food waste.

No one would ever mistake this beach for a pristine wilderness area. Even if dogs were restricted to the extent proposed in alternative F, there is no signage or attempt to restrict people from the beach's dunes which area a critical habitat for wildlife. Most people have no idea what purpose the dunes serve as they are trampling over them and increasing erosion. There is a network of wildcat trails through these dune that GGNRA has never attempted to revegetate and even on the rare 3 days a year that there might be a park ranger out giving citations and yelling at people who have off leash dogs, I have never seen them approach people up in the dunes.

And speaking of enforcement, the GGNRA cannot even enforce the status quo (alternative A) with their current staff. People frequently walk their dogs off leash on Ocean Beach on all parts of the beach and at all times of the year. There is no way that the GGRNA will have the resources to enforce alternative F at Ocean Beach, or anywhere else in the GGNRA, so people will just continue to do whatever they want.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Making a drastic change to dog policy in the GGNRA based on such scant evidence will leave the GGNRA open to all kinds of expensive lawsuits that will waste

taxpayer dollars.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas throughout the GGNRA's current lands and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future, in addition to enforcement for dogs and people that would actually improve habitat for wildlife.

Sincerely,  
Maeve Clancy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3789    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hartford, CT 06441  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent, GGNRA

Thank you for notifying me via postcard for the extended comment period to 2-18-14.

I would simply wish that all dogs be on a leash at all times, I have been chased by dogs, in GGP many times. Dogs are on a leash all the time in Central Park in N.Y.C. it is the only reasonable method to control dogs, be they docile or otherwise. I tried having our dogs under voice control, I even took obedience classes, it did not work. People overall think their dogs should be able to run free, if an owner has a fenced in back yard, and the dog can not get out, fine with me, Golden Gate Park is not someone's private back yard, it is everybody's. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Clark Gardner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3790    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Susan Adams

310 Jersey St  
San Francisco, CA 94114  
Suea47@sbcglobal.net  
January 6, 2014  
Superintendent  
GGNRA  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
RE: GGNRA Dog Management Plan  
Dear Mr. Dean:

I would like to submit a comment about the GGNRA Dog Management Plan. My comment is, it is pointless to make a comment since you clearly are ignoring all past comments of 2011, which I diligently and painstakingly researched. In a letter to me, Nancy Pelosi asked me to trust the process. Unfortunately, after reading your non-response to the comments previously made, I cannot. You don't really care what

we citizens of the Bay Area think or need, do you? So why should we waste our breath and precious ink commenting, when you are going to do what you planned to all along. Bottom line, I reject the entire Dog Management Plan, the concept of a Dog Management Plan, and suggest the only answer is for you to give all the land back to the cities and counties they are in. Give back Alcatraz too, while you're at it. What we really need is a GGNRA Management Plan if the thousands of taxpayer dollars you spent on this fiasco is any indication. You should focus your attention on Yellowstone and Yosemite, true wildernesses where a tazerred errant bear might be more appropriate than a tazerred hiking citizen exercising his beloved canine companions. Trust? I think not,  
Sincerely,  
Susan L. Adams

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3791	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 15:46:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	231B-a414				

#### OVERVIEW:

Like most of politics, the challenge here is to make concessions to all parties (wildlife and wildlife-watchers included), educate and inform the public on new rules, and enforce the standards of accountability for those who fail to comply. I believe this begins to address these complicated challenges with creative, effective solutions.

#### THE PROBLEM:

I believe the problem is very simple. There are a few irresponsible, careless dog owners who are ruining the privilege to travel in parks and city streets. These people are taking advantage of the fact it is difficult to enforce trail laws and too easy to be lazy and play dumb. Why? Because there is a lack of motivation to comply.

#### THE SOLUTION:

So what's the best motivation? The consequence of money loss, the pain of public embarrassment and the of free time or freedom. My solution is to create a GGNRA Canine Use fee system for allowing dogs in the GGNRA. This will be an annual admission fee for dog owners to bring their four-legged companions. At the time of purchase, dog owners would be informed of the rules and sign an agreement. These would be purchased at designated GGNRA facilities. (To avoid misinformation, I would avoid online and privatized (pet store) sales.) The date of admission is would always begin on the first day of the year, January 1st and end on Dec. 31st. Fees would not be pro-rated by date of purchase. The fees would help pay for program administration, trail enforcement, signage and public education, complimentary bag kiosks on designated trails, trash pick up and disposal, etc.

#### RULES and CONSEQUENCES:

Dogs would be allowed on-leash in some non-sensitive, wildlife-lacking designated trails. Dogs would be allowed off-leash along some low foot-traffic, non-sensitive trails and part of Muir Beach. Where dogs are allowed, dog owners would be required to carry a waste bag with them at all times or receive \$100 fine. Dog owners would be required to pick up their canine waste. Dog owner failing to retrieve canine waste within 5 minutes of deposit, would face a \$1000 litter citation, mandatory court appearance and 100 hours of trail litter clean up. Upon secondary violations, the community service cleanup time and fine would double. If the court allows, 50 hours of litter clean up time could be

substituted for each \$500 of fine.

**LONG TERM:**

There are many inherent challenges with any process of making rules for the general public. However, the most common failure is to ultimately 'do it right the first time' (or do it over tomorrow). I believe the reason why this tends to happen so often the administrator the majority of public opinions and solutions are motivated by self-interest and pre-tested for long-term effectiveness, functionality, and hack-ability.

The GGNRA Canine Fee, I proposed, I believe is a positive step toward closing the many loop holes of the current public access model through a self-funded program that is effective and fair for all concerned parties, including the wildlife.

Thank you for your consideration!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3792	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 15:48:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

As a long time San Francisco resident with heavy usage of the GGNRA I strongly favor Alternative D, the "Most Protective of Resources and Visitor Safety".

The park is valuable natural resource whose primary mandate should be to provide protection to natural resources and be available for Park visitors to enjoy without fear of non-leashed and uncontrolled dogs. The GGNRA should be a protected natural resource and not utilized for commercial dog walking activities which disturb the sensitive flora and fauna.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3793	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Lafayette, CA 94549 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

â– I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â– I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

â– The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Mike Jordan  
925-639-4814

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3794    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 16:02:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ellen Soulis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3795    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** NOVADO, CA 94947  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** RETIRED Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 16:05:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I am not a dog owner but I appreciate the importance of dogs in our lives. I have seldom seen a dog that was a problem. Most are appreciated by the people in the dog's vicinity.

Almost without exception California dog owners are very careful to be aware of their surroundings and prevent any negative situations from arising. In my experience dog poop is almost always cleaned up by the owner.

I am at a loss to understand why there is such a movement to ban dogs from beaches and trails.

Sincerely,  
Bruce Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3796    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 16:05:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lauren M Brief

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3797    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Lafayette, CA 94549  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

â– I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â– I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

â– The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Luz Jordan  
925-639-4814

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3798    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 16:07:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is a national park, not a city park. As in so many other cases, the government of San Francisco acts in an irresponsible manner in providing areas within the city for dog owners to exercise and enjoy each other.

GGNRA is a National Park, not a city park and is subject to the rules and regulations of a National Park. I fully support the GGNRA's staff in selecting a proper alternative Dog Management Plan. The citizens of San Francisco should be grateful that we have this beautiful National Park on our door step, and not treat it as a dumping ground for San Francisco's unmet obligations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3799    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pleasant Hill, CA 94523  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

â– I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â– I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

â– The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Florante Marquez

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3800    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Novado, CA 94947  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 16:22:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I truly do not understand the desire to keep dogs away from recreational areas. Most owners are very conscientious and thoughtful about their pet's interactions with others enjoying the great out doors. I seldom see evidence of dog poop and almost never see irresponsible behavior by dog owners.



I am not a pet owner but I think it is very strange to want to keep pet owners and their pets from enjoying our public lands. I should underline PUBLIC because pet owners pay taxes to support these recreational areas too and should be free to enjoy them with their children and Pets.

Sincerely,  
Bruce Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3801    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 16:42:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

â€ I SUPPORT the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

â€ Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3802    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Madams & Sirs,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Homestead, Muir & Rodeo Beach and some Miwok trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. These dogs are our family members who join us & protect us on our hikes & runs. I am always responsible for any dropping and always tidy up after her. Please keep the access open for all our loved ones, including the dogs.

Kindly,  
Lisa Haugen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3803    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 16:51:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider. These areas are a treasure to dog owners - 99% o whom are responsible. Don't ban off leash!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3804    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 16:52:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Fort Funston is a haven for families and dog owners. The restrictions proposed under the dog management plan are detrimental to the sizable portion of household with dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3805    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 16:54:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I take my dog to Fort Funston every weekend. It's the only place that I can take her that will provide enough exercise for her, and I would take her more often if I could. She plays there with the other dogs, runs along the beach, and splashes in the ocean. It's crucial for her to get this exercise and to socialize with other dogs. Not having this outlet truly scares me, because too much pent up energy never makes for a safe situation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3806    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet

---

Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3807    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94111  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 17:05:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Margaret Goeden

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3808    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 17:15:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The Golden Gate National Recreation Area is a true gem in the Bay Area - I personally value it for walking, bicycling and observing nature, especially birds. Others value it for those pursuits, as well as many more highly varied forms of recreation. While the GGNRA in San Francisco is a valuable resource for human recreation, we also have an important responsibility to protect the wildlife in it, for we are their only voices. The GGNRA is big enough to have room for all of it.

To do that, the current dog management policies in the GGNRA should be strengthened, in order to better balance the needs of wildlife with the desires of dog owners. The current proposed rules are a great start in that direction.

Two points with respect to the proposed rules:

- -- The proposed rules should be modified to require that off-leash areas be marked off with fencing, bushes or other natural borders. Otherwise, it is hard for dog owners to know what is permitted where, and violations are likely.
- -- The dog management rules need to be better enforced. I have seen little enforcement in San Francisco to date. Without enforcement, the rules have much, much less meaning.

These proposed rules, with these modifications, add significant protection for wildlife and persons who just don't want to interact with off-leash dogs. Dogs and their owners are still served by over 21 miles of trails and beaches. The new rules, with these modifications, really would move us toward the GGNRA being available to all, whatever their preferred form of recreation, to balancing the needs of wildlife with those of humans.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3809	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Damian Wainschtein

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3810	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 17:33:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Peter Hub

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3811	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 17:35:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose your plan to make park areas off leash. Not only do I often take my dog, Cody, to Chrissy Field to swim and play at the beach, but I firmly believe that the positive, friendly, welcoming environment of many San Francisco beaches and recreation areas would be ruined if this dog management plan were to pass. Furthermore, dogs outnumber children in San Francisco! Clearly this city is devoted to its puppy population, and this is certainly not the right place for a plan like yours. Thank you for your consideration of my proposal.

Sincerely,  
Kate Gilbert

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3812	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Sample Letter				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dogs to Alta Trail, Miwok Trail, the Coastal Trail and the Oakwood Valley Trail. They come immediately when called and I always pick up after them, they are more interested in playing with balls than investigating or interfering with wild life. There will be nowhere left for dogs and owners to enjoy off leash walking and this is an unjust and prohibitive action.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3813    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Franc, CA 94017  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 17:51:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Eric Shank

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3814    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. The majority of dog owners do comply with all regulations and should not be punished in this way.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

---

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Marcia Elias  
SF voter and dog owner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3815    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. The majority of dog owners do comply with all regulations and should not be punished in this way.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Marcia Elias  
SF voter and dog owner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3816    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 18:00:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Mark Elias

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3817    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Greenbrae, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Marin Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 18:09:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to argue for maximum protections for wildlife when setting regulations for dogs in the GGNRA. In my opinion, dog parks should accommodate dogs off leash, and in areas such as the GGNRA where wildlife is abundant, dogs should be on leash if there at all. Creating regulations that tolerate off leash dogs in wildlife areas is simply accepting impacts of dog use throughout the area - as all cannot be controlled. The NPS is tasked with preserving this important resource, I hope the Dog Management Plan will do so responsibly. Let's ask our cities and towns to provide adequate, fenced, dog parks, and not attempt to lobby the National Park Service to do so.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3818    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 18:14:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need to keep open space available for dog owners and dogs. We love to bring our dog to S.F. for the day so he can play at the beach and we can eat the wonderful restaurants. If all dog owners have to leave their dog at home in order to enjoy the City, we probably won't come as often and spend our money closer to home.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3819    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog Zuma to the Oakwood Trail, Rhubarb Trail, in addition to occasionally taking her on the Miwok trail to Muir Beach. She has never been a risk or a problem to either other dogs. In fact, these trails are the only place where we as a family can enjoy

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 3820    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Responsys Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 18:17:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't think anything in the world gives my dog more joy than chasing a ball around at Fort Funston. Please don't restrict off leash dog parks. They bring so much joy to both animal and owner.

Please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3821    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 18:18:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I hope your organization will take into account the need we have for an open space for our canine friends. My husband and I take trips to Crissy Field for the purpose of socializing our dog, we have done this for our last two dogs and what a difference it makes. Dogs are permitted to interact with people, other dogs, bicycles, skateboards and the joy of playing in the water. There is no other place quite like it. The dogs that are running free are friendly, their owners clean up after them and it is a Disneyland for dogs. Our society has become so over cautious that we ignore the needs of our canine friends. More consideration is given to the treatment of animals in our zoos. The animals in zoos aren't expected to be social animals but we certainly expect our canine friends to be social and friendly. How do we accomplish this when they are constantly on leash when we take them out of their home. Small doggy parks are not helpful, too many dogs in small enclosures. Our rescue dog was extremely fearful of people and because we have been bringing her to Crissy Field she has improved immensely. She can't wait to get out of the car when we get to the park, she manages herself very well and has a great time running and playing with the other dogs. Please keep the park as it is, the park is truly a park for all, we love it.  
Patricia Lima

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3822    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94108  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

Sincerely,  
Allison Greenlee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3823    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 18:25:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA and has walked there for over 30 years, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely

Jim Obrien

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3824    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 18:26:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am not writing about this proposal as a concerned dog owner - I am sure that plenty of opinion will be expressed from that perspective. I am however, writing as a concerned taxpayer. My opinion is that a review has not been properly conducted in a thorough and independent fashion in order to evaluate the economic effects of the proposal.

In short - STOP wasting my tax payments on this silliness unless your proposal includes a clear cost-benefit analysis that takes into consideration the economic effects of staffing, enforcement, and revenue generation. Do you have a plan for monitoring for compliance? How many employees will this include,

and what will their salary be? What percentage of violations do you think will be noted, and what percentage of fines will actually be collected? On what basis do you make your estimates. Etc.

I hope that you take a very close look at the process by which any rule proposal or adoption is put forth. Please keep in mind that YOU WORK FOR ME. You are a public servant. You issue and enforce rules at MY direction, not the other way around. And I don't want my tax money wasted like this when you can't even properly enforce existing leash and poop rules. Please provide a revenue statement showing how much money in leash and litter violations you have historically collected versus the cost of your administration and employees so that I might respectfully consider a change of opinion. In the meantime, please be aware that you have been put on notice legally that your rule adoption process is being called into question. If the process is defective or is shown otherwise to be lacking in substance, validity, or clear economic viability then you cannot reasonably expect folks to comply. And you should expect court action (further contrary to the wishes of taxpayers).

Are we clear now? I certainly hope I do not need to consider hiring new employees.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3825	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail, Rhubarb Trail, Miwok trails from Tennessee Valley to Muir Beach. We've never had an incident. Never with another dog. and never with any person. In fact, I regularly take my family to these trails, sometimes even without the dog. We've never had any problem with any other dog on the trails. We have found the trails to delightful with the occasional dog present. Other dog owners have been exceptionally responsible and exceptionally kind. Losing access to these trails would be devastating. Frankly, these trails were part of the reason we purchased our home in Marin. Being unable to take our family pet with us on these excursions is ridiculous and disappointing.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3826	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail, Rhubarb Trail, Miwok trails from Tennessee Valley to Muir Beach. We've never had an incident. Never with another dog. and never with any person. In fact, I regularly take my family to these trails, sometimes even without the dog. We've never had any problem with any other dog on the trails. We have found the trails to delightful with the occasional dog present. Other dog owners have been exceptionally responsible and exceptionally kind. Losing access to these trails would be devastating. Frankly, these trails were part of the reason we purchased our home in Marin. Being unable to take our family pet with us on these excursions is ridiculous and disappointing. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% othe Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3827 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail, Rhubarb Trail, Miwok trails from Tennessee Valley to Muir Beach. We've never had an incident. Never with another dog. and never with any person. In fact, I regularly take my family to these trails, sometimes even without the dog. We've never had any problem with any other dog on the trails. We have found the trails to delightful with the occasional dog present. Other dog owners have been exceptionally responsible and exceptionally kind. Losing access to these trails would be devastating. Frankly, these trails were part of the reason we purchased our home in Marin. Being unable to take our family pet with us on these excursions is ridiculous and disappointing. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% othe Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3828 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Trail, Rhubarb Trail, Miwok trails from Tennessee Valley to Muir Beach. We've never had an incident. Never with another dog. and never with any person. In fact, I regularly take my family to these trails, sometimes even without the dog. We've never had any problem with any other dog on the trails. We have found the trails to delightful with the occasional dog present. Other dog owners have been exceptionally responsible and exceptionally kind. Losing access to these trails would be devastating. Frankly, these trails were part of the reason we purchased our home in Marin. Being unable to take our family pet with us on these excursions is ridiculous and disappointing. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3829    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94612  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 18:35:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There is nothing quite like the joy expressed by a dog running freely in a park. Please keep this joyous beauty a part of the human and dog experience. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3830    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 18:35:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It would be a huge blow to the dogs and dog-lovers of San Francisco if the off-leash areas of the GGNRA are restricted as proposed. You will have a lot of unhappy people who will be less than supportive of the GGNRA going forward. Please do not do this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3831    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,13,2014 18:40:59**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It's a tough sell to say that this bill will decrease environmental impact, when dog owners are by and large the segment of the population that cares for the environment. This is, of course, my opinion and I don't have hard facts to back it up, but I feel pretty confident that it is true. Moreover, this plan will result in a drastic overcrowding of the remaining off-leash areas, significantly harming them in a way that it is sure to overpower any benefits to the restricted areas.

Trust people to be responsible and care for the areas we love to share with our pets instead of trampling on our freedoms.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3832 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,13,2014 19:21:48**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Members of The Park Planning Committee,  
I have two small very well behaved dogs that absolutely love going down to Crissy Field and to Fort Funston on a regular basis. The beach is a special place where they can play with one another and meet other well behaved dogs in a special environment free from cars and bikes. My wife and I do not have kids and it is a joy for us to share one of our favorite places with our dogs. It would be a shame if they were unable to go to the beach.

Thank you,  
Mark Siebert

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3833 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Corte Madera , CA 94925

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,13,2014 19:47:31**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Wolf Ridge Loop and Miwok Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely, E. Endean

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3834	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Public Comment On Draft Dog Management Plan/SEIS				

Dear NPS,

A detailed and enforced dog management plan is needed for the benefit of all users of the parks, and to better provide for the protection of the health and safety of children, families, and people using, playing, and enjoying the parks.

1. The plan needs separated park areas completely free of pets, pet urination and dog waste remains, to provide for the safe and healthy enjoyment of the beaches and park areas.
2. The plan should be reasonable to provide for pet-friendly areas for dog owners to walk and let off leash in responsible and controlled manners. Those identified beach and field areas and access routes need to be properly posted for the enjoyment of pet owners and professional dog walkers.
3. The plan and rules must be enforced vigorously to be effective.

You have a primary responsibility to create a plan that provides for a healthy and safe environment for people and to protect areas of importance for nature and habitat preservation.

Please consider and address the following specific items and elements related to the creation of a Dog Management Plan for the parks in general, and Crissy Field specifically.

#### Require Pets On Leash - No Voice Control Option

There is no such thing as complete voice control of animals. Unless you have a clear and verifiable definition of what constitutes complete and 100% oice control of a pet by a dog owner or walker. This is ambiguous and unenforceable. This should not be an acceptable method for walking dogs along the public paths. I regularly see dogs walking well behind or out of visual eye sight of owners who are distracted or focused on other things. These owners are not in control of their pet. This also creates more ambiguity making enforcement difficult since technically they may be within voice range and therefore meeting a vague definition of under voice control. This unreasonable and irresponsible action by dog owners is part of the reason so much dog waste is found on public paths and grass areas and beaches. Dogs must be kept on leash, and leash in hand of the owner, in all areas other than the designated off leash areas so that owners and walkers are truly in control of their dogs and are fully responsible for their actions.

#### Provide Pet Parking

The plan needs to provide a parking area acceptable for dog owners and walkers to park their vehicles which provides reasonable access to pet acceptable areas and prevents uncontrolled animals from running immediately onto people friendly beaches and grass areas that are off limits to pets.

#### Sufficient Signage

The park must provide effective signage to give notice to rules, policies, responsibilities, enforcement and rights. Adequate signage guiding the owners to pet friendly grass areas and beaches is needed to support the policy and rules. This should include a master signage with site map, marked areas, and listing simple rules to follow to make enforcement feasible. Visual signs along path of travel clearly marking permitted areas and off limit areas through symbols and location maps. Clear location markings and allowed pet areas must be provided. Maybe even a large map with vehicle stop area to read before entering parking area. Provide clear directions for vehicles with pets and when walking animals. Make it easy for the pet owners and walkers to comply with the rules. Make it easy for the staff to enforce the rules.

#### Make Waste Disposal Convenient For Pet Owners

Modify the existing placement layout of trash cans so that there are at least three beach side trash cans for easy disposal of waste bags by owners while the pet is still able to be off leash and under owner control. This should aid buy in by the group for properly disposing the waste bags while being able to enjoy the animal walk uninterrupted. This eliminates any excuses for owners or walkers temporarily placing dog waste bags down and leaving them to pollute the environment. This removes further ambiguity of pet owners actions and makes enforcement easier for the staff.

#### Enforce Dog Waste Disposal Rules

Fines and penalties must be large enough to be an effective deterrent to unacceptable actions that are deemed counter to our park environment and the publics safety and health. This is the only way to change peoples poor choices and attitudes.

#### Enforcement Policy

The policies must be vigorously enforced; otherwise this initiative is doomed to fail. Must make it clear how enforced. The only way to effectively enforce issued citations is to have the rules state that by using the park, dog owners accept the rules and responsibilities, and enforcement procedures. Appropriate staff must be provided and tasked to enforce these rules at all times. Either existing staff or new dedicated staff needs to be hired to patrol and enforce these areas. Enforcement fines should be easily enough to cover the associated personnel expenses.

#### Empower Enforcement Staff

Sufficient and appropriate technologies and equipment must be provided to the staff tasked to monitor activity of park users and pets, enforce policies, document violations along with violating pets and persons, and handle any necessary evidence collecting procedures required.

#### Dog Waste Disposal Enforcement Procedures

For effective citation policies and preserving individual legal rights, the park needs to provide an enforceable objection procedure. Some rule and methodology that will only require the collection, documentation and preservation of evidence for those citations where an election to contest is selected at time of issuance. This will protect both the issuing staff members and pet owners. A policy where the citation recipients need to elect at the time of citation issuance to either accept or contest their penalty and fine. This allows the citation issuing member to collect at the time of the violation the appropriate specimens for later testing and pet identification if it is going to be contested. The burden of the cost for contesting this type of citation must be placed on those who attempt to contest their citations and lose. Pet owners must have the right to object, but this objection must be made at the time of issuance to allow reasonable evidence collection and dog identification procedures to take place. This allows the reasonable protection of individual rights while allowing the park to protect itself with the ability to collect evidence and samples to prove their case. The policy needs to provide that if a violator contests their citation, then if the dog they were in control of and responsible for is proven to be the source of the violation, then the fine is increased to a number that covers the fully loaded cost to the park for enforcing the park rules. Fully loaded with administration, legal, handling, testing, etc. costs. So there is a real risk to not paying



the standard citation fine and attempt to unjustly win in court. If an citation recipient is found not guilty, then great, and then the park will need to determine why this citation was not found enforceable.

#### For A Healthy And Safe Future

Thank you for taking action to reduce the risks to children and families playing in the sand of our beaches and on the grassy fields in our parks. Make their health and safety your number one objective, and let it guide your planning process as you consider everyones views. This is a potential liability risk that the public needs to address properly now, for a safe, healthy and enjoyable future for all.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3835	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 19:57:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I am a passionate Nature lover and dog lover, and thoroughly enjoy my regular walks with my dog in the GGNRA. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3836	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94618 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 20:01:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I urge you to implement the proposed new dog rules, with one addition - - requiring fencing or other clear boundaries around off-leash areas.				

Fencing or boundaries such as bushes will make it easier for responsible dog owners to know where it's okay (and not okay) to have their pets off-leash. It will provide those of us without dogs a little security, knowing we won't be unexpectedly bowled over by frolicking canines.

GGNRA is a precious bit of wild nature in the midst of our urban area. It needs to be a welcoming place for all kinds of users - - not just dog owners, but families with small children, seniors, people with disabilities, joggers and bicyclists, and people who want to bird-watch, hike in peace or otherwise enjoy nature without dogs running all around.

We need to protect as much of the remaining wildlife as possible so it is there for our children to view and enjoy.

For all these reasons, I support the new, more balanced dog management policies.

I believe that most responsible dog owners understand that the GGNRA should be shared with other kinds of users. Please don't let the extreme, vocal minority who don't want ANY changes or restrictions outweigh the needs of so many other Bay Area residents.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3837    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 20:18:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a senior citizen and would very much object to have public recreation areas so heavily regulated and restrictive.  
I walk my dog at Fort Funston. I have enjoyed the opportunity to get out and let my dog play off leash with other dogs.  
I have taken my dog to Golden Gate Park dog run and have had some very serious trouble with dogs. I think it is because the dogs are fenced and can not get away from aggressive dogs.  
I never had trouble at Fort Funston. I think the vast majority of people enjoy this place, respect it and want to keep it available to owners and their dogs.

Have you ever considered the fact that if you close off these areas it will throw more pressure on our streets and parks. Making those areas, as well as our neighborhoods more crowded will impact people that are afraid of dogs.

Let us keep our recreation areas open and public.  
thank you  
j stevenson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3838    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 20:18:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that dogs should be able to walk outdoors because dogs need to be able to smell the fresh air and shouldn't be inside the house forever. Dogs should be able to explore new places and be able to enjoy the outdoors. Even though i don't have a dog, i believe that dogs have the right to do enjoy the outdoors instead of staying home forever.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3839    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mountain House, CA 95391  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Mountain House Feral Cat Rescue Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 20:31:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've been traveling from the East Bay to Ft. Funston for 18 years to have the opportunity to let my Basset Hounds run freely through the soft footing of the sand. Surprisingly, Bassets can run, FAST ! but they have huge pads and finding footing that is comfortable for them to really run and get the exercise that is so critical to keep their weight under control, I've been taking them to the beaches of SF for the off leash freedom to run and exercise. No way could I run fast enough or long enough to give them what they need to stay fit and healthy. Not to mention how well they are socialized from having this opportunity. In all the years I've visited Ft. Funston, never ever have I witnessed poor dog or dog owner behavior. They are far better behaved than most dogs we pass on our daily morning trail walks where every dog is confined to a leash, leaving them feel powerless and often anxious and defensive. Freedom is essential for a dogs health and social skills. Please do not take this beautiful opportunity away. There are plenty of beaches and ocean front cliffs for non-dog loving families to gather for their outings but VERY FEW places we can take our pooches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3840    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** La Mesa, CA 91941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 20:45:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Although I live in San Diego area, I have always admired how Marin County was one of the last bastions left for outdoor people and their animals. My sister lives in Mill Valley and we have many friends who avail themselves of these trails, with and without their pets. This new regulation is going to substantially change the nature of Marin County and the area that so many animal owners cherish and have for so many years. It is too sweeping a change; unfair to so many people who count on those trails and beaches for their own health and exercise and that of their pets. This new regulation would put many people on the road to the few places left, leaving them overcrowded. It would prevent countless older people from going out for a walk with their pets. It is really an unfair and sweeping regulation that will harm many people in the guise of doing public good. Marin county is a dog haven and part of its allure. Regulate what dogs and what owners must do not just ban them.  
Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3841    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I was a resident of and worked in San Francisco for 30 years and now live and work in the East Bay - but still frequent GGNRA parks.

In addition, during 23 of those years I worked in the SF Recreation and Parks Department teaching or administering environmental education programs for children and often had to try to do my work around dogs and their owners - frankly, and sadly, the two activities were not really compatible - even if there

wasn't a dog in sight. Urine and feces are damaging not just to the environment, but children are reluctant to get down on their hands and knees to explore when the area is soiled and smelly. And of course, what little wildlife there is, is scarcer and more skittish in areas where dogs are allowed - even in on-leash areas.

Thankfully, since I first began teaching in our parks dog owners as a whole have become much more responsible. Unfortunately, there are still way too many irresponsible owners who just don't care or understand the impact dogs can have in our parks - and to make matters worse, the dog population has certainly increased over the years and with it, the number of irresponsible owners. The situation is only going to get worse if the rules are not enforced.

As park professionals you know this - I truly hope you do the right thing and stand up to the tremendous amount of pressure the dog community can generate. Many people do not have the time, resources, or stomach to continue to stand up to the dog activist community - sadly, they put up with the situation or just stop using the parks as much.

I URGE the National Park Service to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

- We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.
- Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.
- Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

I am in full support of the GGNRA's proposed plan. It is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

Thank you,

I don't really want to, but I will remain anonymous as I know just how vindictive some people can be.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3842	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	SAN MATEO, CA 94403
-----------------	---------------------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Virtual Beast Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	---------------------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep
---------------------	-------------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 21:27:55
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** As a veterinarian and dog owner, I keenly appreciate and honor the concerns of non dog owners, those frightened by dogs, or those concerned about environmental degradation resulting from dogs. I would suggest that this is a case of a few bad apples - generally the uneducated or obstreperous dog owners who either have no knowledge of how to train/control their dogs, or those who decline to respect the rights of others. These are the owners whose dogs tend to bite me or cause chaos in my waiting room.

I don't think the many (and there are MANY and increasing numbers of dog owners in the Bay Area) should be punished for the crimes of a very few.

My proposal: Try this pilot for 6 months - cite offenders who accompany "difficult", badly behaved, or destructive dogs. Bail is very high (\$500?) and will be waived if the owner attends obedience school (just like traffic school). There's an excellent well of obedience instructors one can tap locally. Get to the bottom of the problem, rather than just kick the dogs out. It will reduce dog bites, dog fights, and abandoned dogs - on and off public property.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Shelton, DVM, MPH

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3843	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Fransisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 21:31:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We love our dog. Most weekends we take our dog to fort funston. It is a great place to go as a family and our dog is part of our family. Being off leash is part of his exersize. We walk him off leash every day.				

Why would anybody want to ban dogs just beacause they do'nt like dogs.

DOGS ARE FUN TO HAVE AROUND!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3844	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 21:42:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We love our dog. Most weekends we take our dog to fort funston. It is a great place to go as a family, and a dog is part of the family. Being off leash is a big part of his exersise. We walk him off leash every day.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3845	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes. Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously. The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.				

---

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3846    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 21:50:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Part of the reason we moved to Marin was for the beautiful nature we could share as a family and with our beloved dog. It would be very sad to lose the ability to let our dog run free in the few places we can, sadder still to lose so many trails where we can even take him. Marin attracts many people for the above reasons. Fairfax, in particular, where we live has a dog loving culture with mostly responsible dog owners who pick up after their dogs and watch their dogs closely. The proposal to limit dog owner's use of trails would be devastating to so many wonderful people in Fairfax and throughout Marin.

The effect of taking so many trails away from dog owners would be to greatly reduce the number of not just dogs, but people who can enjoy these trails, as people with dogs will almost never walk without taking the opportunity to take their dog out. For many of us in Marin, having a dog in our lives is a great source of happiness, not just because we love our dogs but because they get us out walking and give us the opportunity to appreciate the amazing trails we have here in Marin. Please keep Marin dog friendly. Please keep trails open for all of us to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3847    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Fort Funston, Crissy Fields, Rodeo Beach and have done so for over 30 years.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I urge you to please reconsider this ill advised plan,

Susan Rowan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3848    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 22:00:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3849    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 22:06:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Oakwood Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3850    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 22:07:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I strongly oppose the proposed new "dog management plan" for several reasons.

First off, this plan will have a huge negative impact on the city of San Francisco, which we simply can't afford.

For decades large numbers of dogs have exercised at Fort Funston and Crissy Field. If those areas are cutoff to dogs they will start relying on city parks instead. We don't have to imagine the impact on the city parks if that happens since we saw it first hand two years ago during beach closures. For example Stern Grove was over run with dogs. The parking lot was filled as were the streets surrounding the park. If ever there was foreshadowing of a problem this was it.

Second, the proposal to use fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area is ill conceived. The fences will make off-leash areas feel like prison yards and visitors using them will feel as unwelcome as they actually are.

Third, the proposal impermissibly fails to take into account the public comments from the earlier version of the plan. I had hoped the new proposed plan would be significantly different from the original GGNRA dog management plan. It is my understanding thousands of people-the overwhelming majority-submitted substantive comments in opposition to the plan. The GGNRA's failure to make significant changes, thus ignoring the needs of San Franciscans is both disappointing and frustrating.

It is no wonder so many Americans are disillusioned with our government. This is a prime example of a blatant failure to honor the obligation to represent the people.

Quite simply the new dog management plan fails to live up to the GGNRA's promises to preserve and protect recreational access to the GGNRA.

The current proposal is ill conceived. We need to make room for the plants, the animals, the people and the dogs. The GGNRA proposal fails to do that.

Very truly yours,

Shari M  
San Francisco resident

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3851	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 22:11:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** I truly hope that you will not pass this law..it yis so important that we have safe and fun places for our dogs to get exercise and meet new furry friends. It is also a social gathering for humans to meet new friends and to share our tips and experiences with one another pertaining to our dogs. I trust that you will do what is right. Thank you Kindly

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3852    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 22:33:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am generally supportive of the SEIS except regarding enforcement. I am a 35-year San Francisco resident and have a small dog who is always on leash and I frequently walk at Crissy Beach. However, I have often had to avoid the Promenade when I see dogs off leash. Many dog owners are unable to control their dogs using "voice control." I am hoping for ENFORCEMENT as well as EDUCATION of all dog walkers. I have seen problems with off-leash dogs & wildlife, and with off-leash dogs & runners, and with off leash dogs and other dogs. While it may be wrong to over-generalize, pit bulls and other dogs bred for aggressive and guarding behavior are a particular concern.

Education, training, and enforcement are all required. Enforcement of "Voice control" and on-leash areas is needed. Protection of picnicens, children, and other dogs from uncontrolled dogs needs an active proactive plan. Good rules are NOT enough. Especially in the highest multi-use areas, the presence of a Park ranger or sanctioned volunteer is needed to enforce rules and to foster the desired outcome.

Crissy Field's middle beach will be especially crowded if enforcement moves dog walkers from East Beach to the permitted off-leash middle beach area. Redistribution to city parks might also occur, and education of dog owners will be even more important in the more crowded off-leash dog areas.

We need a clear enforcement management plan, modeled after the Boulder, CO, Green TAG program. Dog owners are registered and receive education. Enforcement targets problem users, not areas. Program Director in Boulder reports that program there is a success, contrary to DSEIS conclusions.

A Green Tag Program can be developed and implemented with a public private partnership and all three counties' local humane societies including their licensing programs. Such a program can address all impacts of concern, including endangered and threatened species.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3853    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 22:34:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** My dog is 16 1/2 and has been off leash her whole life. I can not imagine why you are questioning having off leash areas for the welfare of the dogs. Most dog owners appreciate and respect the off leash areas. Please don't rescind them. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3854    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 22:40:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am writing to express my support and gratitude for the new restrictions on dogs proposed for the GGNRA.

As a longtime Marin resident, I have seen that almost every park, trail, and open space has been converted to a de facto dog park by irresponsible and self-righteous dog owners. I am a parent of two young children, and I cannot take my children to any of the local parks or on any of the Marin County trails because they are always full of off-leash dogs that are absolutely NOT under "voice control." The owners of these dogs are so blinded by the affection that they feel for their pets that they cannot seem to comprehend how children and their parents (or anyone other than themselves, for that matter) might see the dogs as a potential nuisance or threat. My children are understandably terrified when one strange dog after another comes bounding wildly toward them on the trails, their owners far behind and nowhere in sight. Furthermore, the grass of all of our local parks and open spaces is so befouled by dog droppings that I can't let my children play there anyway.

I am well aware that dog owners in the Bay Area have been very vocal about resisting the restrictions. But please, do not be swayed, and do not lighten the restrictions. Our parks should be maintained for natural habitat, for the native species that live there, and for human enjoyment; our parks are NOT for people to degrade with their dogs. Having some common sense rules to limit dog use in our parks is long overdue.

Thank you, and feel free to share or forward this comment if appropriate.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3855    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Shana James Chibidakis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3856    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 22:46:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Walking with my dogs on a beautiful trail like the Oak Trail Loop is my RECREATION!! The dogs are well behaved and under voice control. I walk daily and enjoy several areas that are being threatened, including Crissy and Alta Trail.. It would be a devastating loss to me, but even sadder is the effect on our dogs. I am a dog walker and a certified professional dog trainer and I have seen thousands of dog walking on trails for the past almost 16 years of being in business. Dogs need mental and physical exercise. Going at their own pace, sniffing, is what the dogs do on a hike. I have seen very few fights and so many happy dogs.

It is a quality of life issue for our dogs. Why should dogs have to suffer? They are animals who also deserve a place within GGNRA to just be dogs.

I am also concerned about environmental issues-My undergraduate degree is Environmental Studies.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3857    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
John Wu  
Dog Owner and Tax Payer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3858    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 22:57:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Please keep Ft. Funstun as an off-leash area. It provides a unique and important recreational area for people and their pets that can't be served by tiny urban dog parks. For the health and happiness of hundreds and hundreds of tax payers and responsible pet owners every day, Ft. Funstun needs to remain as it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3859    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 23:05:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not change the ability to walk our dogs on beaches and in parks. San Francisco has more dogs than children. Enforcement of the current laws is really all that is needed. Kicking out people and alienating an entire population is not what the parks service is about.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3860    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 23:10:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't ban dogs of off leash on Muir Beach.  
Brenda Smit

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3861    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Leandro, CA 94577  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 23:12:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not reduce off-leash access to beaches in the Bay Area. Our densely-settled neighborhoods include a majority of homes with dogs. We and they need access to open spaces and water. Leash walks are not enough to allow dogs to run the way they've been bred to. And those of us who cannot run alongside our dogs should not be prevented from getting them appropriate exercise. There are plenty of state park and other beaches where those who prefer not to share space with dogs can go. Please preserve the precious few choices those of us with active dogs have access to. At this time of national concern about obesity and sedentary lifestyles, we should encourage activities like walking or running with one's dogs on area beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3862    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 23:15:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Pam Campbell

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3863	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 23:23:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I object to the proposed vast limitations on off leash use of the areas of Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, Ft. Funston and the all the San Mateo coast line.

There is no good reason for doing this. These areas have been accessible for off leach exercise of dogs AND their owners for decades at the very least and in some cases since settlement of California.

Cutting off this access in effect cuts off use by many citizens who no longer will be able to make any use of these areas since they use them primarily with their dogs. Both the people and the dogs need exercise and fresh air. Are we now so insignificant that by fiat we get excluded from these areas.

When the Federal Government took over these areas it was with the express understanding that the uses would not be limited from the historic norm.

Now a Procrustean solution is being forced on the population. In order to make these areas fit the "standard" for all other Federal parks an area that bears little in common with places like Yosemite, Yellowstone other great wilderness areas is being contorted without any rational or credible reason.

There may well be some areas that have some birds but there is not any documentation of their great jeopardy from dogs at present.

This may well fall on deaf ears. Certainly that has been the apparent response to all the vocal objections to this point. But you will have betrayed the trust of the people of this area if you proceed with this unreasonable restriction.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3864	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I walk our dogs virtually every day in the GGNRA, and see many of the same people each morning with their dogs, while we share our trails with runners, walkers and bikers. I'm writing to express my firm opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and would prevent me from enjoying the parks with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

I am extremely disappointed that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas that have been used for decades by responsible dog-owners like us.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future, continuing access to Fort Funston and broad access to Ocean Beach.

Sincerely,

David Mahoney

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3865	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 23:38:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off leash parks support happy and healthy pets and their owners. It's one of my favorite things about San Francisco, and a vital part of the culture here.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3866	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 23:38:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA- -in particular Fort Funston, which is really an amazing place for dogs- -I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lindsay

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3867	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Pilan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3868	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94707 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 23:58:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jean Box

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3869	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying the recreation area the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston for many years. This area was designated by an act of Congress in 1972 to allow for urban recreation and open space in the greater San Francisco Bay metropolitan area - and with the continued development of this major urban area, this need for readily accessible recreation is even more important now than it was in 1972.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

This is a recreation area, not a national park like the Great Smoky Mountains, Glacier or Zion National parks. The GGNRA was built and designed for dog walking from its inception, to better the quality of life of metropolitan residents by making dog walking a well-established priority. Congressional reports referred to dog walking specifically as one of the uses for the space when the GGNRA was created.



The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

SEIS still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who don't want to be around dogs. This criticism was made of the DEIS too and apparently ignored. As someone who is at Crissy Field daily I can give a first hand account of what I see, and it isn't people who don't want to be around dogs, it's people who do. Countless tourists and park visitors lit up by dogs, and brought together as a community, not separate from the city the GGNRA is a part of.

Sincerely,  
David Levin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3870    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:35:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off leash areas are vital for pet owners at no detriment to the general population. No reasons to restrict such vital spaces.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3871    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94704  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** PIDO Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 03:35:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Restricting so much of the park area to off-leash play concentrates a large population of dogs in a smaller area. The Bay Area has millions of happy, healthy dogs who, like humans and wildlife, need some open space to exercise and get rid of stress. Some dogs interact joyfully, but by concentrating hundreds of dogs into a smaller area, their off-leash playtime becomes more of a "hang with the pack" event, something not all dogs are comfortable with, nor their owners.

As a park user, I know that there are times on weekends when the park gets a lot of use, for the health and welfare of the urban companion pet population. Restricting this to a fraction of the area turns the limited play time we have from a chance to exercise and release the stress from being indoors into a much more tense event for many dogs, and may even damage the parkland with its concentrated use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3872    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Dolores Park Dogs Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Also, a friendly reminder..... we dog owners take this seriously and we VOTE!

Sincerely,

Remi R. Nadeau

San Franciscan dog owner, voter, campaign contributor and taxpayer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3873    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 05:37:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a citizen of the city and a frequent volunteer of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, I believe I contribute to the GGNRA. I do so because I appreciate what GGNRA offers me and my dog. The very best part of my day, every day, is exercising my dog off-leash in the GGNRA. Please don't take this away.

Sincerely,

Nancy Rush

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3874    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Piedmont, CA 94610

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 08:29:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because decreasing available space for dogs to exercise and play together off-leash is a very bad idea. I am fortunate enough to live in the East Bay where I have access to very fine off-leash dog areas. To restrict the residents of San Francisco is not a good idea. Dogs are not only man's best friend but they fulfill a critical need for many people in terms of companionship and support. But dogs need the opportunity to socialize and exercise that can only be met by access to off-leash exercise areas. Thank you for your understanding.

Sean McKenna

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3875    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 08:43:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Draft Dog Management Plan. The appeal of this city was dog friendliness. If there is a safety problem, it's people, not dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3876    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 08:50:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** re Muir Beach, I'd like to see dogs banned because it's such a small beach. But I think on long beaches, such as Limantour beach in west Marin, they should be allowed on certain sections

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3877    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 08:51:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Donna Straff

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3878    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have been walking my dogs, Lass and Shimmy, and letting them swim in the ocean and bay, for more than a decade and a half. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The proposal will unduly restrict our beach and coastal access, and prevent the outdoor exercise that is vital to my dogs', and my own, mental and physical health.

Like so many other users of GGNRA land, I am outraged that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. To those of us who have regularly and consistently enjoyed these coastal areas for decades, to have our comments and concerns totally disregarded has been unconscionable!

What is more, the GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Michael Hill, Registered Nurse, Public Health Nurse  
California BRN license # 744267  
1503 Masonic Avenue  
San Francisco, 94117

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3879    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1825  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:19:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/12/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...Please keep Ft. Funston an off leash, dog friendly environment. I have been a resident of San Francisco for 15 years. I own a home, work and spend most my money within the city. One of the reasons I put up with the high cost of living is access to wonderful public parks which are dog friendly. Taking this away from tax payers seems unfair and eliminates a big part of San Francisco's attraction. Please think of a way that the park can be shared by all.

-----  
sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3880    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-4402  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:19:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...I think it's a stupid idea. Dogs need a place to run free. We have enough ridiculous laws in SF

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3881    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:25:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I think that dogs should be free to roam around because I love dogs and they love to run around and play.It's like the dog doesn't get to go out to the sun.Most of the recreational places for dogs are going to get cut.That's why I am going to take a stand. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3882    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** jackson, TN 38305-3309  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:25:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...test

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3883    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115-4169  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:25:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it restricts the enjoyment of parts of San Francisco for my and my family (my chocolate lab included). We all really love our time in many of the areas this proposed plan will limit.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3884    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-2452  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member

---

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:25:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I believe it wrongly restricts areas. Blanket policies rarely work, and this is an example of a restriction that punishes responsible dog owners on a property that is very much a part of the daily lives of countless San Franciscans and Bay Area residents. I am not a dog owner, but don't believe that unedited restrictions in this case, serve the people. Please reconsider this legislation.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3885 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94131-1610

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:26:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because people and pets need open space to be active with their dogs. Not everyone in a city has the luxury of having a yard for pets to be active. Having a beautiful space to come play with your dog gets people off their couches and enjoying parks.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3886 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112-3718

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:27:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I want you to pass The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because. dogs and dog owners in the San Francisco Bay Area feel they have an entitlement beyond what non-dog owners have. They run dogs off leashes, frightening or killing small animals, they soil parks and trails with excrement and block passage with long leashes they often "forget" to pull in when you need to pass. I know this is a minority of dog owners but that minority is growing. I love dogs, but I don't love many of their owners. They pose as environment friendly but they are not. Worst, they often are from upper and middle class backgrounds and have the money and time to lobby politicians. I support limiting their access to established dog runs ONLY. Give me back my walking areas without dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3887 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114-2618

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:27:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because this plan does not further the purported environmental or ecological goals set forth in the plan itself. The burden is on the GGNRA to demonstrate how this plan would protect our environment, and self-serving statements that claim to further these interests are insufficient to overcome that burden. This plan must be narrowly tailored and clearly identify how the goals will be achieved in order for it to pass constitutional muster, and it does not do so. The people of the State of California strongly oppose this plan and it must be rejected.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3888    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Campbell, CA 95008-2838  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:27:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is simply unfair. Restrictions on something as simple and relaxing as enjoying the day with man's best friend are ridiculous. Many dogs are more well-behaved than children. Uh-oh...I hope kids aren't next.....

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3889    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-2852  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:28:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because thousands and thousands of Bay Area residents rely on this area for recreation use for ourselves and our beloved dogs. It is one of my favorite things in San Francisco and I don't know what I will do if it's taken away!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3890    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-3118  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:29:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I am a tax-paying, home-owning resident of San Francisco and I deserve the right to walk my dog where I pay to live. Take away this right and you will have animals with pent-up energy and aggression--in other words, creating a new problem! I pick up after my dog as do other responsible dog owners. Nothing is endangered or harmed by my dog's presence in GGNRA. What is the point of these areas after all if not for local residents, who pay taxes, to enjoy them???

---

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3891 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san mateo, CA 94403-2324  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:30:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the exclusion of dogs in parks doesn't make any sense. There is so much community provided by dogs; allowing everyone to cross borders and relate in authentic way. Effectively sterilizing parks will have a negative effect on both dogs and humans. Dogs are our oldest companions and we should have some compassion for them and their owners who want to keep them healthy and happy.  
thank you.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3892 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1804  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:30:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I strongly support The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the area is overrun by dogs. Dog owners do not pick up after their dogs nor are they mindful of families with children spending time in Federal recreation areas. Thank you for working to curb the demands of unreasonable dog owners.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3893 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109-8823  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:31:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because.. it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
My dog needs space to run just like humans do, it would make the already very crowded city parks even more crowded! Please do not let this happen!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---



**Correspondence ID:** 3894    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103-2598  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:31:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...dogs need space just like humans. We must protect our and animals ability to move freely and have open space.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3895    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** berkeley, CA 94708-1548  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:32:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because off leash time is imperative to a healthy dog

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3896    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San francisco, CA 94110-3435  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:32:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because as long as your a responsible pet owner you should be able to enjoy the park with your dog. Dogs can save lives when no one else is around

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3897    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115-2815  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:32:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because..  
It is not well thought out, not backed by reliable data and violates the spirit and law relating to equal access to national park usage Dog owners have already agreed to some changes but the GGNRA refuses to negotiate..

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3898    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115-2618  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:33:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...one solution (restriction) does not fit all circumstances. Domesticated animals are a significant part of many individual's lives. It is the person's responsibility to maintain control under differing conditions and times.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3899    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-1724  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:34:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14.

I AGREE wholeheartedly with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. As an owner of two dogs, I support the GGNRA effort to reign in unleashed dogs and irresponsible dog owners.

Don't be intimidated by a bunch of all about me dog owners and the DogPAC who don't care about environmental degradation caused by unleashed dogs. Please go ahead with your plans to implement the GGNRA Dog Management Plan.

Sincerely.

Lee Block

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3900    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112-2144  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:34:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...public access to open and recreational landscapes should be maintained and increased, not decreased or restricted.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3901    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-2602  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

1) Oppose the Preferred A.lter.native because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred A.lter.native proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwel com e. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Com pliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on com pliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non- com pliance, it still is primarily focused on mere com pliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non- com pliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3902    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133-3717  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:35:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will eliminate my enjoyment of the park by restricting my com panion's use.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3903    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-2815  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:36:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because countless people who use and enjoy the parks do so precisely because they can

---

let their dogs run freely there. This makes for a healthier community as people get exercise with their dogs.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3904    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-5697  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:36:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because dogs are part of people's families, and the land belongs to the people of the state and the nation. Responsible dog owners should be able to access public land as long as they obey established rules and respect the environment.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3905    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115-2905  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:36:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it's unnecessary, and because it's cruel and detrimental to the health of dogs to not be able to run around.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3906    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112-1243  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:37:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it restricts usage of urban lands too severely. Urban living people and animals have a requirement for access to our adjacent public lands to maintain health and happiness. The GGNRA plan ignores the location of these public parks.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3907    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132-1454  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member

---

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:37:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...my kids and family dog walk fort funston daily, it's our exercise. our dog would be lost without it. It would be extremely sad day if we lost the tiny bit of freedom that our dog has at fort funston.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3908 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127-1602

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:37:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because a key reason why we've chosen to live in this part of the country is having such access to local recreational areas and urban open spaces. Our family outings include our dog more often than not. This draft plan threatens to restrict our options for outdoor family recreation to a significant degree. We urge you to reconsider. Thank you!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3909 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** BELMONT, CA 94002-1549

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:38:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there are very limited area that we can let our pets run free.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3910 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1824

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:39:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it's a draconian response, formulated with little com munity input, to a problem that doesn't exist.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3911 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965-2058  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:39:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...there are so many restrictions already and my dog needs a place to play. How can a dog play/exercise on a leash - he cannot.  
Please don't make us keep our dogs on leash. We're already 100% responsible for them. Let's let them be off leash. Thank you! Nicole

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3912    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602-1615  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:40:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it was not formulated with any input by the public except for special interest groups privy to access this agency. It stands to restrict 90% of the 1% that was negotiated by all stakeholders over a two-year period that was upheld by a federal court judge. If NPS felt a need to have it updated or changed, the same process needed to be activated. Public comment, overwhelmingly opposed to this plan from what I have seen, was not heeded by the agency.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3913    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Emeryville, CA 94608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Timothy S. Thomas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3914    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:54:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lauren

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3915    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I love bringing my dog on walks throughout the allowed areas in the GGNRA. I can't imagine the restrictions being proposed and why they are necessary? The outdoor enthusiasts of GGNRA seem to be primarily people and dogs. These restrictions will create a ghost land of the GGNRA.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

---

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3916    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 09:55:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA.

I am a Marin County resident and support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. The SEIS preferred alternatives will force people with their dogs to drive in search of walking trails. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3917    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I have 4 dogs and I take my dogs to Muir Beach 5 days a week.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Marin residents rely upon this open space. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

If the goal is to bring back wildlife then realistically you would have to close the beach completely as wildlife and people do not co-exist.



Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3918    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 10:21:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Renee Espinoza

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3919    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 10:52:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3920    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:02:53

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my opinion in favor of allowing more areas of the GGNRA for use by people with dogs. This would include expanding areas where dogs are allowed both on and off leash. The present state is far too restrictive and results in a large concentration of dogs in a limited area.

After all, the GGNRA is a "Recreation Area". It is part of the Bay Area's wealth and it is to be enjoyed by all of its citizens and not for the exclusive recreation of those without pets.

Many of the negative comments come from people who have had a bad experience with a dog. Though unfortunate, negative situations will occur but are almost always covered by specific regulations that are broken by careless dog owners. To apply a blanket restriction because of a few scofflaws is inappropriate. The vast majority of dog owners are responsible. Don't let the few that are not responsible restrict our rights.

I am a Marin County resident who frequently uses of the GGNRA.

Thank you, Dixon Power

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3921	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 11:05:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Amy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3922	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94618				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 11:07:27				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Meryl Bailey

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3923	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94608 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 11:09:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please do not create any more fences. They create a hostile environment, redolent of prisons and urban ghettos. Let's keep our open spaces open and inviting to all.

Please do not change the leash status for these areas. One of the reasons I love SF (where I work!) is how dog-friendly it is. Don't make our city less friendly for our residents, workers, and visitors.

Sincerely,

Claire Meyler

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3924	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Kentfield, CA 94904 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 11:14:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRA is different from other national parks. Let the dogs run as they do now. No changes are necessary.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3925	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:15:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please adopt the proposal, but define any off leash areas with fencing.

I have had dogs all my life, but too many people don't control them , or are aware of the damage they cause.

We have only a small amount of park land in the Bay Area, and need to leave room for our wildlife and native plants!

Thanks for all your good work.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3926    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly city, CA 94015  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:17:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Christine Horatschki

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3927    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94707  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:18:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 2/14/14

dear friends and managers at GGNRA:

I am completely in support of the NPS approach to managing dogs in the GGNRA. I am an avid beach user, dog owner and supporter of wildlife in our urban settings.

While many dog owners are responsible for their pets, the effect on wildlife from unleashed dogs is undeniable. and it does not take many animals to affect the entire population of wildlife. I have observed on numerous occasions at the waterfront, the effect of just a few dogs pursuing shorebirds, forcing them to use valuable energy to escape.

there is adequate space in GGNRA to accommodate both dogs and wildlife, but that use should be defined by experts in wildlife behavior, not the biased dog owners.

I would like to compliment the NPS staff on their fair hearing of this issue, and sensitive management of the issue. I have been especially impressed with their eloquent spokesman, Howard Levitt on this issue.

Please count me in as supporting GGNRA staff on this issue.

thank you

Jeffrey Haltiner, PhD, PE  
ESA  
Environmental Hydrology  
San Francisco, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3928    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Ross, CA 94957  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:29:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly for Alternative A - no changes to current dog access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3929    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:29:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are so few off leash dog areas in the Bay Area. Please don't restrict access further. The vast majority of dogs and owners who use the available spots are thoughtful and responsible. Don't punish us if there are a few who are not. And since there are so many places non dog owners can go now, why is it necessary to give it all to them. Dogs enrich peoples' lives and the Bay Area. Please let us keep access to these great dog recreation areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3930    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

For years I have walked and ran with my dog, Ichiban on GGNRA lands, including my backyard at the base of Montara mountain, Fort Funston, and sometimes before work on Ocean Beach. I am saddened by the GGNRA's plan to restrict dogs even ban them from areas of the GGNRA. This is not good for me because I suffer from depression. I am veteran of the armed forces and find great comfort running with my dog, indeed my doctor insists that I continue to run and that my companionship with my dog is healthy and should be maintained. Not allowing me to recreate with my dog directly affects my well-being in a negative way.

I'm writing to express my adamant opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is much too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. I also find that it is obvious that the plan is based on the public opinion of the few, like organized opposition from bird watchers, and other groups, which I have supported (and will continue to support except for their mandate to restrict dogs), for years like the Audubon and the Sierra Cub, both who claim dogs negatively disturb wildlife although there has not been a study to date to support this assumption.

The new GGNRA plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. For example insisting to have dogs on leash on the steep slopes of Funston, including the southern sand stairs. This will be extremely dangerous for the feeble, the elderly and any one else who finds traversing such terrain difficult-even without being jerked around by a dog who traverses the stairway with four feet instead of two. Adding a LEASHED dog in such an environment is not only extremely dangerous, it lacks common sense, Falling down stairs as a result of being jerked from a dog on a leash is not only dangerous to the dog owner but to other people on the sand stairs. A stairway that often is overcrowded with families including small children. In addition to the direct impact to my health, the health of dogs, and the health of other people, such as injuries on the stairway, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Fred Andrews  
415-279-3737  
fred@singingwhale.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3931	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	FAIRFIELD, CA 94534 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 11:32:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This is a recreation area, not an National Park. It is to be enjoyed by people with their animals, as I currently do.				

---

I urge the GGNRA to honor the 1979 Pet policy including their new lands in San Mateo county.

No more restrictions, please.

Thank You,  
Tamara J Wagner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3932    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Ross, CA 94957  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:34:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly vote for Alternative A - no changes to current dog access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3933    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:43:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this Draft Management Plan.

I am a dog owner and frequent user and supporter of the National Parks in San Francisco. Primarily the Aquatic Park and Crissy Fields.

I keep my dog on a leash in Aquatic Park as that is the regulation, but he enjoys greatly the freedom to run in Crissy Field.

Over the past 20 years living in this city, I have noticed the increased use of Crissy Field that corresponds to the development of this once Military use area into the beautiful site that it is today. In the course of this progression, dogs numbers have also increased. I am in this area enough to see if the increase has posed a problem. I do not see a problem. Certainly some dog owners need to be reminded of dog etiquette such as cleaning up after a pet, training a pet not to jump on someone (especially children), or simply being mindful of their animal at all times. This can all be done with increased educational signage that helps to remind those few that need reminding.

Since a frequent user such as myself sees no problem - who does and what is the problem?

I would hope that you can approach this issue at a micro versus macro level and keep San Francisco the unique city that it is.

Thank you,  
Deborah Cardenas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3934    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94949  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:46:03**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe dogs should be restricted in the Golden Gate National Recreation area, as in your original plan. I hike at Tennessee Valley often and now there are always people walking their dogs on the main trail to the beach, even though it is clearly signed "no pets." I own two dogs myself and consider myself a dog lover, but many owners appear to believe that the rules don't apply to them. There are dogs parks all over Marin and plenty of hiking trails where off leash dogs are allowed so it's not as though they have no place else to take their dogs. We need to protect the GGNRA areas for the wildlife, not the dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3935    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:56:10**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Pavel Skaldin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3936    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:57:06**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep off-leash dog parks in San Francisco and the surrounding Bay Area. We are responsible dog owners who always have our dog under voice command and are attentive to her when she is off-leash. Without off-leash areas, our dog would not get the kind of exercise she needs to be healthy and happy. Thank you.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 3937    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 11:58:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As an unabashed dog owner/enthusiast and San Francisco resident, I am writing to state my support of the least restrictive Dog Policy Alternatives, which, appears to be Alternative E.

My dogs depend on me for their wellbeing and I depend on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for off-leash dog recreation, without which, I would not adequately exercise my dogs or myself.

Please consider these points:

1. City of San Francisco gave much of the parkland to the GGNRA for everyone to enjoy
2. Dogs outnumber children in San Francisco and should be given similar consideration in park usage
3. The vast majority of people and even greater percentage of dog "owners" are good, law abiding members of society
4. Policy should allow healthful recreation with minimal restriction of the masses so long as public good is not jeopardized
5. Delicate environmental and historic features should be protected from harm of all sorts
6. Altered areas are not necessarily more or less important than "natural" areas, harm from recreation seems inevitable- - just look at sites where humans have settled over the millennia
7. Looking back at the fossil records shows that PEOPLE are invasive non-natives in this area prior to the influx of "Native Americans", thus, I conclude that everything which is not as it was prior to the first explorers' sightings of the area is "altered". Are we to decide that every trace of civilization should be removed? I think that is not a reasonable path. I recommend we continue use of our parklands with respect to preservation (to a point) of both nature and historic features, though not to the degree that enjoyment of recreation is largely impaired.
8. Respect must be paid to the animals and people who wish to avoid interaction with dogs. Largely, people are best advised that there are significant places in the GGNRA where well behaved dogs are given priority for off leash exercise and fragile, native flora and fauna be cordoned off to keep everyone from disturbing them where appropriate.
9. The 1979 GGNRA Pet Policy nearly provided consideration of the above, the 2013 Alternatives A through F nearly, though not appropriately, manage these concerns. It is right to have law which allows misbehaving persons and pets to be corrected, we must not, however, make restrictions such that the way recreation is enjoyed now becomes unlawful and thus, laws ignored by the majority of visitors!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3938    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** MUIR BEACH, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 12:04:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Re: Comments on GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

(Muir Beach Section Only)

2/14/2014

The mouth of Redwood Creek at Muir Beach is an important wildlife habitat. Not only is the creek and marsh area important for the threatened Coho Salmon and Red-Legged Frog, but many other species use the area as well.

For example, the creek mouth, front lagoon, and adjacent beach area are used as resting and refugia areas for many species of gulls and shorebirds. The refugia during onshore storms are particularly important for these species. However, pressure from off-leash dogs and their owners typically flushes gulls, herons, and other birds first thing in the morning. In addition, a family of River Otters which now resides in the creek system often feeds in the front lagoon and beach area, but not when there is pressure from dogs and people. Raccoons and Mule Deer are also common in the willows near the mouth.

In August 2013, when the beach area access was closed due to construction of the new parking lot and few persons accessed the beach, there were many days when over 200 gulls and terns were present on the beach area adjacent to the lagoon (detailed data available). This almost never occurs normally, since dogs often run into this area off leash and disperse all of the birds into the offshore area. On Stinson Beach, where dogs are not allowed, many species of gulls and shorebirds are commonly found.

For this reason, we feel that the preferred alternative, F, is not restrictive enough for wildlife protection. Personally, we would prefer no dogs allowed in the creek area at all (Alternative D). However, realizing that the dog owner stakeholders continue to insist on open pet access, I suggest that alternative E is the best choice. This alternative allows professional dog walkers and pet owners access to a large ROLA zone south of the beach access ramp, and thus addresses the desire for dog recreational opportunity at the beach. At typical tides, this area would be much larger, for example, than the Mill Valley Dog Park. Of course there is also wildlife at the south end, but I believe the creek mouth is more important overall. Alternative E prohibits all dogs north of the access ramp to the creek (or to the NPS boundary), and the enforcement criteria would be clear. Access by enforcement would be by foot across the bridge (or perhaps by horse via Kaasi Road?).

Alternative E also allows a buffer zone between dog recreation originating from visitors to the beach parking lot from the Marin County-controlled "Little Beach", which is commonly used by Muir Beach residents and their pets. So it is unlikely that this alternative would put more pressure by visitors to the area to use Little Beach for pet recreation. Walking from the parking area to Little Beach with a dog requires a long trek around the fencing, and across a private road owned by Muir Beach which could have additional restrictions placed on commercial dog walking or special signage if Muir Beach so chooses.

If alternative E is still felt to be too restrictive, at least a hybrid between alternatives E and F might work. ROLA for the south main beach, leash control for the north part up to the creek. However, this allows dog walkers easier access to Little Beach during low and moderate tides, which alternative E would not. And of course, leashed dogs flush birds also.

Impacts and benefits from E and F are pretty much the same according to the tables. Both will require a new level of management by NPS which even now does not really exist with regard to trails or access paths to the beach. There is essentially no enforcement now of the leash rules. Vehicle-based enforcement will not be adequate for any of the alternatives.

We vote for E. Give wildlife a chance.

Dave and Bonnie MacKenzie  
Muir Beach  
(Dog lovers and 15 year residents of Muir Beach!)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3939    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Ross, CA 94957  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 12:10:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I want Alternative A - no changes to current dog access

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3940    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 12:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Aine O'Connell  
San Francisco, CA 94105

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3941    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a veterinarian as well as a dog owner. I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

I live in San Mateo county and walk with my dogs in many GGNRA parks, several times each week. I frequently encounter other folks walking with their dogs and find that responsible dog ownership is the rule. The few exceptions should not impact a Dog Management Plan any more than a few unruly and destructive children should result in a restriction for access of children (or horses or bikes) to the parks.

GGNRA represents URBAN parks with a completely different mission statement and purpose than National Parks such as Yosemite. The purpose of these parks is primarily to provide a source of outdoor recreation to the residents of the cities and counties where they exist. In most cases, this goal is not incompatible with the secondary goals of protection of wildlife and plants. All of these can coexist, with some limits. Dogs are a well-established and important contribution to the quality of life for residents in these urban areas. Most have small personal yards and providing their companion dogs with free running exercise is essential. It is also in keeping with what should be the goal of these parks. The greatly increased restrictions and limited access in the proposed Dog Management Plan would have serious negative consequences to the quality of life of the people and dogs that these parks are supposed to serve.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3942    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 12:22:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I want to urge you to preserve some quality areas within the GGNRA for off-leash dogs. There are very few off-leash areas in and around San Francisco. Yet, we should be encouraging pet ownership which promotes urban resident psychological and physical health. In particular, dogs are required to take their owners on frequent walks. Please do it also for the health of the dogs which cannot get the exercise they need at the end of a tether.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3943    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Fransico, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** me Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

---

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 12:23:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a dog lover all of my life, but for many years was not able to have one as I was a renter. Now that I am lucky enough to own a dog I want to give him all of the exercise he needs and deserves. I oppose the GGNRA's plan to ban dogs off leash. I have not seen any Valid studies explaining why we must take this fantastic part of enjoying our City away from so many people and dogs. Thank you,

Kathy Sabatino

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3944    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 12:26:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
David Hughes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3945    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 12:29:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the draft dog management plan because the GGNRA, by its own rules, must conduct site-specific, peer-reviewed studies as the foundation for any policy changes intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. The GGNRA acknowledges the required studies do not exist. This renders the proposed policy changes arbitrary and capricious, and as such they are unlawful and cannot be implemented. The ORIGINAL 1979 Pet Policy should be reinstated per the 2005 Federal Court decision because all closures since then have not been based upon site specific, peer-reviewed studies as the law requires. For lands added after the drafting of the original 1979 Pet Policy, DOI policy requires historical

---

usage be maintained. Any changes would have to be justified by the requisite site-specific, peer-reviewed studies followed by a formal rulemaking process.

Sincerely,  
Jane Shepard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3946    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

We all deserve a healthy community in the Bay Area and that includes open space for our dogs to run and play with humans. Fenced in areas in secluded areas just create anxious, angry owners and dogs. Enjoying the open spaces in the Bay Area with our dog is one of the things we love about being here.

We pay a lot of taxes to support services for children that we don't get any use from since we don't have human children. We expect to be treated with the same respect and have rights for our dependants and that includes the freedom to enjoy the outdoors with our dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3947    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 12:36:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**  
Please manage the GGNRA in consideration of the wild birds who really need their natural habitat in a natural state.

The dogs run ragged all over the place and have a negative impact on the place and its quieter and less rambunctious citizens.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3948    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Concord, CA 94521  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 12:36:22

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

please allow dogs to continue enjoying trails and nature areas. They are cherished family members who need air and exercise. And think about health expenses reduction for all those for whom dogs provide companionship and ability to be in better mood/be less depressed. Being with dogs is therapeutic. In the end, we all benefit from having happier, healthier folks around, and from fewer psychosomatic visits to primary care doctors.

Thank you,

Natalya Golovanov

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3949    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 12:50:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not so drastically reduce/eliminate off-leash access to people and their dogs in SF and the surrounding area. Just like the Plovers and the Elephant Seals, we need some place too! This is a densely populated, urban area and we humans and our canine friends need access to some off-leash recreation. Please PLEASE help us to cope in these overcrowded communities. There needs to be a balance for all of us- humans, pets and wildlife included. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3950    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 13:04:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Estelle Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3951    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Jose, CA 95129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 13:06:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose GGNRA's proposed dog plan and that support off-leash dog walking!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3952    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 13:13:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not ban off-leash dogs and further access for leashed dogs in the GGNRA!  
This is a RECREATION area, not a national park. It is located in the heart of a large urban area. Access  
must be available to all who live here. Recreation is the key!  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3953    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 13:16:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to  
express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog  
management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own  
health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3954    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 13:18:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I live in San Francisco with my great dane, Hammie. I regularly take Hammie to  
Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field, where she enjoys romping off leash with other dogs. By  
getting her exercise in these off-leash environments, Hammie is a management and safe pet in more urban  
environments.

I am opposed to the Preferred Alternative because it is not justified and it is too restrictive. I think adding  
fences would make the open space feel closed and would make it less attractive to dog owners. I don't  
think GGNRA should change the leash status of an area just because people are not complying with  
existing leash restrictions. Changing rules is not s solution to non-compliance.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3955    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3956 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 13:26:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** save the freedom of our beloved dogs!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3957 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 13:27:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It would seem that the plan needs to include facilitated discussions with dog owners around their compulsion to let their dogs off-leash specifically in sensitive areas that are well-signed.

These are acts of aggression that I believe can be dramatically reduced.

Case in point: I watched a woman let her 2 dogs run directly over Snowy Plover habitat at San Francisco's Ocean beach while the birds were there. When she ran back up to the board walk, I courteously asked if she was aware of the sign and the leash requirement, and how the birds were startled by the dogs. Without stopping, No, she said, didn't see the sign, and ran off.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3958 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 13:37:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA's Dog Management for a number of reason:

1. I believe that it is too restrictive and that having limited off leash areas will create more problems in the designated areas and surrounding areas too- no research has been done to find out the impacts this will

---

have on other areas

2. 50% of SF households have a dog and restricting us to such a small area will not allow me to exercise and play with my dog for his health, and mine, in a way that is enjoyable for us
3. The GGNRA lands are beautiful and picturesque, but it is becoming exceedingly difficult to use and enjoy the space due to this plan, along with little public transportation, limited (pay only) and construction
4. there is not enough evidence that dogs are impacting the area in a negative way

Please reconsider your plan to accommodate the thousands of dog owners in the city who have enjoyed recreating with their pets on GGNRA land for years.

Thank you,  
Elizabeth Tausend

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3959	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 13:38:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a longtime resident of San Francisco, tax payer, and a born-and-raised North Bay resident, I am extremely frustrated by the direction the GGNRA is taking with respect to dog policies in what are essentially public lands set aside for public recreation. Dog walking here in SF is already a challenge, with few parks and suitable areas for open play and off leash activities. Further restrictions will serve no clear public policy purpose and will only further alienate the GGNRA lands from the public they were set aside to benefit. GGNRA lands are not purely natural preserves - and I recommend the GGNRA management check the term "Recreation" in the title of the lands. They are, in part, made available to the people for their use. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan and hope you will advocate on my behalf.

Many have joined me in holding the views I have shared with you above, and, collectively, I think we've grown to believe that our voices have not been heard. In addition, we have seen no good evidence to support the current proposed policy changes with respect to dogs on GGNRA beaches. Evidence-based policy making should be central to the stewardship goals of GGNRA and in that regard I feel the administration is failing the public. Nothing I have seen to date justifies the radical policy change that is about to take place.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative and hope you will recognize the views of the many thousands of responsible dog owners in the city and county of San Francisco.

Thank you,

John Karr

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3960	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Nadia Ferrari

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3961    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 13:58:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off leash dog walking in Bay Area allowed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3962    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
L. Martinez

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3963    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Jose, CA 95129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:04:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We and Olie(my dog) enjoy going out to San Francisco and enjoy the beautiful ocean scenery there. Please let Olie enjoy romping around. Don't discriminate her because she has 4 legs. Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3964    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Diana Leung

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3965    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:10:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Nancy Choate

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3966    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:12:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service:

Please do not restrict access for dogs and their owners as outlined in Alternative F. The GGNRA is not like other national parks. It's close proximity to 7 million Bay Area residents provides much-needed opportunities for recreation for citizens in the local communities. That's why "Recreation" is in the name of the GGNRA. People only have so much time, and those of us with dogs (at least 100,000 in Marin) very much need to exercise with our dogs. We accept that our dogs are unable to access over 99% of GGNRA lands, but we strongly oppose you further restricting that access even further. That would simply put too much pressure on the few remaining lands where we can go with our dogs, including nearby county and state-held lands.

I have been hiking every week for 7 years with a group of women (and our dogs) on the Miwok trail above Tennessee Valley. In all of those years, our dogs have never injured wildlife or frightened a horse on the trail. It is a fire road, with plenty of room for all. We share it with joggers, mountain bikers and hikers quite happily. Yet we will lose access to this trail if Alternative F is adopted. Our quality of life - every week - will be adversely affected.

I have been to Yellowstone Park in the winter time, when the gate keepers had to wear gas masks because of all the hundreds of snowmobiles coming into the Park each day. I understand some of those users chase elk and other wildlife.

Yet you allow that usage in Yellowstone Park, a national treasure. Dogs have far fewer impacts in the GGNRA. Yet dog owners are an unacceptable user group?

As a woman, I am far more comfortable hiking with my dog. He makes me feel safe. And he also needs off-leash areas in which to run. Have you ever tried to play fetch with a dog on leash? It doesn't work. Having my son be able to throw a stick for our dog is as American a past-time as going to a baseball game. Please do not force us all into our cars to drive to the one area permitted in Marin under Alternative F - Rodeo Beach - in order to be able to enjoy this experience.

Public lands belong to all of us. You hold this land in trust for us and future generations. Please do not effectively deny us access by disallowing our canine companions. Please adopt instead Alternative A.

Thank you.

Anne C. Harper

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3967    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:13:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Pauline Chau

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3968    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:13:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a hiker and mountain biker, I use the trails in and around Pacifica up to five times a week. Since 1999, I have had many encounters with unleashed dogs not under their owners control.

On the Old San Pedro road trail while riding uphill, I came upon three large German Shepard's - off leash and out of sight of their owners who had sat down for a break around a corner. One bit me on the hand, and one got behind me. The other was barking aggressively. I was so freaked out that I cancelled the rest of my ride and turned around. The teller at the BofA was the one who noticed I was bleeding.

On the Baquiano trail, just above the Fassler trailhead, I was attacked by two Pit Bulls - Off Leash and out of control of their handler who was holding a baby in her hands. This lady was not even from Pacifica but had heard it was a great place to let the dogs run wild off-leash. And they were her daughters dogs, which explained why this lady had absolutely No Verbal Control while the snapped and barked at me.

Baquiano trail near Sweeny Ridge - Off Leash dog and owner jogging by my girlfriend and I. He kept running by, but the dog stopped to bark and snarl. I put Sandra behind me and yelled. The Dog owner came back, grabbed his dog by the collar, then berated US! Like we wanted to get attacked!

Mori Ridge heading up towards the Nike site - two Off Leash dogs running ahead of their owners, barking and snarling aggressively at me. I have to dismount and put the bike between us.

Old San Pedro Road heading up near the three phone poles. A lady's off leash dog barks and acts aggressively. When I comment on the fact that she doesn't even have a leash with her, she responds that I don't have a helmet. I respond with helmet don't bite.

Baquinao trail halfway between Fassler and Sweeny Ridge - Girlfriend and I surrounded and menaced by

---

two large dogs Off Leash and not under verbal command.

I don't have anything against dogs per say, I object to Off Leash dogs who are aggressively and dangerously out of control.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3969    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:14:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an avid birdwatcher, it is distressing to watch the dogs run wild in sensitive environments. From my own experience, there are fewer and fewer birds returning to areas where they were once in abundance. The areas where there are fenced in dog parks to give dogs plenty of space to run, have provided safe environments for both children and wildlife.

Thank you for your attention and concern for to this matter.  
Diane Lavin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3970    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:16:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the Park service limits on off-leash dogs. Dogs have many places they can play, the birds do not.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3971    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** MILL VALLEY, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:17:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In 12 years of running our hound at Muir Beach I have never witnessed any dog there doing any harm to the environment or wildlife.

There are so few places where our canine companions can run off leash to their heart's content, and surely Muir Beach is among the most wild and beautiful.

I urge you not to place these restrictions on dogs at Muir Beach.

I can't imagine what complaints- - if any- -have led you to devise such a proposal, but I suspect that the complaintants have not spend any time at Muir Beach.

Richard Schaper

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3972    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Jose, CA 95129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:20:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose GGNRA's proposed dog plan and that support off-leash dog walking!  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3973    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94618  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:22:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I visit Fort Funston with my partner, our daughter and our 5 year old dog every weekend. We consider ourselves to be responsible pet owners; we keep a close eye on our dog and ensure that her activities do not have a negative impact on other users nor the environment. Her off-leash experiences at Ft. Funston have been crucial to her socialization and training. Our family have developed strong friendships with other Ft. Funston patrons and their dogs.

I am disappointed with the revised draft plan as it proposed extremely draconian restrictions on dog owners. I appreciate the plan's intent to reduce user conflicts and promote the preservation and protection of natural resources. I also agree with proposed limitations on commercial dog walkers. Nevertheless, I believe the plan overly restricts and completely eliminates off-leash access in many locations and thereby fails to support a key part of GGNRA's mission: to preserve the natural and cultural resources, and scenic and recreational values, of the park. My weekend visits to Ft. Funston are fundamental to my recreation.

The DEIS includes many unsubstantiated generalizations about the negative impact dogs have on GGNRA's natural resources. I believe there needs to be more fact-based arguments to support this hypothesis. I witness more impact from human users of Ft. Funston: small children chasing birds and littering or "boot camp" participants destroying native vegetation as they run through the park. However I realize that leashing restrictions on children and joggers are not the answer but rather improved communication and enforcement of GGNRA rules. This same reasoning should apply to owners of off-leash dogs.

I have never witnessed the types of conflicts at Ft. Funston described in the DEIS, neither dog vs. dog nor dog vs. human. This could be attributable to the time of day I visit Ft. Funston but I believe Ft. Funston's location and topography make it uniquely suitable for off-leash dogs. It is not adjacent to a major neighborhood like Crissy Field in the Marina. Also, Ft. Funston does not have Crissy Field's diverse user-base (e.g. roller-bladers, cyclists and beach-goers). Therefore, I don't believe the same draconian restrictions that have been proposed for Ocean Beach and Crissy Field should apply to Ft. Funston.

I enjoy the natural beauty of Ft. Funston but mostly appreciate the ability to walk my dog there off-leash. If the proposed leash restrictions are imposed, I would no longer visit Ft. Funston.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3974    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---



**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:22:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Leave the dogs alone!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

please

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3975    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:23:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 99% o state and federal parks are not dog friendly and if you can bring a dog it usually can't go on trails and rules are just stay in the campsite area for canines. Taking away, downsizing and restricting the off-leash dog areas at Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, Muir Beach, Fort Funston and in Montara is a HUGE mistake. I've heard the excuses that it hurts the wildlife and that people complain about the dog's poop and behavior but WE HUMANS have done more to hurt the environment than any other animal in this world. WE created the dog and should at least give them a chance to run freely w/o fear of losing it's ground(no pun intended) with our current and past off leash dog parks/beaches.

At Fort Funston, most people who go there are dog owners and lovers. If you were to take away the rights of dog owners that are there today you'd really hurt a lot of families and dog owners. I'm sure that Fort Funston would become a desolate place with lots of shady people there and no sense of community or involvement. The mast majority of the visitors that hike down to the beach are accompanied by their dogs. I don't see hardly anyone without a dog.

Ocean Beach os a place I go to regularly with my dog and couldn't imagine not being able to go there again off leash with my dog. I've rarely seen any dog poop at all. I see more trash from others not including dog owners.

Crissy Field has been a part of San Francisco with off leash benefits for dogs for a long time. REAL San Franciscans respect that it's off leash dog friendly whether that own a dog or not. It's what makes San Francisco special and real. Don't change our culture more than it already has.

Muir Beach has been an off leash dog beach for the residents of Marin County for years. Long time residents have been all about conserving the land, environment and financially supportive of parks and recreation. Why take a simple off leash dog beach away from them after all the support in the past??

Please reconsider and do the right thing and that's leave the dogs in peace.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3976    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941-3407  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Folks,

I am a Tamalpais Valley homeowner and dog-lover whose property abuts the GGNRA just below the

---

Lattie Lane trailhead to Homestead Hill/Four Corners. My dog and I frequent the trail and share it with numerous dog-walkers, as well as local runners and walkers.

I support Alternative A, the "No Action Alternative", in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

The GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

Thank you for this opportunity. May sane minds prevail.

Love,  
- B

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3977	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Carlos, CA 94070				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 14:25:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3978    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:27:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose GGNRA's proposed dog plan and that you support off-leash dog walking.  
Please listen, thanks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3979    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:31:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Regards,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3980    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94804  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:31:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not restrict dogs in the GGNRA. One of my favorite pleasures is to take my dog to the beach and play with him off leash. I always clean up after my dog. The current policy on dogs at the GGNRA works fine. Don't try to fix something that's not broken.

---

Diane Dickey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3981    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for this opportunity to share. I am a 20-year plus Tamalpais Valley homeowner and dog-lover. My dog and I frequent the trail and share it with numerous dog-walkers, as well as local runners and walkers.

I support Alternative A, the "No Action Alternative", in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

The GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

Thanks for your consideration, Judith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3982    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** RCM Capital Management Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 14:48:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I profusely oppose this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3983    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 15:02:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We would rather walk our dogs in an open environment and free to run rather than a closed fenced area which will feel like walking in a big cage.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3984    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 15:05:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Steven Brown

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3985    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 15:07:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am saddened and frustrated to hear that the National Parks Service and San Francisco are trying to ban off-leash dog area throughout the city. We have lived in San Francisco for over 9 years and have a 5 year old dog. She was raised in the city and every day, for over 2-3 hours, is outside, socializing with the other neighborhood dogs, playing, running and burning off energy that wouldn't be possible if they weren't allowed off leash. All the dogs we socialize with are extremely well adapted and socialized. City dogs have this advantage to dogs in the suburbs because most owners don't have the option to throw them in the back yard. Because of this, city dogs are much more social and adapted to interacting with people and dogs of all types. We also go to the beach at Chrisy Field weekly. The majority of people who are at the beach are dog owners. Here dogs are able to run, swim and enjoy what not many others do, apart from the 5 nice days a year the beach is actually warm enough to warrant use by families and non-dog owners.

It will be a shame and very frustrating for San Francisco dog owners if off leash was taken away. We realize there are always the exception to the rule, and non-San Franciscan's who bring dogs into the city, but 99% of the dog owners I know are extremely respectful of the parks and beaches. We pick up after our

---

dogs, obey the rules and really just want a place for our dogs to exercise and run to burn energy that is needed to make a dog happy and healthy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3986    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 15:07:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose restricting dogs in the Golden Gate NRA areas discussed. Dogs add to the pleasure and beauty of our parks and beaches and are special creatures who need to be able to run and play, with people and other dogs, and not kept on leashes in these open spaces.

Our dog, Dutch, loves to run and play with his buddies and we would all be saddened not to have the opportunity to watch him enjoy himself.

Sincerely,

Terry Bremer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3987    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Michael Keel  
www.michael-keelphotography.com  
<https://www.facebook.com/MichaelKeelPhotography>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3988    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 15:27:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We use Crissy Field on a regular basis wo excise our dog. We willing share with endangered birds etc., etc. Because the area is a GGN park we feel it is our rights as citizens to use the area as it has been designated off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3989    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 15:30:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The bay area should set an example to allow on-leash and off-leash dog walking are for the country. We have one of the highest pet population in the Nation because we love our pets. We are responsible owners and will not put the public or our pets at risk. However, you will be telling us - as pet owners - to illegally walk our pets in restricted areas. That is not the message the district would like to share.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3990    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oaklalnd, CA 94608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 15:46:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to suggest that many parks could SCHEDULE off leash dog time. Many people want to walk their dogs in the morning and the evening, and let them play with each other as THE ADULTS SOCIALIZE! Dog time could be posted, so people who like to socialize with their dogs would know appropriate times. Dog baggies could be provided. Especially in the evening, dog walkers would make the parks safe after dark. Seniors would be safer after dark. I am in favor of any changes that make off leash dog walking possible.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3991    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 16:01:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kristen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3992	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 16:17:10
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a former employee of the Environmental Science Center at Fort Funston and now as SFUSD teacher who brings my classes to programs at the Environmental Science Center, I strongly support plans C (1st choice), D (2nd choice), and E (last choice).
------------------------	--

I have first hand experience with rude and disrespectful dog owners and dog walkers who care more for their animals being off lease and free to go where ever they want than the young children who use/share the Fort Funston area. Although there are some dog owners who understand that not everyone loves dogs or is comfortable around them- -and they try hard to share the space, many of them could care less about sharing the area.

Also, it is usually the dog walkers who are the most rude and disrespectful of the idea of sharing the area. Many have little control over the large number of dogs that they walk, and they really don't care if the children are uneasy or scared. They are at Fort Funston to do a job and have no respect for the children or the Environmental Science Center program. And many don't even pick up after the dogs, or leave the plastic bags full of feces on the trails- -so rude and unsanitary!

Unfortunately many dog owners feel they should have free run of any part of the city, and can't or won't even try to understand that not everyone agrees with them.

I grew up with dogs and was taught by my parents to respect people who are not comfortable around dogs and to be a good ambassador on how to be around people with my dogs. It is a shame that others don't care to work together and share the more than abundant area of Fort Funston.

I hope the NPS doesn't bow to these selfish folks who want to hog everything for themselves and blame



others as dog haters. I love dogs but want my students to feel safe when they go for an overnight program at the Environmental Science Center at Fort Funston.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3993    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland , CA 94609  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 16:18:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In San Francisco more people own pets than have kids. It is vitally important for the health of the community to have off-leash dog areas. Both non-dog owners as well as dog owners benefit from having healthy dogs who are well socialized in the community.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 3994    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 16:22:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Dean,

I'm writing to voice my extreme displeasure with the proposed changes to the GGNRA under the Draft Dog Management Plan. I'm a lifelong environmentalist and dog lover, nineteen year resident of San Francisco, and responsible dog owner for the last four years. I take my dog to Fort Funston once a week, and visit Crissy Field and Lands End a couple times per month. There are very few off leash areas available in San Francisco, so the threat of losing what we have makes this a very big deal. Fort Funston in particular is a very special place to city-dwellers, close enough to be accessible yet peaceful and remote-feeling. It's a place where I can jog on the beach alongside my dog without having to trip over her leash or worry that she's going to dart out into traffic. If any of the proposals "B" through "F" is enacted, dog owners will be left with but a few city parks with typically small, fenced-in dog runs - - certainly nothing like the vast stretches of beach we currently enjoy.

The history of this issue seems like a solution in search of a problem and serves as a perfect example of bureaucratic overreach. The use of a 1500 page, English-only document only underscores the NPS disconnect with the community and with reality. I've browsed the document, and the gist seems to be that GGNRA needs to have the same dog policy as other areas under NPS management. The issues cited in the "Need for Action" are cherry-picked to support the clear bias of this document. Hazardous and offensive dog waste from a handful of irresponsible dog owners? Possibly, but never mind the beach littered with horse waste and human trash, several homeless encampments, and storm water outflows that are covered top to bottom in graffiti. Dogs destroying vegetation? From all appearances the non-native eucalyptus and ice plant are doing just fine. Sound pollution from barking dogs? Maybe, if you can hear over the crashing waves, the steady stream of planes departing SFO, and the constant gunfire from The Pacific Rod and Gun Club at Lake Merced. Dogs destroying historical sights? Like the austere concrete bunkers designed to withstand an enemy attack? Dogs causing erosion? Surely, natural processes share most of the blame for the sand hillsides falling into the ocean. If my responses seem absurd, it's because the accusations made against dogs are equally ridiculous.

Our parks showcase both their natural environment and reflect the communities they serve. I wouldn't expect to find hang-gliders launching off the Washington Monument, yet at Fort Funston it's allowed (and

admired!). We accept that there are different rules for different parks, and off-leash dog walking is no different. The reality is that San Francisco has more than 800,000 people and 120,000 dogs and is in dire need of off-leash areas like those found in the GGNRA. When I visit Fort Funston, I see lots of happy dogs and their owners. I've had numerous positive encounters with dog-free families on the beach and atop the cliffs, with parents and their children often asking for permission to pet my dog. I'm sure conflicts do arise, but I've never witnessed anything serious during my visits. I urge you to use common sense and adopt option "A".

Thank You,  
Bjorn Foster

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3995	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Disallowing dogs off leash would be criminal. I have been going to East Beach at Crissy Field for 3 years without a single incident or complaint (we go roughly 3 times a week). My dog is well behaved, super friendly and loves the outdoors. It is an activity that my entire family can enjoy together. Taking this away from us would take away from not just our dog but our entire family.

In addition:

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3996	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109
-----------------	-------------------------

	United States of America
--	--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Disallowing dogs off leash would be criminal. I have been going to East Beach at Crissy Field for 3 years without a single incident or complaint (we go roughly 3 times a week). My dog is well behaved, super friendly and loves the outdoors. It is an activity that my entire family can enjoy together. Taking this away from us would take away from not just our dog but our entire family.
------------------------	---

In addition:

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims

that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral de Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3997	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 16:30:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern,				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, which also happens to be supported unanimously by Marin County Supervisors, all San Francisco City Supervisors and San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee. The No Action Alternative is also supported by public opinion (as borne out in the previous comment period where people who commented opposing the plan outnumbered the others by 3 to 1).

I regularly take my dog to Tennessee Valley, Stinson Beach, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, Mount Tam, Fort Funston and Crissy Field.

Each and every time we visit, I clean up after my dog and other dogs. I also clean up after the countless humans who leave behind endless streams of garbage. We are often one of few people in these areas and regularly report any issues we see to the rangers or institutions like the Marin Mammal Center, something that many other dog owners also do.

There is an active campaign to paint dog advocates and owners as anti-conservation by the zealous, bullying environmental groups that you, the GGNRA and NPS partner with, and evidence to the contrary

---

demonstrates nothing could be further from the truth.

In spite of the blustering lies disseminated by people like Michael Lynes in an often shocking misinformation campaign, management of the GGNRA is NOT tilted sharply toward use by dogs and their owners. Dogs are currently banned on over 99% othe Golden Gate National Recreation Area, even though over 40% othe population owns a dog. And yet, we have been happy with 1% a have taken quite good care of it. You are more likely to be violently assaulted by another human being in the GGNRA than you are have a bad interaction with a dog.

Furthermore, there is ZERO (nil, zilch, nada) consensus in the scientific community that dogs are directly (or at all) responsible for the destruction of habitats, flora or fauna in the GGNRA. And there isn't a single independent, peer-reviewed, site-specific scientific study in existence to support the groundless claims laid out as so-called evidence for the desired regulations. BY LAW, you are required to have the above before you can enact any change. Yet, you don't and you are attempting to force through change (illegally) anyway.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. To that point, the insidious nature of your subversive campaign to get people to refer to the national recreation area as a national park (along with the Golden Gate Audobon Society, The Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy et al) is grounds for a cease and desist, if not a lawsuit. You cannot change the status of the national recreation area by simply referring to it as something else. We are very aware of the semantic battle you're attempting to fight above and beyond the dog issue, and we're prepared to go head to head on that next if need be.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

The fact of the matter is that what you are attempting to do is underhanded, has no scientific basis, requires a legal due process (you are not following), ignores the potential impact on surrounding areas and parks, willfully ignores any and all currently available statistics that refute the weak claims peddled in the plan, ignores the feedback of the community and its representatives and serves no purpose other than to appease the few conservation ideologues who are anti-dog, plain and simple.

It's an abomination.

Soon to be a former NPS donor,  
Jessica Teas

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3998	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	n/a Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 16:31:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% othe Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any

---

compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	3999	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Los Gatos, CA 95033 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jen Kidwell

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4000	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Union city, CA 94587 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 16:48:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This ban is just one more example of how ridiculous our so called representative government has become. My wife is European and she said it best: "You Americans talk a lot about 'freedom' and 'liberty' and love to say you are more free than other people's and countries. But after living here for 3 years I am amazed at how, on a daily basis, I am constantly told that I cannot do this or that, due to some pointless regulation,especially concerning pets!"				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4001	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 16:51:18**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Adam Thomason

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4002 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Sacramento, CA 95833  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 16:59:58**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and nature lover, I cannot stress enough the importance of legal off-leash spaces for dogs and owners. Allowing dogs (and their humans) access to natural environments makes for healthier well adjusted dogs and people. Please keep the current off-leash dog beaches open and available.

Thank you,  
Lauren Anderberg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4003 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:04:56**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Please keep off-leash possibilities at Muir Beach!

There is no way I can get my hound enough exercise if I have to keep him on a leash.

When he runs freely, as he can at Muir Beach, he runs so fast and long, I could never keep up!

It is essential for his health and well-being (not to mention mine ;-)

In the 14 years we have lived in Marin, and taken our dogs to Muir Beach for exercise, I have never seen any dog create problems for wildlife, nor have they run off trail as they were voice controlled by their owners. It is one place where we dog owners can take our canine companions for good, thorough exercise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4004    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:06:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in Marin since 1974. I was 17 when I moved to this idyllic county. I have raised 7 dogs and 2 kids in my 40 years here.

I had big dogs in the 70's and smaller dogs in the 80's and 90's.

I enjoyed Muir beach and the hiking trails with all of my dogs.

However I NEVER took them out off lease ever! No matter how well they were behaved. I also cleaned up after them always.

Unfortunately the dog owners and dog walkers now In Marin show little respect for others space and desire to hike and enjoy the county free of a dog jumping up , running at speed toward you, and steeping in their poop.

I have come to not like dogs in this county, probably because of the owners.

I feel there is no way to keep allowing dogs to have access to the parks and beaches because of the level of disrespect for the rules and common manners in the past 2 decades by the owners.

There should be no dogs allowed at any of the GGNRA's.

And the law needs to be enforced.

I hike in Headlands above Marin city now. It is covered in dog poop. dogs are all off leash, running and jumping on hikers. the owners think it is cute when they flush baby quail out of the brush or chase after wildlife.

Please provide the strictest ban possible on the dog owners to save this county

Thank you

Gail

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4005    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Seattle, WA 98109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:08:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To the GGRNA General Superintendent

Re: Comments on Supplemental Draft GGNRA Dog Management Plan/EIS (SDEIS)

Date: February 14, 2013

These comments on the SDEIS are submitted by an interested citizen who has been involved in the dog management process for several years and has worked on management plans and environmental impact statements on public lands for nearly 40 years.

As a regular out-of-town visitor to and user of GGNRA and a long-time member of several environmental organizations, including Sierra Club and Audubon Society, my basic comment is that the Interior Department, National Park Service, and Golden Gate National Recreation Area can and should produce a



better plan than has been proposed to date.

## OVERALL COMMENT

I support revising Alternative A or Alternative F to provide more access to GGNRA by people with their dogs. The current draft plan is not balanced and is too restrictive on dog walking - it does not protect and preserve the fundamental values for which GGNRA was established: natural, historic, scenic and recreational values.

The current supplemental draft EIS, while an improvement from the earlier draft, continues to show serious bias and lack of objective analysis, as discussed below and in other comments. Most important, the supplemental draft plan/EIS (SDEIS) needs more work on alternatives including mitigation measures.

The draft regulation should also have been disclosed in the SDEIS, as it is an integral part of the "proposed action." The public should have an opportunity to evaluate alternative rules and their impacts, and have the opportunity to comment on them.

The following more specific comments will address only a few of the points in any detail, given the many comments likely to be submitted on the supplemental draft plan/EIS.

## INADEQUATE SCOPE AND FUNDAMENTAL BIAS IN SDEIS AND ALTERNATIVES

Under the NPS planning process and NEPA, the purpose and need, which is expressed by GGNRA's "Objectives" (page 2) drive the development and choice of alternatives, including monitoring and mitigation measures. Urban recreation should be one of those objectives.

Surprisingly, while mentioned in the Purpose of GGNRA, the word "recreation" does not appear at all in the plan's Objectives (nor, also revealing, in the index of the SDEIS). The bias in the current draft could not be more stark than the omission of "recreation" as a keystone objective for the Golden Gate "National Recreation" Area. This omission stands in contrast to scoping - which is supposed to identify the scope of the plan and EIS - and where urban recreation needs were clearly identified (page 14).

The phrase "park resources and values" is frequently mentioned, but does not refer to recreation as one of those resources and values. Likewise, the analysis of what is "environmentally-preferred" omits recreation as an environmental value. This omission also reflects the document's bias, despite decades of national environmental policy and Interior Department recognition of "recreation" as central to the meaning of "environmental quality."

GGNRA itself was expressly established to provide and maintain recreation as a needed and essential part of the urban environment. The SDEIS contains many pages of purpose and need, objectives, regulatory history, and impacts at the outset of the draft document, but it is not until 43 pages later that the SDIES acknowledges the central role of recreation, when it finally quotes GGNRA's organic act:

"GGNRA was established by Congress in 1972 (PL 92-589). The language of the enabling legislation states the park's purpose as follows: 'In order to preserve for public use and enjoyment certain areas of Marin and San Francisco counties, California, possessing outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is hereby established.' "

This should be the starting point for the development of the plan and the comparative evaluation of

alternatives, not treated as a historical footnote on page 43.

Conservation of recreation is an essential GGNRA value that should not be impaired (see SDEIS inadequate discussion of impairment on pages 42-43). Certainly conservation of GGNRA's ecological integrity is a paramount mandate under the NPS organic act, but omitting urban recreation as an objective and as a park value that should be maintained improperly biases the planning and alternatives evaluation process.

Instead, the SDEIS treats GGNRA as a victim of lack of recreational space in the Bay Area (pages 21-22). As noted, the need for urban recreation area is one of the main reasons GGNRA was established in the first place (see GGNRA organic act quoted above and on page 43 of the SDEIS). This need for urban recreation is not an impact on GGNRA - it is one of GGNRA's fundamental purposes. This basic error permeates the SDEIS.

Until recreation is considered an objective per the GGNRA organic act and legislative history, and an environmental value - - not simply an impact - - the supplemental draft EIS is biased both scientifically and politically. This bias results in a proposed plan that is far too restrictive in maintaining urban recreation for people and dogs in this unique national recreation area.

## URBAN QUALITY AND DESIGN OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

GGNRA was established "and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment" (GGNRA organic act above; page 43 of SDEIS). GGNRA is located within one of the major urban environments of the United States and is by definition an urban environment (urban environments can also be natural in character). GGNRA is central to the quality of life of a major urban area - in short, to the "urban quality" of residents of San Francisco and its environs. If this weren't the case, there would not have been 4,700 comments submitted on the draft EIS.

The term "built environment" is commonly understood, as Wikipedia notes, as "encompassing places and spaces created or modified by people, including buildings, parks, and transportation systems." The NEPA Rules' definition of human environment and effects likewise includes the "natural and physical environment and the relationship of people to that environment."

GGNRA has numerous features that have been designed and built by humans, from trails, to signage, to parking lots and buildings and other facilities, to habitat restoration projects. It includes many constructed environments, including former military installations and city parks. GGNRA is not a wilderness. GGNRA is in many respects a designed landscape. Even efforts to restore its natural values involve urban design components, such as vegetated berm separation and other design features to preserve its resources and values.

It is hard to imagine how the SDEIS could dismiss "urban quality" as not relevant (page 24):

"Consideration of this topic is required by 40 CFR 1502.16. The quality of urban areas is not a significant factor in determining a dog management policy for GGNRA. No new building construction or rehabilitation of existing structures is proposed under the alternatives presented in this draft plan/SEIS; therefore, this topic has been dismissed from further analysis." (emp. added)

This statement in the SDEIS misinterprets CEQ rules and results in basic noncompliance with NEPA. GGNRA is in an urban area; it was established to improve urban quality of life; the design of this urban parkland could not be more relevant. The design of urban parks is a recognized discipline. Good design is central to the ability to preserve park resources and values, including recreation, ecology, and cultural

values.

This one paragraph from the SDEIS, quoted above, dismissing urban quality and design of the urban environment, highlights the absence of rigorous expiration of alternatives, as required by NEPA, CEQ, DOI and NPA NEPA rules, procedures and guidance. It also demonstrates the document's bias in treating GGNRA like a traditional national park and not as an urban unit of the national park system. NPS/GGNRA seems out of its comfort zone here, but this doesn't excuse the omission.

One of the reasons NEPA requires a "systematic interdisciplinary approach" with an "integrated use" the "environmental design arts" as well as sciences is that the design disciplines can help solve environmental problems. NEPA Section 102(2)(A) and corresponding Interior and NPS requirements.

This has essentially not occurred with the planning process or SDEIS to date. There are many examples where design can avoid or otherwise mitigate potential user conflicts or impairment of resources. Many of the conflicts noted in SDEIS, whether real or perceived, could be addressed with good urban design, such as access to specific areas, separation of areas where people and dogs, people only, or no one is allowed, how a user "understands" where people and dogs or other users are allowed, and so on.

The fact that the proposed plan does not propose new buildings is not relevant to the NEPA requirement to evaluate urban quality and design. If these alternatives and mitigation measures are not rigorously explored, both the planning and EIS process are inadequate. Good urban design is at the heart of a balanced plan - yet NPS has "dismissed this from further analysis." (page 24). This work needs to be done.

San Francisco and the Bay Area are known for their attention to urban design and to sustainability principles and have many talented design professionals. NPS and GGNRA will not have difficulty bringing the required resources to bear on this plan and EIS.

An adequate plan and EIS needs to recognize that this plan is about the quality and design of the urban environment, and not dismiss it as irrelevant and remove it from the scope of the analysis.

## LACK OF OBJECTIVE AND SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS

The failure to distinguish between impacts on GGNRA resources by people, by dogs, or by other causes is perhaps the most basic scientific and policy flaw in the current document. The SDEIS's basic reasoning is that because dogs are capable of causing certain impacts to the natural environment, they will cause those impacts and thereby impair the ecological integrity of GGNRA. (See, for example, pages 15-20 of the SDEIS and much of the chapters on alternatives, environmental consequences, and affected environment.) Site specific, empirical data is lacking on this point.

Equally important, while the current draft identifies impacts from humans and dogs - site specific observations like "high foot traffic (both people and dogs)" - there is little or no analysis of: (1) whether off leash areas differ from other areas of high traffic; and (2) whether humans need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural values.

For example, the impacts of the many special events in GGNRA, such as Crissy Field, relative to impacts from people and their dogs is not seriously analyzed. Any management plan that does not deal with the causes of the perceived, alleged or documented impacts does not meet the basic objectives of preserving GGNRA's values - because the impacts will still happen after the adopting of an overly restrictive dog management plan.

Making dogs the scapegoats is not objective analysis. And if the document does not tell the public that

people, too, will be restricted from popular areas of GGNRA, it fails NEPA's requirement for a "full disclosure" of impacts (in this case, impacts on recreation).

The survey of other areas ranges from sloppy to inaccurate. For example, on page 32, the SDEIS states:

"Seattle, Washington. Dogs are allowed to roam off leash at 11 of the 400 parks and recreation areas in the Seattle metro area. Although dogs are allowed on leash in most other park areas, they are not allowed on beaches, play areas, or organized athletic fields. Owners are responsible for waste removal. Fines are implemented for leash and waste-removal violations (Seattle Parks and Recreation 2009, 1, 3)."

This statement is incorrect. In fact, Seattle does allow dogs on beaches (Magnuson Park), as does the City of Vancouver (there is a dog beach on False Creek/English Bay next to the Burrard Bridge). In fact, this information is readily available on both the City of Seattle's and City of Vancouver's websites. Vancouver parks' website starts with the statement: "Dogs are welcome in all of Vancouver's parks and must be on leash unless they are in a designated dog off-leash area" and shows photos where dogs can be off-leash at various beaches and waterbodies.

Although these areas are smaller than San Francisco's extensive saltwater beaches, if such easily obtained information is incorrect in the SDEIS, it raises serious questions of the accuracy - or more likely - bias and lack of objectivity in its preparation.

As another example, the SDEIS gives short shrift to long-standing planning and NEPA documents that have helped guide GGNRA management to date. For example, the Crissy Field Plan Environmental Assessment is briefly identified (on page 44 of the SDEIS), but little or no scientific or other information is provided in rest of the documents hundreds of pages to provide a basis for the proposed radical departure from the existing uses allowed and recognized in the Crissy Field EA.

The East Beach and other readily-available beach access should be restored in the final plan, with appropriate design and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential conflicts with other uses, and vice versa. Crissy Field, in the heart of the city, is an example of a unit where many recreational uses have and can continue to co-exist.

The SDEIS is more than 1400 pages, not including appendices. As President Carter said when the current NEPA Rules were initiated: "We do not want impact statements that are measured by the inch or weighed by the pound." It is the quality of the analysis, not its quantity, that counts.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EXPLORING, DEVELOPING AND EVALUATING ADEQUATE ALTERNATIVES (INCLUDING MITIGATION MEASURES)

The comments above include recommendations for exploring, developing, and evaluating adequate alternatives including mitigation measures, from the role of urban recreation, urban design, plan revisions to specific units such as Crissy Field, and providing unbiased, objective analysis.

To improve on the plan, GGNRA should return to the first two goals stated from its Scoping conclusions (page 39 of the SDEIS):

"Work toward community acceptance of the process and the solution" and

"Allow the community to participate, maximizing creative thinking."

To date, other than the reg neg process, NPS has mainly involved the community by providing

opportunities to comment on formal plan/NEPA documents. Upon receiving comments, GGNRA has not allowed the community to participate in the planning process until the agency issued its next formal document, many months later. This does not meet the spirit or letter of the above objectives.

For example, NPS has held no design workshops or design charrettes on any potential solutions in any GGNRA unit, a standard method San Francisco and many federal agencies and municipalities use to develop solutions to sensitive or controversial areas or areas with user conflicts.

These techniques were not used in the reg neg process, in the scoping process for the EIS, or in the comment periods on the DEIS or SDEIS. NPS is again requested to recognize both the relevance of urban design and initiate design workshops on focused issues that can help produce a good plan.

The Monitoring Program (summarized on page 63 of the SDEIS) is an important part of the plan. Thank you for working on improvements to the former version of this element. While improved, it needs more work. For example, it does not address identifying or distinguishing impacts from dogs and from other causes, such as human (e.g., disturbance) or natural impacts (e.g., climate change). This is fundamental to a scientifically valid monitoring and management program. For example, if there is more than one cause - such as people and dogs in a seasonally-restricted wildlife area - any proposed management action should deal with the relevant causes, rather than basing management actions on one cause that may not address the problem. The public should be able to comment on the appropriate response.

An objective monitoring program - based on maintaining long-standing urban recreational uses per GGNRA's organic act - should respond to the data and should allow restoring and increasing dog walking areas, not simply restricting them.

## CONCLUDING COMMENT

The Interior Department, National Parks Service, and, in particular, GGNRA have an opportunity to realize the mission and objectives so clearly stated in the landmark Golden Gate National Recreation Area Organic Act (emphasis added):

"In order to preserve for public use and enjoyment certain areas of Marin and San Francisco counties, California, possessing outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is hereby established."

GGNRA is unique. There is no other urban national parkland like it. No unit of the National Park System - from Santa Monica to New York harbor - has the identical mandate. The Superintendent has the administrative discretion to adopt rules that will further conservation of all of the values for which this national recreation area was established.

GGNRA is San Francisco's and the Bay Area's backyard. GGNRA serves an extraordinary population with a similarly unique culture. Its residents love nature and the outdoors, love their dogs, and love their communities, urban neighborhoods and shorelines perhaps as no other region in the U.S. These are complementary - - not conflicting - values to the vast majority of GGNRA users.

San Francisco and the Bay Area residents have a distinct culture that places high value on both community and individual choice, on both freedom and responsibility. Out-of-town visitors, like many of us, expect and appreciate this culture as well. The Dog Management Plan can and should support, not diminish these values. It does not yet do that.

The SDEIS makes some strides to propose a plan that protects natural, historic, scenic and recreational values - despite the EIS's remarkable reluctance in its text and analysis officially to recognize "recreation" as a protected value in GGNRA. But the alternatives proposed still fall far short of a rigorous, cooperative effort to find solutions.

It is as if park management has decided, due to all the controversy, that efforts at legal defensibility or appear "green" are more important than finding solutions that meet the GGNRA Organic Act's mandate. Please return to your roots as you prepare a final proposed plan and EIS:

1. GGNRA VALUES AS DRIVER. Make the mission, mandate and objectives articulated in GGNRA's organic act the driver for developing plan alternatives and evaluating preferred alternatives. That act is not inconsistent with NPS's own organic laws. NPS and NEPA statutes and regulations make clear that natural, historic, scenic and recreational values are ALL components of environmental quality. Each may also have impacts on the other, but that should not relegate recreation to lower status, as the current preferred plan and draft EIS do.

2. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS TO PRESERVE GGNRA VALUES. GGNRA was intended to be used by people as well as dogs, horses, etc. (it's in the bill reports for PL 92-589). User conflicts are common in national park system units; it's part of the management of these areas. The proposed plan needs to give a harder, objective look at (a) whether and how significantly the impacts cause an impairment of the four fundamental values of GGNRA; (b) whether alleged impacts are caused only by dogs or a combination of factors; (c) what management actions can avoid impairment or important impacts to all four values - or put positively, what management actions can most preserve and maintain all four values for current and future generations. Targeted management actions such as better education, signage, and design can be very effective in parklands and need to get more serious development. This comprehensive and long term analysis is essential for a sustainable plan and an adequate EIS - and most important, it's vital for GGNRA to meet its mission.

3. ENGAGE WITH THE COMMUNITY TO FIND BETTER SOLUTIONS. NPS should be commended for its outreach and efforts in the formal elements of the planning and NEPA process, such as scoping and comment periods on the draft EIS and issuance of a supplemental draft EIS, and some additional public engagement. However, both NPA planning guidelines and NEPA rules, procedures and guidance encourage on-going, active consultation with the community as alternatives are developed and EISs are prepared. Instead, the agency has largely refused to engage in between issuance of formal plan/EIS documents.

Yes, this is a controversial subject. No, the plan and EIS won't please everyone. Just because there are avid advocates for more "all or nothing" positions does not mean NPS should decline to engage between the issuance of formal documents, with constructive participants, such as Eco-Dog, SF SPCA, and Crissy Field Dog Group (whom I have represented) for example, and others who have been trying to work with NPS to find reasonable approaches in specific units.

If NPS pursues these three fundamentals as it moves toward final decisions, a good plan can come out of this process.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like additional information on any of these comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken Weiner

Kenneth S. Weiner  
2911 First Avenue North, Seattle, WA 98109  
parkerharbour@gmail.com  
206.370.8000

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4006    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san jose, CA 95129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:11:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support off\_leash dog walking

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4007    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Ca Native Plant Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:14:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative F is the best option although still does not limit dog access in many critical areas of concern for our native plants, migrating and resident birds and wildlife. Marin Headlands and Crissy Field shd not allow dogs on or off leash on trails and beaches in these areas to protect plants, wildlife and people; allowing them the freedom of some protected space. With protecting these areas you have welcomed the return of many wild visitors that shd not be disrupted from their feeding on migration by frolicking dogs and their owners. Dogs roam everywhere these days lets save some space where we are free from the effects of there presence. thank you for your consideration and efforts in preserving our natural places.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4008    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, NY 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:22:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Coastal Trail and Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4009    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:25:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please let our dogs continue to accompany us and run free - don't close off any more parks or make them stay on leash. If you've ever seen the happy look on a dogs face while running you'd reconsider. Please let us share our beautiful surroundings with our best friends!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4010    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:25:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4011    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:28:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean:

I have had four different dogs for most of the 14 plus years that I have lived San Francisco, and have spent a lot of time with my dogs in our National Parks, particularly Fort Funston and Crissy Field. I am



writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

The new plan either eliminates or dramatically reduces existing dog walking access. It does not take into consideration the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a severe restriction of dog-friendly areas.

It is a simple fact that there are many dog owners in the Bay Area. It is also a fact that dogs need exercise and socialization. Many dog owners are not able to run with their dogs, and rely on the GGNRA for their dog's exercise needs. The GGNRA provides an opportunity for dogs to run and play.

The GGNRA was designed to be an urban recreation area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. Without such designated areas, many dogs are going to be foreclosed from exercise, resulting in stressed and unhealthy dogs, unhappy owners, and overcrowded animal shelters. As a long-time volunteer at the SF/SPCA, I know how painful it is for people to be forced to surrender their pets due to their circumstances. I am very concerned about the impact that this plan will have on animal abandonment, which the SF/SPCA is working so hard to end.

The pet policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County as well as on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. There are certainly less drastic means of protecting our national parks while honoring the original intent of the GGNRA. I urge you to work towards modifying this plan to protect all types of recreation in our GGNRA.

Sincerely,

Robyn A. Leonard

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4012	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	SF Gray Panthers Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 17:32:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am in favor of a balanced dog policy in the Draft Dog Management Plan with the emphasis on protecting the natural contours, plants and animals.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4013	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 17:35:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't make it illegal for people to walk their dogs off-leash! It is good for the people, the animals, and the community as a whole.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4014	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:40:32**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please protect the biological resources of the GGNRA by requiring dogs to remain on leash in most areas. Off-leash recreation is valuable but protection of the indigenous flora and fauna must come first in these last pieces of our Bay Area coast. I was a commercial dog walker for ten years in San Francisco and foster for a local dog rescue group. I've also completed two studies on dog walking in an off-leash area for the SF Recreation and Parks Department.

The density of off-leash dogs in the Bay Area is so very high that restrictions must be in place to protect natural resources. Dogs are very much an extension of our ecological footprints. We have to take responsibility for their impacts on the land. I thoroughly enjoy off-leash recreation when the density of dogs is manageable. With proper introductions, off-leash recreation is wonderful. That said, I know that the recreation needs of my foster dogs can be met without off-leash recreation. We can enjoy our wonderful parks on leash.

Where the choice is between harming habitat and off-leash recreation, we need to choose habitat conservation. And I do. I hope the GGNRA will do the same.

Thank You.

Rachel Kesel

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4015	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:42:30**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This plan is a terrible idea for all residents, not only dog owners. I run on these trails nearly daily, and all - and I do mean all - canines I encounter are well-behaved, orderly and non-destructive. I've yet to see an example of an out of control dog wreaking havoc on either me or the surroundings. Professional dog walkers rely on these trails and paths for their livelihoods, while owners deserve a nice environment in which to exercise their animals.

i urge you to reconsider this ill-advised plan and allow the county to set the standards for pet owners.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4016	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:45:12**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are very few places in the San Francisco area that are dog free. I do not object to people owning dogs but I do object to the fact that there are just too few (if any) places that I can enjoy nature without dogs being present and usually off leash. A National Park should put people and nature first. I don't spend much of my time at GGNRA as it seems to be one big dog park and has been this way for far too long.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4017	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94708  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:50:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Stop the madness of taking away off leash areas for dogs. We need more off leash areas, not less! You work for the public, not vice versa. NO TO THE OFF LEASH BAN! Open more space for dogs, off and on leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4018    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Seattle, WA 98122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:54:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

While I live in Seattle, I regularly frequent San Francisco, am a dog lover and regularly enjoy the GGNRA (often with my friends and their dogs). The GGNRA is a place where people have taken their dogs for decades, mostly without major problems. I feel that the draft plan being proposed is far too restrictive - it eliminates too many leash and especially off leash areas, which is bad for people and dogs. The Park Service needs to do a better plan and EIS and seriously work with the community to find solutions, not just provide comment periods on draft plans/EISs.

Thank you for your consideration,

Reid

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4019    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Lagunitas, CA 94938  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:57:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep option A.

I am dismayed at how our liberties are getting more and more limited. Governments at every level are trying to get us to live straight-jacketed lives. I don't own a dog. But watching dogs run freely nurtures me; they have so much joy it is contagious.

Humans need some places that are not inundated with restrictive laws. Everyone is so stressed. They need an outlet. Taking a walk or run with your dog on undeveloped land is a total stress release.

Governments want to shut everyone up in a box to keep them, endangered species, and the people themselves "safe". And I am myself an environmentalist. But this is how we end up with school yard massacres and mailbox bombs. People are just so stressed. Their natural outlets for stress, to regain inner calm, are already widely restricted.

Please keep option A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4020    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 17:58:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4021    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94708  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 18:05:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the implementation of GGNRA's proposed plan on dog management. I believe enforcement of regulations is critical - at present the regulations that do exist are ignored  
o We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.  
o Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.  
o Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.  
o Visitors to the park should be limited to a maximum of two dogs per person. The park should not serve commercial dog-walkers, who are a disturbance to those trying to enjoy nature in the parks.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas. The small, very vocal group of dog owners who demand additional off-leash areas should not be allowed to spoil the park experience for the majority. This is the ONLY NP that permits off-leash use at all, and although I

accept the compromise of the GGNRA plan, it really seems wrong to permit unleashed dogs on the seashore at all, with habitat for migratory birds becoming more and more rare.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4022    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 18:09:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

It will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. I feel that it will cause me to move away from the city.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Marian Christine Brodigan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4023    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 18:16:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a responsible dog owner who only lets my dog off leash in designated areas, and who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

A. Bishop

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4024    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Corte Madera Marin County, CA 94925  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** member of Marin Human Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 18:20:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the GGNR Area Dog Plan because it is far to restrictive.

I am a tax payer and my dogs are a great comfort to me. There is not reason to take these drastic messures.

My dogs need and deserve to have space to excercise and accompany me w/o leash. Norhtern California is a very dog-frendly community- - you cannot ignor our rights to be able to use the GGNRA areas with our dogs.

There is a long history of access for dogs in the Park Areas.

Please do not implement these extreme rules!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4025    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 18:29:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To National PArk Service,

I have two dogs that I have been walking on the Marin trails and beaches for almost 10 years. It is a major factor in our fabulous quality of life here in the Bay area, and it sets us apart from unfortunate, overly developed places like Southern California. We are already limited to a small number of trails, small sections of Mt Tam and the Headlands. There are enough "No Dog" trails to satisfy hikers or equestrians. Do dogs really disrupt other wildlife to a significant degree? We, the tax payers, are paying to preserve this land and would like to use it in a reasonable way.

Please, leave the current restrictions in place - do not further restrict the dogs!

Thank you,

Julia Evans

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4026    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Pelican Media Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 18:34:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our family grew up with dogs and I'm very fond of them. However, I am not fond of them running off-leash and harassing other animals. My sister owns four dogs, and routinely lets them romp in park areas where she is supposed to keep them on-leash. She bristles when anyone calls her on it, and claims that her dogs do no harm. (This despite the fact that, being Jack Russell terriers, they are constantly running after, harassing, and sometimes killing, other animals.) Her attitude reflects the entitlement felt by many dog owners, who feel that their dogs should be able to do whatever they want, wherever they want, especially in parks. They have no sensitivity to other species such as small mammals, birds, deer, etc who might be harmed by their illegal activities.

It's time to pay attention to the park's constituents who don't have aggressive, vocal human boosters. It's time to speak up for birds and other animals who deserve respect, space, habitat, peace, and quiet. Please do not let rabid dog owners blind you to the needs of other species. Do what's right. There are plenty of other places where dogs can run free.

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

â€ Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

â€ Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4027    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 18:38:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I are writing in support of "Alternative A: No Action" of the GGNRA 2013 "Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement", now open for public comment. Our specific reasons include:

- It fails to offer reasonable alternatives to support the off-leash needs of dog-owning GGNRA users.

- The wholesale elimination of off-leash dog access from many GGNRA sites, including Muir Beach, attempts to impose standards appropriate to traditional National Parks, where protection of the natural environment is paramount. But the GGNRA is a RECREATIONAL area in an urban setting, not a park,

---

and must be managed as such.

- The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, which opposed the plan by an overwhelming margin. Was the NPS listening to those comments? It doesn't seem so.

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

- The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring, as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

- The long-standing 1979 Pet Policy has the support of the vast majority of the users of the GGNRA and should be retained.

Besides Alternative A, none of the proposed alternatives provides any reasonable off-leash dog access. Clearly the NPS is not interested in devising a policy that supports dog owners, those who provided comments to the 2011 and 2013 plans, GGNRA users, or the general population of the Bay Area. The process should be re-started with not only public input, but with specific public decision-making rights on a new plan. Such a decision-making body should have voting members from all stakeholders, including affected local governments and the general population, as well as the NPS. Without this shared authority, the NPS cannot be trusted to represent the will of the people.

Hopefully,

Alan Mullendore, Carolyn Lie, Kaja Mullendore, Cassie Mullendore, Zoe Mullendore, "Bogie" (the Bernese Mountain Dog) and "Darcy" (the Black Lab)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4028	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 18:45:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. The use of some of the areas will be diminished as most of the people I see during the week are with canines.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.



The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

QWilliam Mills

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4029	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Moss Beach, CA 94038 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 18:57:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think there should a couple of specified off leash areas for dogs and their owners, but I think for the most part I'd like to see dogs on leashes, and some sensitive area with no dogs at all. And if they're really sensitive, no people at all, since that's the best way to keep dogs out.				

In San Mateo County I'd like to see dogs allowed off-leash at at least one beach.  
Montara Beach would be perfect. Then no dogs at all on other beaches.

Please please enforce the leash laws once you declare them.

Dog owners are vocal and have a sense of entitlement. The parks are for people, not just dogs and dog owners.  
And the parks are habitat, not just for dogs and dog owners.

That said, GGNRA is a RECREATION AREA and walking with dogs off and on leash is recreation, so do please find a few spots for the dog owners.

Thanks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4030	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Groveland, CA, CA 95321 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 18:58:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not restrict the rights of dog owners to be on public lands . Both people and dogs need safe, healthy areas to exercise. I live near Yosemite. Even with 4 million visitors a year, they allow dogs leash in the park..When I am in San Francisco I always walk my dogs in Golden Gate Park.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4031	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 19:06:04**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

The proposed rule are too restrictive. All those dogs have to go somewhere so the few areas where they are allowed will be used excessively. Also, the areas you chose to make off leash in Fort Funston and Ocean beach are the easy access places where people who whst to enjoy paying on the beach go. They are the closest areas to parking and so families with small children will go to the closest beach which will now be concentrated with many more dogs. It is a recipe for trouble. Please reconsider.

Thank you.

Olivia

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4032	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Tara Manning

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4033	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94619 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 19:42:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think there are plenty of other places for people in the Bay area to run their dogs, but there's only one ecosystem like the GGNRA.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4034	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Redwood City, CA 94062 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 19:47:38**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4035 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 19:49:23**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I moved to San Francisco just over two years ago. Since then, my dog and I have both thoroughly enjoyed the off-leash areas especially Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Ocean Beach. The dog-friendliness here is one of our favorite things about San Francisco.

Since moving here and having access to these resources, my dog has been much healthier and better behaved, as are the other dogs that we come into contact with. I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive, and I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

My additional criticisms regarding the new dog management plan:

- it did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them.
- it does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011.
- it claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.
- it admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.
- it misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the

GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

Sincerely,  
Kristen Aramthanapon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4036    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 19:51:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I VERY strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4037    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** VoCal, SaveMcClarenPark.org Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 19:53:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Attn: SEIS Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area,  
Fort Mason, Building 201, San Francisco, CA 94123

Part one: General info from Jake Sigg Newsletter:

â€ I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

Additionally, please include the following comments regarding Commercial Dog Walkers using the

GGNRA for commercial business:

â€ Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

â€ Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Part 2: Below are my personal comments:

Please help to regulate this fast growing industry. As a resident of San Francisco, I'ts not fair that we can't enjoy the parks with this many dogs running around unsupervised. I want to be able to enjoy myself when I go out in nature and not have so many dogs at once. There are too many dogs per person and they are off the leash.

There are a lot of people who don't have dogs and they deserve to enjoy the park too. The wild animals in the Natl. Rec area are getting a raw deal too. I was upset to see the photo of an unrestrained dog aggressively pursuing a great grey heron. This is unacceptable! The Dog Management Plan is exactly what we need.

Why should their business get free land to operate while others have to pay and get licences, etc? Who suffers because of this? The wildlife and other parkgoers who want to have a peaceful day in nature.

Thanks for your support,

Karen Arnold

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4038	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94122 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 19:59:16
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** as a brand new dog owner of a rescued puppy from the shelter, I was shocked to see that this is even an issue. I assumed that there would be plenty of places to bring my dog, responsibly to wander and be off leash. The idea that it is potentially going to be eliminated is so sad to me. I love birds. I own a bird. I love nature and from what I can observe, the pet owners are taking good care of the parks and the beaches and should be allowed to walk their dogs and exercise their animals as they have been. Please reconsider banning dogs from all of these places. Dogs would then be banished to small dangerous dog parks where ironically people are not so careful with their dogs, though it is in an enclosed area. It is safer and healthier for the city to maintain broad areas for off leash. If you make having a dog difficult, people will not rescue and adopt dogs in shelters and there will be an even bigger problem  
thank you.

sincerely,

Lisa Neimeth

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4039	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 20:10:59
------------------	----------------------

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The suggested plan to impose restrictions on off-leash dog walking at Golden Gate National Recreation Area locations will negatively impact my life, the lives of others, and the local environment in the following ways:

1) Dog walkers who currently use GGNRA locations to perform their duties will be largely displaced to San Francisco city parks, such as Bernal Heights and McLaren. Increased use of these parks by dozens or hundreds of dog walkers and their groups will lead to excessive erosion and the virtual destruction of those parks. I grew up half a block away from Bernal Heights Park and to see it turn into a pile of rubble due to overuse is a tragic thing to consider.

2) Having lived my entire life in San Francisco as part of a "dog family," I've been going to Fort Funston & Ocean Beach with my dogs literally since I was in diapers. To lose that privilege would be heartbreaking.

3) The population of dogs in San Francisco is largely made up of adopted, or "rescued" dogs, generally meaning dogs who would have been euthanized had they not been adopted. If GGNRA lands are no longer available for dog owners and dog services to use off-leash, then it will have a massive impact on the number of people who are interested in or willing to adopt a rescue dog. This will cause rescue shelters to overfill, lose funding, and eventually be unable to save hundreds or even thousands of dogs from death each year.

4) In 2013 I started my professional dog walking business, and I've invested over \$20,000 in order to get properly educated & equipped. If this plan passes, there is no way I can afford to continue my business as the only remaining park space in the region will be overflowed with other walkers to the point that it is unsafe for the dogs I service and the environment. I have not had enough time to make this business profitable enough to make back any money on that investment, and therefore this plan will literally cost me \$20,000 should it pass.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4040	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Emeryville, CA 94608 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 20:11:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Do not end the rights of dog owners and dogs to have equal access for the things we love! Put children on leashes if you're going to put dogs on leashes. It's the outdoors! It's a PARK! The whole point is to be able to enjoy it like it's NOT a city or a suburb! Don't ruin one of the few still natural and free experiences for dogs and their owners. Responsibility is the solution, NOT more rules and regulations that are barriers to natural environments to be enjoyed the way they were meant to be.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4041	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	castro valley, CA 94546 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 20:17:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** We love Crissy Field. Sam our yellow lab is at his best when he is there. We went today on Valentines day and got to walk, throw the ball and connect with nature. It is so important to have nature available to all, including dogs, in the heart of the city. It erased the boringness of a long work week. I go back feeling like I have had a trip to the mountains or been. My connection to nature is what keeps me healthy and also Sam our yellow lab. As a retired couple Sam is our constant companion and to be able to go to Crissy Field is the best. I go home feeling like I have been to th mountaina on a long vacation. Please do not close it off. The bikes cause more troubles then the dogs. Please do not take away our wonderful closeness to nature, our ability to find pleasure without a long drive. If you are reading this inside, go out and look around anad when you go back inside see if you don't feel better, Or pet a dog and you will feel better.

Thanks Elaine Anderson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4042	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 20:42:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I favor Plan E, the compromise plan that sets aside a specific area for dogs off leash at the southern end of Muir Beach thus allowing for wildlife around the area of the creek mouth.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4043	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 20:43:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I welcome the effort by the NPS to tighten up restrictions on off-leash dog use of the GGNRA. As a biologist, I feel that a less-restrictive dog use policy in areas like the National Parks is a dangerous precedent. These areas are meant to be wildlife havens as well as accessible by human visitors, so it stands to reason that allowing the presence of dogs should only be allowed in limited cases. While human use can be a problem as well, dogs that are off-leash can frighten and injure wildlife much more effectively, as a result of their hunting instinct, than most human visitors can or are likely to do.

I tire of seeing off-leash dogs in areas where they are prohibited such as Snowy Plover nesting beaches - not to mention the habit of certain dog owners to leave their full dog waste bags on trail sides.

It's time for an ever-growing human population and their non-native animal pets to stop assuming the right to go everywhere they please. It is also time for pet owners to recognize and take responsibility for the damage that their pets can do to native wildlife.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4044	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 21:25:34				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Wolf Ridge, Muir Beach, and other GGNRA approved areas.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4045	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 21:27:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** This plan goes too far in restricting my access to park areas with my dog. This is a park in an urban area and should not be looked at like Yosemite. The rules need to be different here. We need access to off-leash areas, not less. Please consider that dogs and their owners have as much right to use the park as anyone else.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4046	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Petaluma, CA 94954 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Teresa Davilla



---

**Correspondence ID:** 4047    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Self Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 22:06:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Yes, please provide clearly demarcated, fenced area for dogs.

Enforce license requirements. Fine dog owners with dogs that are unlicensed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4048    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 22:10:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We support Alternative A: No Action for Homestead Valley.

The greatest threat to the natural environment are not dogs but housing development in Homestead Valley and the proposed Marin County Land Management Plan, particularly the proposed pile burning and herbicide applications.

We support limiting the number of dogs that can be walked per person to 3.

Thank you,

John Eager  
Averil eager  
Leah Eager

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4049    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Union city, CA 94587  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 22:18:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This proposed regulation is truly upsetting. Anyone who has been to fort funston on the weekend can't help but see that making this park only for leased dogs will due much much more harm than good. Of course some govt bureaucrat wouldn't understand it-just another example how our government intrudes and over regulates our lives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4050    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 22:32:10**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I oppose any further restriction on dog-walking in the GGNRA. I think land-use decisions should be based on sound science. Currently dog-walkers have access to only a tiny portion of the total GGNRA area and there is no reason to reduce it further.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4051 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 22:46:59**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** The GGNRA i support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in densely populated urban areas.

I consider my four-legged friend to be an intricate part of my family and is considered more than a dog.

It is a shame to hear how the GGNRA is considering to strip us of our rights to freely visit OUR recreational parks just because they have no care for our pets. Take a good look around and you will always see a large population of pet lovers at these parks. Our pets are not meant to walk city streets. They are meant to freely enjoy the beaches, parks, and trails as I enjoy.

Please listen to the comments and that the changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Keep Muir Beach Dog Friendly. Keep Marin Headlands and all of the GGNRA available to people with pets.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4052 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** n.a. Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:** Member**Received:** Feb,14,2014 23:09:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I agree with the position of the Golden Gate Audubon Society.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4053 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 23:28:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been taking my dogs to Fort Funston for over 25 years. In those 25 years I have encountered very few aggressive dogs. I truly believe that dogs are less aggressive when they are off the leash. I have two high energy dogs. They need to run. My Lab loves the ocean. My Dutch Shepherd loves to have his ball thrown. You will take away the best fun & healthy lifestyle my dogs love so dearly, just like other animals our dogs deserve certain rights as well.

Thanks for your consideration. If you own a dog you will understand.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4054	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 23:32:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4055	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 23:34:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4056    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:37:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In an ideal park experience, a park visitor wouldn't need to hear, see, or interact with dogs at all. Dogs have ruined my experience so much that I stopped visiting San Francisco city parks. Now the dog bullies want to complete their exclusion of the rest of us from the GGNRA. They've already succeeded to a large extent. So short of banning dogs altogether, I would request that the NPS do the following:

Include more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

The reality is that there should be no off leash areas at all, but if there must be, please mark them off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

Vigorously enforce dog rules. Currently, the dog owners and dog walkers are the only ones who are represented at all. Wildlife and nature-respecting humans belong in parks; dogs do not. If they must be tolerated, it should be with the understanding that their owners keep them away from wildlife and other people, and only in designated area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4057    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 01:16:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs need a place to play in the city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4058    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** WILLIAM HAMMOND HALL SOCIETY Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 01:41:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I worked for the City and County of San Francisco from 1968 until 2002 in the parks and open space provision divisions of the Recreation and Parks and Public Works Departments. Dogs, dog owners, children, and a variety of

---

compatible and incompatible activities were prevalent daily. I grew up with a dog, my constant best friend for 13 years, have two dogs in our family household now, and raised two children interacting with domestic pets throughout youth, including dogs.

There are some dog owners, guardians, companions, trainers, walkers, or howsoever they be rightfully identified, who are arrogant, indifferent, troublesome, and establish the need for control over where dogs should be allowed, on or off leash. All the arguments about protection of wildlife, birds, mammals, etc. included, are profound and must be a first consideration before space is relinquished to domestic dog presence. A second argument referencing the needs for children (under 18 years of age), and elderly (60 years of age and older), or disadvantaged in any way whatsoever, should be foremost when weighing preferences or "needs" of those responsible for dogs in public spaces. Those who have a genuine established need for a dog companion should be a third category of priorities when evaluating legal use of shared public spaces. Dogs on leash should be mandatory except where there is protection separation from children, elderly, disadvantaged, special needs, or hazards to free roaming people or animals; "dog closures" should be available wherever feasible, without eliminating other incompatible use, activity, or simple presence. Some adults and children are frightened of animals, especially dogs which run freely among people in public spaces. Leash restrictions, and dog defecation clean-up guidelines should be consistently and effectively enforced at all times; fines should be substantial to deter even wealthy owners, with options to "work off" fines (with unpaid public service); a special "animal issues" court should be established and prevail, primarily to enforce, and to monitor enforcement of laws with penalties.

Dogs off leash should be allowed in dedicated spaces that do not diminish the use and enjoyment of the public space or resource otherwise available to those who have no responsibility for domestic pet ownership. It is not the assumed responsibility of everyone in a society to adjust behavior to please pets, or pet owners. The choice to own or control a pet should solely remain with those who are required to legally care for a pet, dog or any animal. A fund created through licensing of dogs should be principal source of funding for public space provided strictly, or devoted only to, dogs and their mandated adult companions. Clean up, hygiene maintenance, noise and nuisance controls, and all other matters pertaining to dog spaces, should be mandated upon an appointed group representing pet ownership or responsibility, if use of space provision is chosen.

If there are not adequate or appropriate spaces available in public domains sought for dog use, separate exercise

areas should be sought by dog representatives and regional public space providers. Collaboration between public agencies and residents of any given community should be inclusive, democratically directed, and without favor to special interests. Priorities established for youth, elderly, disadvantaged, and otherwise deprived populations should be clear, and enforced - from proposal to use stages. Dogs should be treated with respect, acknowledged regarding needs, and recognized relative to social and psychological functions for members of society. But to prioritize dogs running free, in ways that are not compatible with other uses and potential use, is ludicrous, without merit, and disrespectful to the general populace, and the posterity - which would likely be prohibited from any future retrieval for public activities not compatible with dogs running loose and socializing with one another. Dog socialization is underrated by even a large proportion of those who own dogs, but IT IS NOT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE WHOLE SOCIETY TO PROVIDE REAL ESTATE FOR ANYONE'S CHOICE TO OWN A DOG. INCOMPATIBILITY SHOULD BE TAKEN SERIOUSLY BY ALL INVOLVED IN DECISION MAKING FOR THE COMMON GOOD, THE COMMONWEALTH.

Problems posed by irresponsibility of a few, similar to other realms of social intercourse, are often the very reasons we must create laws, controls, and limitations for everyone. And laws should be effectively enforced - or rescinded. Little has a more negative impact on a democratic republic than failures to maintain respect for understood, and communicated mutual expectations. Allowing dogs to have a negative impact on public resources, space shared, is clearly unacceptable and casts a shadow on socially-respectful dog owners. We who maintain responsibilities for our pets do so because we respect other members of our society. We do not expect those who do not enjoy dogs to adjust to our choices to own pets. Unfortunately, rules and enforcement are needed to minimize unpleasant experiences in public spaces provided for general uses. It is not complicated what must be done. Please, do it!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4059	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 02:11:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a long-time volunteer in the GGNRA lands, I feel we need stronger regulations for off-leash dogs to ensure the enjoyment of all and the preservation of natural resources. To this end I believe:				

---

off-leash areas need to be fenced off, or otherwise clearly marked, so EVERYONE is clear on where dogs can run freely

more areas need to be designated as on-leash only or off limits entirely to dogs

professional dog walkers should be charged like any concessionaire conducting business on park lands

finest imposed for dog rescues carried out on the cliffs of Fort Funston (or elsewhere) should reflect the cost of that operation. This should include fines for the rescue of any dog owner who gets into trouble while trying to retrieve an off-leash dog

NPS needs to commit to vigorously enforcing any regulations put into place.

I support Alternative F except for Fort Funston and Fort Mason, where I support Alternative B.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4060	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Larkspur, CA 94939 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 05:26:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Carol Pott

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4061	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 06:33:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I favor Alternative D, the "Most Protective of Resources and Visitor Safety".				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4062    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 07:15:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off leash dog parks active throughout San Francisco. Ideally, we dog owners would prefer more dog park options around the city. There are more dogs in San Francisco than are currently registered. I think an expansion would make the city not only a people friendly city, but one friendly for the 4 legged friends as well. Perhaps this expansion would encourage fellow dogs owners the motivation to register their respective dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4063    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 08:24:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4064    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 08:32:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to let you know that strongly oppose Alternative F, your proposal to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my two chihuahua mix dogs to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 4065    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94134

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 09:20:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Keep the dog and dog owners free to walk their dogs in the national parks and on the beaches free of leashes. Dogs and dog owners are a large community and san francisco and need a free space to walk dogs. Our city is beautiful, our beaches are beautiful and EVERYONE should be allowed to enjoy them free of leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4066    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** KZK9 Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 09:21:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please save our off leash areas.

If someone were to film time lapse video of one of these areas they want to restrict, there's no way they would after seeing the thousands of dogs and their families that use this space.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4067    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94947

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 09:23:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am so sorry that this is even an issue. Of course I understand that we need to preserve our wildlife areas however with the growing amount of dogs cooped up in the city and all over the Bay area it seems that there must be a compromise so that dogs will always be able to run off leash even if it's a designated part of the beach (or area).

My husband was the assistant project manager on Crissy Field. During that time he assured hundreds of dog owners that their dogs would always have an area to run off leash because that is what he was told. When the whole issue raised it's ugly head years ago he was not only disappointed but felt like he had mislead the general public due to their changed party line. We had always thought that even though it was National Park it would be excluded because of it's long tradition of people being able to exercise their dogs. It is not only a joy to watch the dogs romp and play but there is an additional social component for people to come together which in this day and age is most important.

It is my hope that we can find a COMMON SENSE SOLUTION for this issue where dogs stop losing the ground that is so important for their well being.

Thank you,  
Randy Turpie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4068    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valle, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 09:29:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support Option A, leaving the existing regulations in place.

As a long term (35 year) resident of Marin county, I strongly object to banning owners from allowing their dogs to run in allowed areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4069    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 09:31:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The suggested plan to severely limit the amount of off-leash dog parks is not in the people's best interest, and I strongly oppose it. In my neighborhood, there is already very little space I can take my dog. The percentage of dog owners, and those that make use of this open space, is already well out of proportion to the amount of space available. And the Preferred Alternative measure would drastically shrink this area further.

Please consider all the people who use these spaces when considering this measure. With nearly 50% of the population as dog owners, this measure is entirely too restrictive.

Jeremy Murphy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4070    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Foster City, CA 94404  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Chihuahua Meet-up Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 09:33:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My group, the Chihuahua Meet-up members, who meet the first Sunday of each month at San Francisco's Sigmund Stern Grove's doggy park - - about 75 - 150 active members, including a vet tech and some doggy rescue group representatives, would be devastated if any of the proposed areas forced us to limit them being off-leash!!! (Our group is not limited to only Chihuahuas, but all SMALL dogs are welcome.) The socialization, camaraderie, and communication among dog owners is invaluable. This is true of many MEET-UP doggy groups. Nowadays, it's a happy escape from the unpleasantness with which many of us have to deal on a daily basis.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please let Nancy Pelosi know that i strongly oppose the GGNRA dog plan!!! Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4071    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 09:41:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the GGNRA's proposed plan as an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide more than 20 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners. That's more than sufficient for me and my dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4072    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 09:47:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4073    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 09:48:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dog owners love their animals. They love them so much they will let them do terrible harm to the environment and to wildlife and believe they are in the right to do so.

Many dog owners simply don't realize how much damage their individual pet can do. And en masse the hordes of dogs completely disrupt an already troubled ecosystem.

Some dog owners will keep their dogs on leash in wild and semi-wild habitats, but most will not, even when they know it's against the law. They think it's natural for their animal to romp with other dogs, as well as pursue wild birds and animals. And it \*is\* natural for their dogs to do these things, but it's also incredibly destructive.

Even after warnings of bans, dog owners as a group have continued to essentially refuse to control their animals.

We are privileged to live in city with so much natural beauty and so many wild creatures at our doorsteps. In order to survive in a world of ever encroaching human domination, these things need our help to survive - YOUR help to survive.

Dog owners are a vocal and active political group, but they're wrong in this.

Please act on the science and facts of this situation. Do not bend to the tyranny of the louder voice.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4074	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 09:52:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4075	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 09:54:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

---

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4076	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 09:57:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Miwok Trail, Coastal Trail, Wolf Ridge, Rhubarb Trail, Oakwood Valley trail

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4077	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 09:58:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. I regularly take my dog to Miwok Trail, Coastal Trail, Wolf Ridge, Rhubarb Trail, Oakwood Valley trail				

---

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4078    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 10:01:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and volunteer with a rescue group I believe this proposal is entirely too restrictive when we live in a city with thousands of dog owners and no backyards as well, our animals need the space to exercise so long as their owners are responsible. PLEASE do not pass this, it is of extreme importance to the people of the city of San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Megan Stacy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4079    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 10:09:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

Sincerely,

Brandon Ketterman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4080    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403-3970  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 10:21:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Caspar Willems  
San Mateo, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4081	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who uses GGNRA lands regularly to recreate with my dog, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent thousands of people from recreating with their dogs for their own health and their dog's health the way they have on GGNRA properties for years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, URBAN area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

It is also worth noting that parks that allow off-leash recreating make those parks safer for everyone. People with dogs visit these parks rain-or-shine, day-or-night, because dogs always need to be exercised.

That means there's always someone in the parks and solo people out for walks or jogs are safer for it, because they aren't alone.

Sincerely,  
Kristy Brady and 6yo goldendoodle Seamus Brady

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4082    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 10:38:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Do not restrict dog access any more! I do not own a dog, but feel they are a wonderful family-oriented addition to our National Parks. I vote for keeping the current policy (Plan A I believe) and even considering opening up more dog access. I am shocked that the Park Service would even consider such drastic dog restrictions in the parks (Plan F and such). I want you to count my vote in full favor of as much dog access as possible in our national parks. DOGS ARE OUR FAVORED PETS AND NEED TO GET OUT AND ENJOY NATURE ACCESS TOO! Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4083    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 10:50:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4084    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**



**Received:** Feb,15,2014 10:51:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not allow unleashed dogs on Muir Beach. I went there less and less over the years as it became so widely known as a dog park, until I stopped going altogether. But recently I (a San Rafael native) have been making tentatively forays back to that area, enjoying immensely such things as the newly redone Dias Ridge Trail, the "secret garden" at the Zen Center and taking the Middle Green Gulch Trail from there, and the stunning Muir Woods and Muir Beach Overlook, and also, I went to Muir Beach itself while it was closed for restoration work and learned again why it's a such a gem. There is no reason that it should only be enjoyed by people who like unknown wet dogs bounding up to them and their tots (not to mention the effects of dogs on the habitat/wildlife). I know other people like myself who have stopped going there because it is overrun with dogs. I would be happy to see a coyote there, but no domestic dogs that bound up to you or on you, may bite you, and are unnatural animals running loose in a stunning natural place. (I have had bad experiences with dogs, including once a Doberman ran down the street to me and put its paws up on my shoulders, and meanwhile the owner was calling out "don't worry, he's friendly!"). Please, please, please, I am begging you, no unleashed dogs at Muir Beach. It's gorgeous, and I have a right to go there without fear of loose dogs. I don't want to have to pass it by for another 10-15 years or more. Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4085	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Linda Lalley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4086	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 10:58:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** There are so few places to take your dog, please allow us to take our dog on leash or off-leash as appropriate to places in the state. If there are proper plastic bags and waste cans people will clean up after them. A lot of people don't have children and dogs are like their kids. We should be

allowed to take our 'dog-children' to places like human children. Thank for looking at the big picture of everyone, not just the few who are 'afraid' of dogs or just have whatever issue with them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4087    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I also oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Richard Holeton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4088    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** San Francisco Naturalist Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 11:16:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

Although I own three dogs myself, I recognize the importance of protecting national park lands and the wild animals that live there.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4089    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 11:20:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am against the dog management plan. I should be able to play with my dog off-leash at Crissy Field and Ft. Funston. These parks are for \*people\* - they are not wilderness areas.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4090    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Falmouth, MA 02540  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 11:24:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm the writer of the Chet and Bernie series, mysteries narrated by Chet, the detective's dog. Here's what Chet would think about this controversy: "Hello? What about me and my kind? It just so happens we like wide open spaces, same as you. Aren't we in the mix? We're here, too. We live! We breathe!"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4091    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 11:28:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a SF resident, pay my taxes, vote and am committed to my community. I am also a responsible dog owner. Dogs in SF need places to be walked off leash where they can get adequate exercise . The issue is more about responsible dog owners than restricting off leash areas in SF. Please leave off leash areas throughout the city in all neighborhoods so that we minimize the impact in one or two secluded areas. Dogs have rights too!

Susana Muniz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4092    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 11:40:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is excessive and extremely imposing on the residents and pets of the San Francisco Bay Area. In this area you find a large and generous population of people willing to open their hearts and their homes to rescue animals and save them from shelters. Part of the reason they are able to do that in a highly populated city is due to these large off leash areas. Dogs are not meant to be stuck in an apartment all day, but the active lifestyle of these residents plus these off leash areas where dogs and owners are able to play fetch and run freely make that all possible. Additionally, these off leash areas allow dogs to run through all their excess energy making them content to sit at home for hours at a time. Without these off leash areas dogs will have excessive energy stuck in an apartment and will probably bark and tear the house apart. These changes will have major impacts that we may not even be able to foresee. Ones that I can think of include dogs stuck in apartments barking all day causing neighbors to get frustrated and potentially cause major arguments and less enjoyable living conditions. Dogs that are not able to get all their energy out and play in a productive manner can become aggressive and we may see more aggressive dogs on leash due to these restrictions.  
For me, the moments I enjoy living in San Francisco the most are those moments when I am at the beach with my dog playing with the Frisbee or playing fetch with a tennis ball. Those are the moments I capture

---

on my camera and post to my facebook bragging to friends on the east coast of how I live in such a wonderful, beautiful place. Those are the moments I love living in San Francisco the most. If you take that away, I don't see myself living here much longer. My dog is a huge part of my life and the time we enjoy together is very valuable to me. This is a major part of me enjoying living here and taking that away makes me consider living elsewhere. The convenience and enjoyment of taking my dog to the beach and other off leash areas is the highlight of my weekend. If we have to get in a car and drive for miles to find an off leash area that every other dog from San Francisco (and there are a lot), not only will that have a negative impact on the environment (all that not previously unnecessary driving) but also dogs in overcrowded areas will get into each other's way and potentially become aggressive. This is something very important and valuable to the residents of San Francisco. Even before I got a dog of my own I enjoyed watching the dogs on the beach play and seeing how they all managed to get along so well. Please don't take our parks away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4093    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 11:45:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep GGRNA dog friendly including off leash dogs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4094    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Grant Cooper

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4095    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 11:59:54

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Preserving our parks and land is extremely important to the citizens of San Francisco...but so is the health and well-being of our pets. We are no different than any other pet owners in other cities- but we have limited space to care for our pets. Our pets need exercise and sufficient space to do it, just like anyone else. With such limited space as it is, this will only make matters worse. Some of us aren't able to have children of our own, so our pets ARE our children. Please don't take away their space to run and play, especially without providing an equivalent alternative instead! Please!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4096    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94605  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Piedmont Pet Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 12:06:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Karen Kenney, Piedmont Pet dog walking and home boarding

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4097    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 12:07:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Christina

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4098	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Costa Mesa, CA 92626 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 12:08:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I Oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4099	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 12:13:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern:				

---

As a San Francisco native and mother to a very young child, I am writing to strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is far too restrictive and will ultimately harm our city's unique sense of community. As an ardent voter who believes in the preservation of open land, I am appalled to see the GGNRA overstep their role of conservatory.

I oppose fences surrounding or delineating any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them feel minimized within the community.

My family walks our dogs daily at Crissy Field and I am always impressed by how responsible and attentive dog owners and dog care providers are on the property. The land is a gem that we protect and off leash areas are a key part of a happy, healthy community.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas merely because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. The GGNRA off-leash areas are a big reason why we choose to raise our young family in the city and not in the suburbs.

Best regards,  
Patricia

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4100	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 12:16:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

David Garden

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4101    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 12:26:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a proud San Francisco resident and taxpayer. I enjoy using the recreation areas in my neighborhood including Chrissy Field, Fort Funston, Lands End, Ocean Beach and Baker Beach with my dog. The GGNRA's proposed alternative is extremely restrictive for off and on leash dog walking. Up to 75% of dog walking access in San Francisco will be eliminated if the GGNRA's proposed alternative is adopted. This would cause the small areas in SF city parks where on and off leash access is allowed to be severely overcrowded. Please do not adopt the GGNRA's proposed alternative.

Sincerely,

Cory

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4102    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 12:26:17

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider the severe reduction in off leash dog rules for GGNRA. The beach at Fort Funston, for example, is so valuable for the exercise of our pets. Should the real issue be the use of GGNRA by dog walkers with numerous animals not properly controlled, please institute restrictions targeted to multi-dog walkers who do not regulate their animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4103    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Yuliya Byakina

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4104    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 12:29:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet



policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kelly Spencer

/Users/Spencer/Desktop/IMG\_0277.jpg

Thank you for your support.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4105	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

M. Byakin

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4106	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Y. Litvyakova

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4107	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

O.Byakina

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4108	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Bruno, CA 94066 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

A. Astrakhantsev

**Correspondence ID:** 4109    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925-1930

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 12:36:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To live up to its name (Golden Gate National Recreation Area) your agency's mandate should include enabling taxpayers - - who, after all, own the land you manage on their behalf - - to have the most enjoyment possible from the area without destroying it. I recognize that there is a balancing act, here, since use always carries with it some small measure of destruction. The only way to keep the GGNRA pristine is to ban all use which, of course, runs against your mandate.

Some of the most fervent users of the people's land are dog owners. Here in Marin County, dog owners are an unusually responsible group of people. They value the nature that they and their dogs get to enjoy. Destroying the land would destroy their own pleasure in it. They therefore strike the perfect balance - - recreating on the land while respecting it.

With these considerations in mind, I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

In stating this preference, I am keeping in mind the fact that the GGNRA has already placed 99% o the recreation area out of reach of people like me who enjoy taking their dogs responsibly into nature areas. For this reason, there is no compelling reason to deny them full or partial access to the remaining 1%. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

In sum, the GGNRA functions as the people's steward for the land. It does a splendid job, incidentally, and one that I and my dogs very much appreciate. Maintaining 1% o the land for full dog access will not interfere with the GGNRA's work, but it will ensure that the people (and their dogs) get to enjoy their own American bounty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4110    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94707

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Audubon Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 12:38:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an Environmental Educator, Bird Watcher, nature lover, and consistent user of GGRNA I am particularly distressed by the pressure to include both leashed and unleashed dogs into the area. A great percentage of "leashed" dogs actually run free and are followed by owners with the leashes draped around their necks. Dogs startle and harass wildlife and and can disturb humans.

A UC Berkeley study in the Eastshore State Park found that dogs consistently startle and chase migratory birds away from their foraging and resting, as well as harass and disturb nesting birds away from their crucial activities.

---

I enjoy quiet hikes to listen to birds and other natural sounds, to contemplate, to find some peace of mind. The intruding sounds of dogs barking or fighting, the harassment of strange dogs running up and jumping on me are distressing. Owning a dog is discretionary. Wildlife have no choice.

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€¢ We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

â€¢ Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

â€¢ Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4111	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 12:46:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

And I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

Pets are our family members. Please remember this!

Sincerely,

Alex Grossman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4112	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 12:50:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to oppose the alternative to the new draft dog management plan by GGNRA. As residents of San Francisco, my family, including our dog, frequents the Crissy Field recreation area on a daily basis - we also visit other open parks on occasion including Baker Beach, Fort Funston, and Ocean Beach. These recreation areas with their open trails and spaces for families and dogs to run are why we love living in San Francisco. The new GGNRA draft dog management plan would eliminate our ability to enjoy these parks.

With respect to the new draft plan, I believe that the proposal for closing off the park's dog-friendly openness with fencing is not supported by any legitimate evidence calling for this drastic change. It does not cite site-specific impacts or has it adequately taken into account the impact it would have on our community.

In particular, I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. I believe that the fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

I am an engaged citizen, a tax payer, a voter, and a responsible dog owner. There has always been a mutual respect for everyone who uses our off-leash parks in San Francisco. As this city continues to grow and open spaces continues to be at a minimum, I urge you make the right and responsible decision to reject this new draft plan and maintain the tradition of allowing for dogs to be off-leash in these public recreation areas.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4113	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, NC 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 12:52:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. The proposed restrictions will also have a negative impact on quality of life throughout the city as the increasingly limited dog friendly areas become overcrowded and inaccessible.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Kristin Hinkle

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4114	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:04:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I am a Mill Valley native and dog lover who frequently enjoys walking my 7 yr. old Labrador at Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach & trail as well as on many of the fire trails throughout Marin. There are not enough places left to walk dogs off-leash in Marin County and I want you to know I strongly oppose the GGNRA proposed ban on off-leash dogs at Muir Beach, Homestead, Rodeo Beach loop & all the Fire Roads as well as the complete ban on many of the Fire trails. This is outrageous & completely opposite of what the people of Marin want and stand for. Dog owners are the very people who care for these beautiful beaches and trails - more so than people without dogs. Please do not allow this unfair loss of roaming space for the people and dogs of Marin. I invite you to call me at any time to discuss further. I thank you in advance for your consideration & hope from the bottom of my heart you will support the opposition to the GGNRA plan.

Sincerely,  
Leigh Bakhtiari

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4115	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:08:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

As someone who work full time during the week, I look forward to my nightly and weekend walks in with my dog the GGNRA. Having the chance to spend quality time with my dog and exercising on a daily basis with him is important to my health, both physically and mentally, but also my dog's health.

I'm writing as I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It's restrictiveness will prevent me from exercising and playing with my dog as I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston for many years.

I understand that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. I think these comments are so important to consider, as they reflect not just my opposition but the many

others in our communities. I also understand that there hasn't been a peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. I know the impact that this will have on my life, and my dog's life, and I know I'm not the only one with concerns.

I oppose the need for fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences don't help with dogs who are out of control, rather it will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. It only lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, but doesn't provide site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA.

Further, the plan lacks acknowledgement of its impact on other areas. Surely the GGNRA plan will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas. I don't frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing. My time with my dog outside is a time for both of us to exercise, relax and feel free.

The GGNRA was originally set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. The trails and beaches were set aside for dog walking per the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you for hearing my feedback. And I appreciate your consideration of these comments before moving forward with this plan.

Best regards,  
Monika

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4116	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:11:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Recent transplants to San Francisco, my wife and I were very excited about the dog loving nature of the city and limited restrictions. It is very disappointing to see the strict Dog Management Plan being considered and we hope all parties can come to a more suitable and scientifically substantiated arrangement.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4117	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Richmond, CA 94804 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:11:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** The discussion regarding multiuse access to parks is long overdue. As a birder, I have given up birding many of the parks here in the East Bay- -Wildcat, Albany Bulb, Bay Trail around Pt. Isabel, because of offleash dogs. I really don't want to be tripping over dogs or having noses in places I would rather not experience when I am focussing on birds, in addition to being growled at on several occasions.

In my experience, what is missing is oversight and fining of those few owners who do not obey the rules.

If there is to be any resolution, the Park District needs to do a survey of endangered species, either plant, bird or animal, identify those that need the greatest protection, like Snowy Plovers, establish rules, stick to them and then have a strong enforcement program. It's a waste of time having all these meetings where dog owners rule or environmentalists rule because the real rules needs to be set by the governing agency and enforced.

Thank you.  
Sheila Dickie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4118	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:31:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

I am submitting these comments in response to the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. I am a frequent visitor to the GGNRA, including areas from Stinson Beach south to Fort Baker. I visit both the beach areas and the inland trails and fire roads network. I appreciate the incredible amount of time and energy that the NPS and others have dedicated to this issue over the last decade, and would say its time for the NEPA process to come to a reasonable end, an alternative be selected, and as importantly, it be enforced. I support the implementation of Alternatives B or D, as clearly the most consistent with balancing the objectives identified in the SEIS. I will address only the most pressing consideration in my comments, in support of these Alternatives, and attempt to relate these to the objectives of the Dog Management Plan.

Provide a clear, enforceable dog management policy

First, all of the alternatives' definitions' and much of the impacts analysis, are undermined by the use of a vague and undefined term of "voice control", as though this were some verifiable standard, as easily observed as a physical leash. It is not. Anyone who has interacted with dogs in public knows that "voice control" means after repeated yelling by the dog owner, the dog may or may not obey, before or after it finished doing whatever activity (jumping on child, chasing wildlife, defecating on a public walkway, chasing another owner's dog, etc..) its pursuing. "Voice control" implies that the owner speaks, and the dog responds to do as the owner desires, which simply is not the reality outside of re-runs of The Dog Whisperer and The Adventures of Lassie. Because the specific impacts of the dog use are so closely tied to the nature of effective controls and limitations on the dog's activity, this criteria is absolutely critical. The GGNRA's reliance on this vague, subjective criteria as a basis for defining alternatives is a significant defect in the SEIS, and if retained, is likely to lead to future disputes on its interpretation. Any new policy should rely on clearly observable conditions and standards that support consistent enforcement and expectations by the public, meaning either dogs are on leash and under physical control, or they are



"uncontrolled", with the same expectations of any wild animal not physically constrained. Despite the appeal of a "voice control" expectation that balances the dog owner's desire for unfettered freedom of their pet with the GGNRA's focus on compromise between user groups, it's a meaningless standard at present, and is being applied throughout the SEIS as if it were as clear as day. The conditions of dog use should be simple and clear; on leash and under physical control, or uncontrolled. That is the reality of the current situation, once the convenient but misleading term of "voice control" is recognized for its meaningless practical impact.

Second, without effective enforcement, none of the Alternatives will be successful. The SEIS is silent on the current level of ineffective enforcement, and on any plans for increased and truly effective enforcement of current dog use regulations. This is a critical flaw of the SEIS, because like the issue of "voice control", the Alternatives are purely theoretical in intended outcome if not backed up by effective enforcement. I urge the NPS to not be silent on this practical disconnect. The best Alternatives will be greatly diminished in their intended outcome without effective enforcement. To advance an Alternative under NEPA, but not have practical supporting actions by the responsible federal agency to make the intended outcomes reasonably achievable, is flawed policy making at best.

#### Preserve and protect natural and cultural resources and natural processes

Unleashed, uncontrolled dog activity is known to lead to habitat destruction and harassment and destroying of native and endangered species. If ESA regulations were being meaningfully enforced in the GGNRA, these actions would not be tolerated, and dog use that resulted in taking/destroying/disturbing listed species would be treated in a far more serious manner. There are times when mutually exclusive goals have to be recognized, and uncontrolled dogs will result in taking/disturbing of ESA listed species, under the willful negligence of the dog's owner.

#### Provide a variety of visitor experiences

The GGNRA provides a huge variety of visitor experiences, and well-regulated dog use should be one of them. Right now, the overwhelming presence of dogs on some beaches is effectively excluding any other use, creating a significant imbalance in user experiences. The marginal benefits of uncontrolled dog use, versus on leash, for the dog users is far less than the major degradation of benefits to the non-dog users, caused by the wide-ranging impacts of the uncontrolled dogs.

#### Improve visitor and employee safety, and Reduce user conflicts

These two goals are closely related, and heavily impacted by the current dog use practices. We have witnesses numerous incidents of close calls where children and adults were put in harms way by reckless, out of control dogs that were clearly in sight of their owners, who chose to do nothing. We have been accosted by dogs while trying to sit and enjoy a snack on the beach, twice in just the last few weeks, once at Stinson and again at Muir, both under relatively uncrowded conditions, due to the obvious negligence of the dog owners. Maybe they had "voice control", and chose not to exert it, or maybe they really did not have control. Their owners were oblivious, taking no action, as is observed to be the case the majority of the time. A month ago, we witnessed a man carrying a baby being nearly knocked over by a dog running full speed back and forth across the bridge at Rodeo Beach, again to no reaction by the apparently oblivious owner of the dog. The lack of enforcement of rules and current practices are putting all users and the NPS at elevated risk of injury and conflict, and putting the NPS at greater risk of liability for fostering user conditions that have clear and preventable hazards like out of control dogs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4119	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 13:32:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Although our family has grown recently with a new baby, we choose to live in our same small apartment with our labrador retriever for a very good reason. The close proximity to parks and the beach where we can let her run. My wife even moved us to this apartment so we could get a dog, that enriches our lives, as many different pets do.

The saying goes, "a tired dog is a happy dog", but how can that happen if the parks, beach or other areas make regulations or policies that prevent our dogs or other pets from getting the exercise they need? Not everyone is physically capable of running their dogs to the extent they need, which is why these parks, beaches and areas are important in a city such as San Francisco or in the surrounding suburbs. The most popular game of "fetch", which is done by all breeds of dog, not just our beloved retrievers, is absolutely impossible if your dog has to be on leash everywhere you go. The amount of exercise certain breeds need is too much for a person to "walk" it. Also we, and I am sure many others cannot afford to have their dog walked a couple times a day, everyday to meet the needs of the dog.

As a resident who lives near Fort Mason area, I often see on a nice weekend oodles of young people who are trashing the park, leaving behind waste, trash, bottles, broken ones on their way out of the park, and I think to myself, "how is it that dogs do more damage to these beautiful parks than humans are doing?" Sometimes I come across more homeless feces, throw up, and needles, in the local park than any dog waste. Basically I see more damage done by humans than by any amount of dogs. If dogs dig a massive hole in the sand at Crissy Beach, the tide rises and it is covered and flat in less than 24 hours. Most owners that I know are competent, and pick up after their animals and police others who don't. That is what is needed, if the concern is about waste, then everyone is responsible, even pick up dog waste you see that was left behind.

It is already difficult to live in the city of San Francisco as a family, when we cannot afford the homes or more spacious apartments that many dot com earners can afford. If these regulations and restrictions come to pass I feel it will just drives in another nail in the coffin for me,.....to finally come to the conclusion that I and my family have to leave the bay area to enjoy a "normal life" where we have more freedoms, space and less of the tickytack regulations and restrictions.

Please keep these off leash areas open for the benefit of so many good owners out there, and their companions who they love and want to be happy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4120    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** corte mader, CA 94925

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 13:42:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and Rodeo Beach and trails at Tennessee Valley.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4121	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:43:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Cecily Ward

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4122	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:49:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been walking my dogs at Crissy Field and Fort Funston for 15 years and the experience has enriched not only the lives of the dogs in my life, but also my life and the lives of the friends that I have met there over the years. Restricting off-leash dog walking in the GGNRA will negatively impact not only the quality of life of the many dogs living in and near San Francisco, but also				

---

the people in their lives.

The vast majority of dog owners are responsible people, and in my opinion are more aware of the good of the environment and respectful interaction with others than those who are simply absorbed in their own self interest or their precious, vulnerable kids. In 15 years the most traumatic negative interaction between off-leash dogs and the general public that I witnessed was the theft of a chunk of cheese from a picnic. Dogs are not the menace they are made out to be by a vocal minority of the population. As with any aspect of life, irresponsible dog supervision should be punished and we already have laws as well as social mores that more than adequately address such problems.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4123    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 13:50:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Melissa Hinkle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4124    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** La Honda, CA 94020  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 13:51:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Helen Hutton

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4125	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:52:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Mason Hinkle

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4126	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:53:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,

there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Gloria

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4127	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:55:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ryan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4128	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	La Honda, CA 94020 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:56:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4129	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:56:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Shay

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4130	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:58:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash



access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
John Inson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4131	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 13:59:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Rachelle Phillips

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4132	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Barry Taylor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4133    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** City and County of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 14:20:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not limit the off leash areas. Dogs make better pets/companions and tenants in buildings when they have off leash areas to run.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4134    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94707  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 14:24:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the proposed maps identifying on-leash areas within GGNRA. I do not support off-leash areas except where well contained and isolated from other types of uses, such as walking, parking to enjoy views for those who cannot walk trails, picnicking, bird watching and other low-impact wildlife viewing. I find "voice control" to be an invitation to have a bunch of dogs running loose (potentially disturbing wildlife, people and other dogs) while their owners scream, yell, scold their dogs, often without controlling effect. These park areas were set aside to maintain a wild setting for people to enjoy, not for pets. I would prefer these areas labeled voice control to be limited, and generally prefer leashed dogs in parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4135    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** oakland, CA 94608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 14:33:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please re-consider the proposed leash laws in the recreation areas like Fort Funstun. The ability to walk my dogs in open areas is really central to their and my happiness. These places are sanctuaries for dogs and their owners. Thank you for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4136    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

With a change in policy as suggested, I would not use the GGNRA recreation areas at all and cannot support this proposed decision

Sincerely,

Daniel C McCarthy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4137 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,15,2014 14:38:06**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** The Draft Dog Management Plan is ill-conceived. It would mean the closure of most of the off leash areas San Franciscans use to exercise their dogs. It would deprive dog owners the opportunity to properly socialize their dogs with other dogs and people. If this plan were to go into effect, many of the city's dogs would become more territorial, fearful, and untrusting, which in my opinion, would increase not decrease, the likelihood of dog aggression.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4138 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,15,2014 14:40:35**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I love Crissy Field and Fort Funston and visit these places regularly. My family and I live three blocks from Ocean Beach. I used to walk my two Irish Setters on Crissy Field and the adjacent beach every day

for 15 years. Their off-leash recreation contributed to their long lives and quality of life, as well as my own. Never once during that period did I encounter one negative impact to the environment from any dogs in the area. In fact, I saw countless snowy plovers and other birds along the shore in harmony with the dogs and humans nearby. I always cleaned up after my dogs, who were very well trained and socialized and always promptly responded to voice control. Like the vast majority of off-leash dog walkers, I was a responsible dog owner.

The "Preferred Alternative" plans to restrict off-leash dog space are way too restrictive. As someone who visits Crissy Field and Fort Funston every week and Ocean Beach daily, I would like to point out some of the problems with these plans.

Crissy Field: "Alternative F" limits way too much space for off-leash recreation on the Crissy Airfield and Promenade. At the very least, all of the field east of the path between Mason St and the former Coast Guard Station needs to be off-leash. Dogs need to run for their health and well-being. Currently, the airfield is home to gigantic, industrial art sculptures and is often used for large events. There is no reason that the airfield should be restricted for off-leash use. Furthermore, I used to walk my dogs along the inlet between the Central & East Beaches and see no reason why dogs and humans cannot enjoy the inlet off-leash. "Alternative A" should remain in effect for this location.

Ocean Beach: Ocean Beach serves as the backyard for the citizens of the Outer Sunset. You cannot possibly to ban off-leash dog walking from Golden Gate Park to south of Sloat Blvd. "Alternative F" is completely unrealistic in scope. We live 3 blocks from Ocean Beach by Vicente St., and Alternative F would force us to get in a car and drive somewhere else to provide proper recreation for our canine companions.

Fort Funston: Why does the "Alternative F" proposal restrict off-leash dog walking along the Battery Davis and Sunset trails and their surrounding areas? This former military area is crucial for the thousands of dogs who depend on this area. There is no reason to restrict any of this land for off-leash use.

Based on the examination of the San Francisco areas in question listed above that the GGNRA's plans to restrict off-leash use in Marin and San Mateo Counties are most likely equally near-sighted, myopic, and draconian.

The GGNRA already has an extremely small amount of space set aside for off-leash dog walking as it is, and the proposed "Preferred Alternative" plan to limit the available space is draconian, pointless, absurd, unfair, and unrealistic. This plan would destroy the quality of life for thousands of people and dogs who deserve their continued enjoyment of and recreation in our open spaces. The limitations presented in the "Preferred Alternative" are way too radical in scope. This plan was obviously crafted by a very narrow minded small group biased against dogs, with little to no scientific evidence to justify their malicious intentions. The real impact to the environment of the GGNRA is from humans who do not pick up their trash. I have personally picked up huge amounts of food wrappers, plastic beach toys, cigarette butts, and other human trash.

The GGNRA needs to realize that these open spaces have always been used by the people of San Francisco and the Bay Area for recreation that includes off-leash dog walking, and to limit these spaces in such a myopic and draconian manner amounts to nothing more than environmental extremism. I am certain that a much more fair and balanced compromise can be reached than this ridiculous and misnamed "Preferred Alternative."

It is obvious that the GGNRA is not listening to the overwhelming needs of the people to maintain more space for off-leash recreation. I consider myself to be a staunch environmentalist, but the new plans new presented out by the GGNRA, including the "preferred" Alternative F versions, are blatant examples of

"environmental extremism" run amok. These San Francisco lands were transferred to the NPS under the "Golden Gate National RECREATION Association" with the express legal understanding that these areas would retain their previous recreation status including off-leash dog walking. As I walk Ocean beach every day, I pass by large, thriving throngs of Snowy Plovers, Sanderlings and other shore birds living alongside humans and off-leash dogs as they have done so for generations. The restrictive plans to hinder off-leash dog recreation is simply misguided, cruel, and unjust to the thousands of dogs and their responsible guardians who depend on our public lands to sustain and enrich their lives.

In short, I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy along with off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Maguire  
2646 45th Ave.  
San Francisco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4139	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 14:46:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I urge the decision-makers to keep the status quo, meaning no new restrictions or requirements for the present off-leash/voice control areas.				

Keep the off-leash/under voice control areas as they are today (February 15, 2014), free and open for dogs' exercise off-leash. Dogs are sentient beings and need freedom to be dogs. Lack of proper off-leash/voice control exercise for pets leads to their frustration and possibly aggression which these further restrictions would bring to fruition through cause and effect.

Many years ago when the Army had possession of the Presidio & Crissy Field area a petition was signed by myself and other dog owners who wished the area to be off-leash/voice control, and the petition was granted and dogs off-leash were allowed.

This policy should be a grandfathered in provision (as I believe it has been since the GGNRA took possession).

Ocean Beach should remain off-leash/under voice control as well as Fort Funston and other GGNRA areas presently enjoyed by pet owners, pet-owner families, and their pets.

There are fewer and fewer areas for off-leash since the City & County of SF instituted its then new dog policy a few years ago which basically relegates dogs to small fenced-in areas around the city with wood chips placed on the surface (splinters).

I view this covering with wood chips - - and perhaps the SF Health Department should also - - as a health hazard as it concentrates urine and feces and opportunity for diseases to spread.

The dogs, their owners, and children are basically playing in a cesspool. Playing fetch just brings the filth into the dogs mouths with possibility of transmission to humans.

In addition these areas become dust bowls in the summer and mud bowls in the winter due to the concentrated use.

I have witnessed Corona Heights park near my home succumb to the concentration issue where prior to fencing the off-leash area vegetation flourished, and the now fenced-in off-leash area is a wasteland of feces- and urine-ridden wood chips covering the surface area.

PLEASE, NO MORE RESTRICTIONS. KEEP THESE GGNRA AREAS AND OTHER AREAS OPEN TO OFF-LEASH/VOICE CONTROL.

THANK YOU.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4140	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94966				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Richardson Bay Maritime Association Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 14:51:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Park Staff,				

Here we go again. Another move to limit my access to trails in Marin. Because I have a dog. I have heard the arguments and understand the problems of too many dogs running in the wrong places. I do however object to your management plan which punishes me for the bad actions of a few dog owners who 'do not get it', with their careless use of the land letting the dogs run and poop with abandon. I am 66 and a lifelong resident of this area. I voted for the original National Park over the alternative which appeared as massive development. It's not the 60's anymore and the urban park that grew massive attracts lots of people. They are a problem. Your mandate to protect and preserve is for us the people and that is your job. It is not to protect the land from us, the people but allow us access to the land we own as people for us to enjoy which for me is to walk my dog.

Currently my favorite walk is a off leash Oakwood fire road and trail. Now I will be banned from walking the trail and must walk up and back on the road leashed. Just like your bike use plan you can not go anywhere easily and make connections. Just in and out.

Instead of this plan which man power must enforce thus wasting time giving nice thoughtful dog owners a ticket. Enforce current laws about poop and dogs running. Give hefty citations to those offenders who are really abusive. Educate others, be helpful and stop acting like the police and everyone is criminal. If your budget is short and can't fund the manpower to control bad dog owners and park visitors, re-prioritize. Stop the fancy infrastructure developments and increase workforce to effectively protect the park and good visitors from those doing their bad deeds.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I accept Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, since I will never have access like I did before all you other people arrived on the scene.

John Shuey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4141    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 14:54:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Todd Roehrman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4142    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 14:59:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet

---

policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4143    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 15:01:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the plan to change the dog rules especially at Oakwood Valley and Alta Rd areas. What you are doing is limiting the enjoyment of this RECREATION AREA by PEOPLE! I've been using these areas almost daily since 1996, when I moved to Marin City. I did a survey, and more than 75% o the persons met on these trails have dogs, most off leash except for the dog-walkers who generally have their flock on leash. In fact, persons-with-dogs are so prevalent on these trails that my dog expects to see another dog, for socializing, whenever we encounter a person. If you ban dogs, you are banning tax-paying people.

What might be your purpose? Are there a few complainers who believe dogs affect their 'wilderness experience'? If so, send them to PRNS Wilderness Areas just a short drive away. Is it that you are protecting wildlife? In the period I've been using this area with my dog, I've encountered mountain lions of 3 occasions, bobcats on dozens, and coyotes even more.

I've spent way more than 200 hours pulling scotch and french broom from these trails over the past 10 years, and only once have I ever met a 'ranger' (who questioned my ability to distinguish broom from other plants! your restoration people, in fact, have lent me a weed wrench). So, on what basis have you made this proposal? I'm pretty sure that it is not based on personal experience.

Please spend your time and energy on parkland restoration and not on banning dogs and their owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4144    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 15:02:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.



The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Maria Morelli

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4145	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 15:06:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Antonia and Micah

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4146	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 15:08:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Additionally, I donate money to the GGNP and will stop doing so if this new ban is imposed.

Sincerely,

Anne Saulnier

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4147	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 15:11:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog owner, I wanted to comment on the proposal to limit dogs.				

I support the No Action Alternative in each area of the proposal: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

I have been an avid user of the GGNRA for many years, and I want to continue to use the area. Please do not limit pets further.

- Chris Streeter

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4148	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 15:14:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin

residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4149    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 15:16:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to all accessible trails and beaches.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4150    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 15:23:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

Sincerely,  
Corrie Scalisi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4151    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 15:26:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It may concern,

I have a pet care business and take the dogs out for walks to a area where off leash is allowed. It is so important to let dogs run around to get all that energy out.

We are very responsible with cleaning up after our dogs as well as keeping them under good control.

Their may be people that don't like dogs and would like to have them confined to a leash as well as people who love to see there dog walk and or run along with them. I think it would be fair to put up a sign up for people who don't want to be around dogs that are off leash which alerts people that this is an off leash area and tomenter at their own discretion.

Let's play fair with this issue.

Thank you,

Sincerley,

Teresa M. Steele,

Primo Pet Care,

650-483-8983.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4152    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 15:28:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am at Rancho Corral De Tierra frequently as we have a horse in that vicinity. In the last 5 years I have seen many responsible dog owners with a handful of really poor owners. I would say it has only been about 5-10 percent of the people walk their dogs off leash. But that 5-10 percent has not only caused turmoil and spatial disrespect for others on trail along with local habitat disruption. I feel there should remain a leash law in conjunction with strict enforcement . I have not only seen off leash dogs attack dogs on leash but dog walkers with 6 dogs off leash and out of control. 1-2 dogs off leash is somewhat maintainable but when there are 6 the the pack instinct comes into place. The dogs run as a pack and is disruptive to other park members who are trying to enjoy the wildlife and elements that do not want to be disturbed by a pack of dogs. These few that I have run into on trail tend to be disrespectful of other peoples space and have no concept of control for their animals they get very vocal and some have been quite nasty and refuse to leash their dogs. If we let our children run wild like that in school they would get sent home .... What's so different about the parks system and their dogs? I ride my horse responsibly through this park nearly everyday and people would certainly be offended if I let her run upon their dogs and stick her nose where it doesn't belong.... Why is it so different for these dogs and their owners? There should be strict enforcement to allow for dogs and non dog owners or even responsible dog owners to coexist here.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4153    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Franicisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 15:34:44

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Having lived with my family - including our dogs - in the Marina for 34 years, making the proposed changes to off-leash recreation for my dogs will definitely impact the quality of my life and theirs.  
PLEASE DON'T UNLEASH THIS PLAN!!!

San Francisco already has a reputation for being a difficult place to afford to live, let's not add more reasons for people to seek their homes and jobs elsewhere!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4154    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 15:39:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, the Oakwood Trail in Tennessee Valley, and countless other locations in Marin County. I have been doing so since 1980, with totally friendly Golden Retrievers who need a place to experience free and open space.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

THOSE OF US WHO HAVE LIVED IN MARIN FOR DECADES AND HAVE - UNTIL NOW - RESPECTED THE GGNRA AND THEIR EFFORTS IN PRESERVING THE AREA ARE TOTALLY INCENSED BY THIS THREAT TO USE OF THE GGNRA BY LOCAL RESIDENTS AND THEIR DOGS. THERE IS EVERY REASON TO LISTEN TO, AND POSITIVELY RESPOND TO, INVOLVED COMMUNITY MEMBERS WHO WANT TO CONTINUE TO RESPECT THE GGNRA BECAUSE THE GGNRA LISTENS AND RESPONDS TO THE OVERWHELMING NEED FOR ALLOWING CONTINUED DOG USE.

THE APPROACH TO TAKE IS TO ALLOW US TO CONTINUE EXISTING USE BY DOGS!!!  
WHY ALIENATE A SUPPORTIVE CONSTITUENCY??? ... REALLY!

Thanks,  
Frank Z. Leidman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4155    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94402  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 15:57:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I feel as a tax payer, I should have equal access to the open space areas that make living in the San Francisco Bay Area so desirable. I am a third generation native to the San Mateo a County and have a vested interest in preserving our outdoor spaces and keeping them pristine for all yo enjoy. Dog owners like myself leave areas better than how we found them. We respect these spaces and cherish them. We are in no way harming species are destroying ecosystems when we respectfully use these recreation areas. In fact, we are the ones who contribute to the local economies when using these spaces. We strengthen the economy with each trip we make to these recreation areas. We and our pest are assets and not liabilities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4156    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:01:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because a large part of the pleasure of visiting recreation areas is seeing an area where people and animals can intermingle in a relatively unrestricted way. There are already plenty of places in which people who dislike animals can go to find recreation, but the number of places for humans and animals to find positive interaction is becoming our greatest scarcity. Dogs should be free in recreation areas to roam under the supervision of their owners and intermingle with each other.

From an environmental impact standpoint, dogs are FAR less damaging to the environment than people. If there is a particularly sensitive habitat that exists in these recreation areas, they should be closed to public use entirely and redesigned as wildlife preserves. A dog in the company of a responsible owner will stay on walking paths, refrain from disturbing wildlife, and make the overall park experience more enjoyable for everyone who might potentially enjoy the connection with nature that an outdoor recreation area is supposed to foster. Conversely, humans leave behind garbage (particularly cigarette butts,) trample pants, and, at times, create a tremendous intrusion into the lives of wild animals. The ecological impact of humans is far more detrimental than the impact of dogs. Thus, if an area to sensitive to intrusion, it should not be open to any foreign intrusion.

Please retain the rules and regulations adopted in 1979. I adamantly support not only the continuance of the current off-leash areas, but an expansion of outdoor areas in which dogs are permitted to accompany responsible owners without physical restriction (i.e. leaches, harnesses, etc.)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4157    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:09:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir beach to run. There are already so few parks and trails open to dogs where they away from cars and traffic. What you are proposing is essentially a ban on dogs off leash. Very unfair and close minded.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4158    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:12:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

My family and I regularly take our dog to Muir Beach and the local trails including the coastal trail. If we were not able to do that I feel it will have a negative impact on our West Marin lifestyle.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Jonathan A Rauh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4159    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Scotch Plains, NJ 07076  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:13:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My wife and I used to live in Palo Alto and we still visit the area regularly. We frequent these beautiful parks and we almost always bring our dog, a 10 pound Norwich terrier, Layla. We derive a great deal of pleasure from these visits, and if some of the proposed changes were to go into effect, we would be adversely impacted.

I want to be clear that I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Additionally, I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will

make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences would mar the landscape and become an eyesore.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I would support a more strict enforcement of the current rules. I believe that there area very small number of dog owners who do not have proper voice control over their dogs when walking them off-leash. These owners should be fined. But, that small number of bad apples should not become justification to change the rules for everyone.

Thank you for considering my comments. I trust that you will make the right decision.

Jesse Flowers

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4160	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 16:13:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The dogs in our city are already regulated enough. Please let them continue to enjoy the GGNRA grounds. Most dog owners (and walkers) are completely responsible (maybe even more so than people without), and look after/clean up after their dogs. Please, please, please don't restrict their access further.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4161	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 16:20:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not limit or decrease the on or off leash dog access to the trails and beaches in the Marin County area. We love to enjoy the orders with our best friend, Cali Oso, and the dog friendly trails and beaches are already extremely limited. I understand that there can be some negative effects of the dogs in the wildlife but our animals are part of our family and they need to get out and enjoy these areas. 99% o the trails are already dog prohibitive.				

---

Thank you for your consideration

Ben

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4162	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---



**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a veterinarian and someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. In addition I am concerned about the proposed restriction and the affect it will have on the dog population at large. Exercise is such a HUGE part of health for both people and animals. I fear this will have detrimental behavioral affects on dogs leading to more aggression and people will be become more sedentary as well.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4163    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:25:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Miwok Trail and Rodeo Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained or expanded.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4164    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:28:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the Draft Dog Mgt Plan currently open for public comment for the GGNRA.

Please adopt it and enforce it vigorously. Wildlife needs to be protected and dogs can run off-leash in areas specifically fenced in for their pleasure.  
A win-win.

Thank you for your protection of our open space.

Deb

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4165    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:30:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep in mind that an estimated 1/3 of area homes have canines as pets. This number actually outnumbers children in San Francisco. There are very limited places for the dogs to go play so please consider expanding the dog access rather than eliminating it.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4166    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Petaluma, CA 94954-7402  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:40:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...This plan mostly ignores the overwhelming popular dissatisfaction with the previous plan and reduces dog recreation areas throughout the GGNRA with reductions of 80% i some parts. 50 % o homes have dogs. We need area to run and play with our dogs. This is not a good plan.SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4167    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-2325  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:40:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there are not enough outdoor / green spaces in San Francisco for people & dogs. Taking away more will only make the problem worse and dogs are one of the best motivators to get people outside.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4168 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-2525  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:41:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it's com pletely unnecessary and if enacted, will reduce the likelihood I will stay a resident of the city.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4169 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112-1835  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:41:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRAI) because there are very limited areas that we can let our pets run free. We have enough out of shape obese people in this country. We don't need the same for our dogs. As a taxpayer, I pay for the maintenance of the trails and deserve to walk the dogs on these trails as well. A few grumpy people that hate dogs should not be allowed to dictate to the majority of people that love dogs to restrict access. If this is enacted, please tell us where the dogs are going to run and exercise.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4170 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-2917  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:43:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...healthy animals need a space to run and play and to get out of the confines of apartments, further, there are more dogs than children in the city and they are an integral part of many of our family lives...so stand up for healthy animals..

---

--:--:--

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4171 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118-2602  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:43:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it will make our parks less joyful, friendly places. And there are A LOT of dog owners in the Bay Area and they vote.

--:--:--

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4172 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:43:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Katie, Graeme, and "Ozzy" MacQuien

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4173 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-4050  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:44:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there are so few areas you can take your dog in both San Francisco and Marin. All the dog owners I know are extremely responsible. There are more dogs in San Francisco than children. Please let us enjoy them.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4174 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94618  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:45:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There need to be MANY more signs at Pt. Isabel (in Richmond, CA) dog park for dogs to stay out of the water.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4175 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Martinez, CA 94553-4237  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:45:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/13/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... This is a National Recreation area. Not a reserve. Not a park. Not a national protected area. Recreational means for the enjoyment of the com munity. Dogs and the ability to play and run with your dog are an important part of family and com munity life.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4176 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105-2049  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:47:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because parks are for people and some people need and depend upon dogs as members of their family.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4177 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122-2806  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:47:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4178 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-4339

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:48:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there is a war on dogs in this city. Keep restricting everything and you'll find everyone has moved out.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4179 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108-1935

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:48:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...this is important to those of us living in the cityWe are here with our dogs and we pay a lot of money to remain here. All of the children move away and yet dog owners remain for life. If this changes I will be forced to move away with my. If you have to, create a licensing system that requires all dogs to carry proper identification. Those yearly fees will generate

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4180 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116-2228

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:49:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because:

Dogs. our family members and an important part of our life are just like us, the people; they are also alive and need spaces to exercise freely. If you don't want to be leashed all day long without any freedom so don't the dogs. So please allow them some freedom in our human world. Remember, they are our best friends.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4181 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Palo Alto, CA 94304  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:51:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My husband and I walk lived in Palo Alto until recently and return frequently to the Bay Area. On our visits, we make sure to walk with our dog in Fort Funsten and Chrissy Field. This was one of our favorite activities while we were in living in the Bay Area. We derive great deal of pleasure from these visits, and if some of the proposed changes were to go into effect, we would be adversely impacted.

We oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Additionally, we oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences would also mar the landscape and become an eyesore. In addition they may prevent dogs from getting as much exercise.

We oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

We would be in support of a more strict enforcement of the current rules. We believe that there are very small number of dog owners who do not have proper voice control over their dogs when walking them off-leash. These owners should be fined. But, that small number of bad apples should not become justification to change the rules for everyone.

California contains a large community of dog owners who enjoy the wonderful off-leash dog parks. It would be a travesty for this right to be taken away from them. Thank you for considering my comments. We trust that you will make the right decision.

Shari Flowers

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4182 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102-5993

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:52:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it is too restrictive and will drive dog owners to the already overcrowded city parks of San Francisco.

My partner and I recently moved to San Francisco from Washington, DC with our 5 year old collie mix Max. Every weekend, we take him to either Crissy Field, Ft Funston or Baker Beach to run freely on the beach, swim in the water and socialize with other dogs. We are responsible dog-owners who pick up after our dog and leave any area we visit untouched.

---

We live in a small condo with no yard, so if it weren't for the GGNRA parks, we would be limited to taking him to small city parks that are already filled with homeless people and their waste. If the GGNRAs became restricted from dog access, it would create major over-crowding in the other city-run parks in the city and cause a ripple effect impacting all of the people visiting these parks for recreation, picnics et al.

Please DON'T do this...

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4183    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** OAKLAND, CA 94610-1016  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:55:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because decreasing available space for dogs to exercise and play together off-leash is a very bad idea. I am fortunate enough to live in the East Bay where I have access to very fine off-leash dog areas. To restrict the residents of San Francisco is not a good idea. Dogs are not only man's best friend but they fulfill a critical need for many people in terms of companionship and support. But dogs need the opportunity to socialize and exercise that can only be met by access to off-leash exercise areas. Thank you for your understanding.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4184    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:57:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to a variety of dog approved trails and beaches.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed



in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely

Byron Carlisle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4185    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107-4339  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:58:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. The plan is not justified as it seeks to punish responsible dog owners, who are the vast majority of the dog owners using the GGNRA. I would support a plan that limits the number of dogs any individual has off leash but I believe that would be difficult to enforce.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4186    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129-1082  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 16:59:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alter.native described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4187    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94708-1436  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:01:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because banning dogs in all areas is too restrictive.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4188 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN MATEO, CA 94403-2413

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:01:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it is necessary for dogs to have a place to exercise and run free without a leash. A well exercised dog is a well behaved dog. I do Animal Assisted Therapy with my dog and there are no words to describe the joy that he brings to client and patients all over the City. With proper exercise he does his best work.

I urge you to please continue to support the program that has been in place for years to allow dogs the privilege to run free in these areas.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4189 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** El Sobrante, CA 94803-1710

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:03:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because all dogs and their owners require space to run free and unfettered. Please stop this insanity now!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4190 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Martinez, CA 94553-2428

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:03:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... My dog and I need more open off leash places to go to enjoy our time together. He is very well-trained and there are not enough places that we can go and to enjoy the day. Please help us by giving more off leash parks so that we can have more fun together in more places

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4191 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-1518  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:06:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I urge you to preserve some off-leash areas within the Presidio and elsewhere in the GGNRA. We have so few off-leash areas in and around San Francisco. We need to promote pet ownership for our mental and physical health, especially those of us living in cities. Dogs, in particular, promote our physical health by taking us for frequent walks. But a dog really cannot get enough exercise to be healthy if it is at the end of a tether.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4192    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127-1225  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:06:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose the GGNRA Draft DMP because....WHERE'S THE BEEF?! - site-specific, peer review studies, required by law? that support their conjecture and presumptions to support these drastic changes to a 35-year policy (1979 Pet Policy, still legal and in effect ) that used 2 years of real science, studies, and public input from all stakeholders (and actually listened to them). The GGNRA admits they don't have any. They d.elete.d/omitted the scientific studies that prove the out com e is very different from what they say. The statistics on their own web site contradict their claims.

As a mother, dog owner, bird lover, nature lover, plant lover and environmentalist, I don't want ANY of our resources harmed. I taught my children and now teach my grandchildren to be good stewards of the earth. If there were any peer reviewed, scientific studies that actually show the dogs are causing harm, I would support changes that would actually help the environment, unlike NPS's fencing off acres to the public which not only did NOT protect the bank swallows, it gave birds of prey posts on which to sit and pick off the birds. The birds that were not eaten, left.

To make such dramatic changes without sound science and evaluating the impact of those changes, specifically what it will do to our City parks, is unconscionable.

Stop wasting massive amounts of taxpayer money on these exhausting exercises in frustration - ANPR, NR, DEIS, SEIS - when they haven't listen to the thousands of com ments submitted, and the SEIS does not address concerns raised in the DEIS. Please tell the park service to simply enforce the current laws on the books which protect this valuable urban recreational resource. Ticket the people who don't pick up the poop; whose dogs chase birds, or are not under voice control, etc.

Keep the current law of the land- the 1979 Pet Policy - with a Section Seven Special Regulation and an addendum to include preserving historical recreations of newly acquired lands.

Sincerely,  
Jane Shepard

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4193    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127-1225  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:07:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management plan and think you should be aware of the following:

As recently as Ms. Pelosi's Forum in Stern Grove, Frank Dean and Howard Levitt keep telling the public "but there are so many more dogs and people now, we have to do something". This is an excuse and totally unjustifiable.

Increased usage over time was anticipated when this National Recreation Area was created. The House Report No 92-1391 made clear that the GGNRA would be confronted with problems in San Francisco that would require careful planning because of the high volume year-round visitation:

"As a national urban recreation area, this new component of the national park system will be confronted with problems which do not frequently occur at other national park and recreation areas. Great numbers of people can be expected to use the area-particularly those portions located in San Francisco County." (pg. 11)

. In October, 1977, Rolf Diamont, GGNRA "Environmental Coordinator" prepared a memo proposing a "Draft Dog Policy for San Francisco Unit." His memo enumerated the following guidelines:

1. "No regulation, verbal or written, should be attempted that cannot be reasonably and consistently administered."
2. "Dog regulations should be different for different areas of the park reflecting public needs and attitudes as well as urban geography and our capabilities."
3. "When we discourage or restrict dogs in any area, whenever possible, an alternative site where dogs are allowed should be suggested."

We don't want excuses; we want site specific peer reviewed studies that prove the damage they are claiming. There are none in the SEIS. NPS has not done their job. Until then, the 1979 Pet Policy remains the law of the land.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see [http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report](http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4194    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114-3861  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:07:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because the only times I enjoy the beautiful parks of GGNRA is when I am taking my dog to run, exercise and play. If he cannot be off-leash under my supervision in the GGNRA, then I will not be benefiting from the use of the parks either. I strongly support off-leash park use for responsible dogs and dog owners. Thank you.

---

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4195    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116-1050  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:07:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...my little rescue dog Nami loves it there. It's her favorite place in the world to run and play with other dogs and get fresh air and exercise. We and countless others who walk their dogs at places like Fort Funston really realize how lucky we are to have places like this and do our best not to let our pooches run amok and clean up after them. Please don't put restrictions on off-leash dog walking.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4196    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-2423  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because 1) the Preferred A.lter.native is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) I Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred A.lter.native proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwell. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Sincerely,

Philip Sweet

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

**Correspondence ID:** 4197    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** REDWOOD CITY, CA 94062-4503  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GFGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because fort Funston is the only place where my dog and I can be free Where all the dogs and people are real not phony Please do not take away mine and my dogs freedom or anyone elses.....

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4198    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610-4013  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:11:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because having open areas for dogs improves the health of owners and canines as well as reducing behavior problems through exercise and support from other experienced dog owners. On any given day there is a com munity of many dozens of people available for friendship and exchange of knowledge. Urban dog parks don't offer the space or exercise opportunities available here. We need this area. Please visit and see how wonderful it is for people and pooches.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4199    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** GGNRA Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

L.A. Williams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4200    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** self Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:13:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Irene Dick-Endrizzi  
San Francisco, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4201    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94321  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:13:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lauren A Sonnenberg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4202    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123-2914  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:13:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because there are miles of beach and land for use by myself and my 4-legged friend. I would not put my dog in a harmful situation knowing he could be put down if not under control. Please do not ban the few off leash places we currently have in the gorgeous state of California.

-----  
sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4203    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121-3850  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:14:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because taking my dog to Ocean Beach every weekend for the past 4 years have brought me and Sumo such pleasure and allows him to run, off leash and get the exercise he needs, especially when I am working full time Monday - Friday. PLEASE don't do this to us animal lovers!

-----  
sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4204    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san jose, CA 95110-2704  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:14:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... my pug loves to run on the beach! It's unfair to keep pets leashed, they need their exercise too!

-----  
sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http:// www .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4205    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Castro Valley, CA 94546-2729  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

---



**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:15:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because my friends and I love taking our dogs offleash at the beach. They are well behaved and have a blast. It would be so sad to take this freedom away from them.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4206    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94609-1312  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:15:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because in San Francisco more people own pets than have kids. It is vitally important for the health of the com munity to have off-leash dog areas. Both non-dog owners as well as dog owners benefit from having healthy dogs who are well socialized in the com munity.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4207    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122-3526  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:18:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because our whole family enjoys taking our well-behaved dog to Fort Funston nearly every day of the week. He runs around safely off leash, we pick up after him, everyone gets some fresh air and exercise. This Dog Management Plan is a solution in search of a problem, and will greatly reduce the quality of life for many, many SF residents and their animals. It's unfair and unnecessary.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4208    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1452  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:19:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I want to maintain the existing dog access in GGNRA areas so that I can continue to recreate with my dog. My dog encourages me to be active outdoors, exercise, destress from a hectic work week, and enjoy nature with a constant com panion. It's already so difficult to find places to hike in the forest with my dog, that I can't imagine more restrictions com ing into play. Since getting my dog, I've be com e an expert at all the dog friendly places (on lease and off leash). Living in an urban area

---

such San Francisco is difficult enough to get access to wilderness areas, if new dog restrictions are placed, it will only force me further and further away from the places in which I love. Please do not restrict dog access any further.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4209    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112-1325  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:21:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/14/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...we need more of leash areas not less.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4210    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-6002  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:22:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...I have a beautiful, sweet and loving dog who is my life, and who loves (and needs!) to run! She loves going to the beach every day with her dog buddies, running and playing in the surf. She loves being able to run in the park and really exercise. Our city is so small, it's really important that our city's dogs have the space to play that they need to maintain healthy lives.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4211    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-2723  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:22:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...We have such a heavy tax burden in the state of California and you take away the one thing that eases the pain of that burden our national parks and access to those park with our four legged com panions! I am watching how you act on this and com e Election Day I will act accordingly!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4212    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-7837  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:22:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...it does not represent the users of the bay area parks and beaches that are shared and enjoyed harmoniously by all tax payers including dog parents like me that, over the last 20 years, have created a lifestyle with our dogs and other dog parents at our local outdoor spaces. Personally, my dogs and I have developed long lasting friendships at Chrissy Field and Fort Funston and I have developed business relationships, partnerships and even employed some of the people I met after our dog children romped and played together every weekend. This idea to restrict this lifestyle is erroneous and shows a total disregard for the constituents who are being affected. I am the CEO of a small business in San Francisco. I employ 8 people 1 of which I met at the "dog beach". Marjorie Scholtz, CEO Stangl Advisors

--:--:--

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4213	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 17:41:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA Officers,				

please reconsider the plan to drastically reduce allowed off-leash play areas for dogs. As a responsible dog owner, I believe that responsible dog ownership needs to be exercised in order to be widespread. Ghettoizing dogs-trained or not-into small fenced areas gives their owner an excuse to never properly train and socialize their pet. I am all in favor of instituting harsher penalties for owners who don't clean up after their pets, cannot control their pooches either verbally or with an electric collar, and cause disturbances to the ecosystem, the local wildlife, and other GGNRA patrons. That said, I believe we can all coexist in a peaceful and respectful way-hopefully one that allows me and my dog to play fetch on the Pacific shores for many years to come.

Respectfully,

Giacomo Fiore, Ph.D.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4214	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Boise, ID 83702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 17:42:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I object to the GGNRA banig of leash dogs from Muir Beach.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4215	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:46:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I read the section of the report that discusses the impact of dogs on vegetation, which is offered as part of the explanation for reducing the number of areas where dogs would be allowed off leash. The section on page 15 of the introduction to the report relies on a number of old studies (dating to 1935), which state that breaking branches and bending limbs can be harmful to vegetation. I understand that off-leash dogs might cause such damage to vegetation, but the same would be true for deer, coyotes, and other large mammals. I know of other research that actually cites the beneficial effects of such interactions between large mammals and the surrounding vegetation.

To me, the most disappointing aspect of this section is that it makes no mention of the fact that the overwhelming majority of off-leash dog use in the GGNRA is on grown lawns and on beaches, where none of the cited problems can occur. The evidence offered does not in any way prove that a change in policy will reduce the number of broken branches in the GGNRA. By citing these studies in the way this report cites them, the NPS seems to be reaching far outside of any known impact of dogs in the GGNRA in order to make a case for very broad restrictions. I would prefer that the NPS rely on arguments that make a connection between the actual effects of dogs in the GGNRA and the policy recommendations.

Frankly, isn't it obvious to the NPS that changes to regulations regarding off-leash dog activities in locations where there are no branches won't have any impact on the incidence of broken branches?

I appreciate that the NPS would prefer to change the policy for off-leash dog-walking in the GGNRA. However, I hope that the NPS appreciates that this section about the impact of dogs on vegetation does not prove in any way that the new policies will have any beneficial impact at all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4216    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:49:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been walking my golden retrievers off leash at Fort Funston for more than twenty years. In the many hundreds of times I have been there I have never seen a single serious problem with any of the thousands of off leash dogs I have encountered over the decades. GGNRA is a recreation area, not a nature preserve. Fort Funston has more than enough recently fenced off and restricted areas for native plants and birds. Let people and their dogs enjoy it the way they have for decades. My dog needs the exercise and so do I. A retriever can't retrieve on a leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4217    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** retired USAID Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:49:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please get dogs off the beach and let the shorebirds breed in safety- -dog and beach lover

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4218    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:50:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am so sick of unleashed dogs and their irresponsible owners. I go for a daily walk either in the Bayview's shoreline parks or in San Francisco's Golden Gate Park; there isn't a day when I don't encounter an unleashed dog in areas where signs are posted stating that dogs must be on leash. On a few occasions I've pointed out the signs to dog owners and have been subjected to verbal abuse or threatened with physical violence. I would love to see just one dog owner cited and fined for ignoring the leash laws. I've seen unleashed dogs digging, chasing wildlife, and leaving their mess behind...yes, I have recently stepped in dog poop on a trail with signs requesting dog owners to clean up after their dogs. I disagree with Tom Stienstra (S.F. Chronical, January 20, 2014) who admonished park rangers for "imposing their will on people they do not know..." and he cited the case of the ranger in Half Moon Hay who stun-gunned a man walking his two small dogs who did not stop as he was asked to. I say it's about time that dog owners who scoff at leash laws are made to suffer the consequences.

Please, good people, give us non-dog lovers (and our wildlife) some outdoor space free of unleashed dogs.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Gubelman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4219    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:52:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There is no good reason to eliminate the last remaining trails for our dogs. This open land is owned by the government.

Government is run by citizens, for citizens. We have already established that much of what government does anymore is in the best interest of itself and not it citizens. Now, if that is not enough, you want to stretch your authority over dogs too.

We are lucky to have so much open land in Marin. The land is to be enjoyed by those who live in the bay area. And, many of those people own dogs. We should be allowed to enjoy nature with our dogs.

There are so many good things you guys good be doing, seeking to expel dogs is not one of them. Let go of this or next we will work on getting you and your leaders replaced.

Marty Allen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4220    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 17:59:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alternative A to the Dog Management Plan. Off-leash dogs should not be permitted in GGNRA just as they are not permitted in any of our National Parks. I have never understood why the park service has allowed dogs to run off-leash in these special areas in San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo. Every dog owner believes that his or her dog(s) is well-behaved and should be allowed to run loose in any open space regardless of the damage the dogs do, the wildlife they terrify, the land they foul with their excrement and urine, or how unpleasant they make these spaces for people who are not comfortable with dogs.

I greatly resent being painted as the bad guy in this debate because I believe that the prohibition against unleashed dogs anywhere in a national park should be enforced. Unleashed and leashed dogs have no place on the trails in these parks, the open lawn spaces, or other areas, whether the park is in an urban area or outside of it. Dog owners are myopic when it comes to the damage done by their animals. While some do clean up the stinking piles of excrement produced by their dogs, I have yet to see a dog owner manage to clean and make fit any place where their animal has used a grassy area or open space as a toilet. We don't tolerate people pissing and shitting at will in our prized park areas. Why on earth should dogs be permitted to do so?

Several years ago at Ft Funston, I found myself surrounded by more than 15 unleashed dogs, their walkers nowhere in sight. Due to bad experiences with dogs, I'm uncomfortable around dogs that are not under the direct control of their handlers and I was absolutely terrified. The irresponsible morons who allowed this situation to happen just shrugged it off and told me the dogs were all "friendly." I have never returned to Ft Funston, deterred by the packs of dogs that have free run of a national park - - a National Park!!! - - while the dog walkers feed at the public trough, ruining this jewel for their personal gain. Private, unregulated commercial activities in the parks are not allowed so why turn a blind eye to the damage inflicted by these paid walkers.

Friendly or ferocious, dogs are dogs. National parks are national parks and the National Park Service owes it to all of us to enforce the same laws and regulations in San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo that apply to dogs in these special areas that have been preserved for the enjoyment of all citizens. Not all DOGS, all citizens. The fact that so many dog owners can't distinguish between the two is no excuse for allowing this disgraceful situation to continue. Their sense of entitlement is breathtaking - - just watch those yahoos allow their animals to run loose at Ocean Beach at all times, including when signs clearly indicate that the dogs need to be leashed to protect wildlife such as snowy plovers, particularly during breeding seasons. They have no concern whatever for anything beyond the comfort enjoyment of their pets. The fact that their dogs foul the beaches, trails, and grassy areas of the park, while making them so much less inviting to many small children and adults, pales in comparison with their perceived "right" to allow their dogs to run wild and shit and piss at will.

I realize this is a very difficult situation due to the loud, organized dog owners who insist on asserting their non-existent "right" to inflict damage on our beloved national parks. They think they should be allowed to exercise their animals in these special places and use them as toilets. They argue that because this obnoxious behavior has been tolerated in the past, it should now receive official blessing from the park service. I shudder to think how the dog owners will push against the next set of regulations when they feel fully entitled to ignore the existing ones.

Please do the right thing. Enforce the same regulations in our beautiful GGNRA that apply to every National Park. Don't give in to the organized and entitled dog owners, no matter how much noise they make. Do your job to protect these special places for generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4221    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Belvedere, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 18:04:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4222    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kensington, CA 94708-1103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 18:06:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to stand firm and meet its obligations to manage both recreation and the natural resources in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). Adopting even stronger dog management policies will provide this balance. For the moment, this proposal is the most sustainable proposal to date and should be adopted.

Despite current practice and what you are being told, the GGNRA does not belong mainly to dog owners. Many of us strongly desire to have areas off-limit to dogs, especially if wildlife is at risk. And those off-limit areas need to be separated with signs, fencing, and enforcement.

Also, off-leash areas need to be similarly separated with signs, fencing, and enforcement. Especially fencing.

When we are in the GGNRA, we need areas where we do not need to have to worry about dogs bounding up to us and threatening us. Nor should we have to worry about their feces. Do the rest of us need that?

Dogs under "voice control" is a bad joke. Almost no dog will respond if a bird is within reach of a bird or can chase other wildlife. Yet few dog owners acknowledge this danger.

The current proposal offers a certain real balance among people without dogs, dog owners, and wildlife. Please note how very much dog owners receive under this plan and do not irresponsibly give in to political pressure.

Please adopt and implement the proposed plan (and add fencing to separate the off-leash areas).

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4223    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 18:11:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ellice Sperber

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4224    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Los Altos Hills, CA 94022  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 18:14:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a wildlife researcher at San Jose State, I have been disappointed to see how this SEIS has promoted skepticism for Federal Management of wildlife resources. I pointed out in the first round of comments that many of the conclusions of the SEIS with regard to negative impacts of dogs did not follow from the contradictory scientific literature cited in the analysis. Perhaps the GGNRA feels that the public will not read or cannot follow this information. Summaries of this literature, particularly in the section on Dogs and Natural Resources, are not balanced or objective. Little effort has been made to investigate any of these issues for the sites under consideration, although clearly there would have been public support for data collection. For example from page 34, "It has been documented that recreational activities can affect vegetation and soils, resulting in damage to plant communities (Cole 1978, 281; Douglass et al. 1999, 9.2)." All species in their normal behavior affect vegetation and soils. Where are the specifics? This document lacks the balance and attention to measured impacts that we expect in a formal SEIS.

The need for action related to litigation referred to on page 1 on the SEIS is largely a result of the GGNRA's own decision not to follow appropriate procedures. The conclusion that "The conflicts will likely escalate if not addressed .." also on page 1 is not supported by experience or data.

---



The statement on page 5 " ... for more than 20 years, the park erroneously implemented the 1979 Pet Policy in contravention of Service-wide regulations." sets the stage for the apparently predetermined outcome of this SEIS. Also this appears to apply to the conclusion on page 24 "The quality of urban areas is not a significant factor in determining a dog management policy for GGNRA..." given that urban quality of life has been a persistent issue in the debate.

On page 6 the SEIS reads that "... the park continued to receive an increasing number of complaints by park visitors, including minorities, seniors, and families with small children, alleging that off-leash dogs had prevented them from visiting the park for fear of being knocked over or attacked by dogs or verbally abused by dog owners," The actual number of complaints starts from a small base and the change may be correlated with the population increase. This conclusion is clearly overstated based on my 20 years of personal experience of walking these areas.

The statement on page 18 "Even though western snowy plovers do not nest at GGNRA" is going to make the public wonder why the snowy plover figures so prominently in the analysis given that over a long period of time only "... multiple instances where dogs flushed or chased shorebirds or snowy plovers at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field..."

I regularly walk my dogs at Fort Funston, as do many other active environmentalists. With regard to the evaluation of Fort Funston the analysis concludes: "Visitors who enjoy having dogs at the park would experience ... long-term, minor, adverse impacts under alternatives E and the preferred alternative F." This conclusion is contradicted by the many conversations I have had with the visitors to the park and my own experience in bringing my dogs to Fort Funston for 20 years. You are telling the people something about themselves that they don't believe. How does the GGNRA expect to "Build community support for the plan ... ", a goal on page 2. Public skepticism for federal management is only exacerbated by this approach.

The statement on page 19 that "... Dog walkers and visitors without dogs often come into conflict." is simply not true. It is an embarrassment to see this information included in a formal SEIS, again degrading public trust. From page 21 "... a total of 95 dog bites/attacks at GGNRA sites from 2008 through 2011." How does this level of hazard compare to any other recreational area with such large traffic? From page 22 "Visitors with children who play along the water's edge or in the sand and are approached by dogs, either aggressively or not, may feel that their child's safety may be at an elevated risk for dog bites or other injuries." It is well known that many visitors, including families with children, come to see the dogs.

The report suggests on page 14 that "... An increase in nutrients from dog excrement in concentrated areas could result in some areas becoming overfertilized and lead to changes in plant species and distribution as well as changes in soil organisms." Also, on page 20 "the overwhelming smell of urine in park areas with heavy dog use (e.g., Fort Funston) may also affect visitor experience at the park." The common consensus is that dog excrement at Fort Funston is in general effectively managed with significant public participation. Perhaps the reported smell is coming from the poorly maintained human toilet facilities managed by GGNRA. From page 22 "A health concern associated with dog waste is pathogens that can infect humans if ingested." No data provided to support this as an issue. Literature is cited without any investigation of the actual conditions at the sites. Again, the issue of public trust when the efforts of so many volunteers helping to clean the park are ignored.

Also from the Fort Funston analysis "Impacts to health and safety would be long-term, moderate to major, and adverse for the noaction alternative, long-term, minor to moderate, adverse for alternatives C, D, E,

and the preferred alternative F, and long-term, minor, and adverse for alternative B." It is common knowledge that Fort Funston was a hang-out for drug use and sales prior to it becoming popular for dog walkers. As anyone knows who has significant experience at Fort Funston, this is an overstatement and is not supported by the analysis.

On page 9 we read that "... one percent of all survey respondents using a commercial dog walker." With a sample size of only 400, a percentage so close to zero loses many of the standard normal statistical properties. Even if only one percent of the city uses a professional dog walker, that still represents a sizable number. Given the amount of money and time allocated to this SEIS, using a sample size of 400 to draw their conclusions seems ingenuous. I have personally conducted samples of three times that size in my own research.

The SEIS inappropriately dismisses the socioeconomics on page 25 "If commercial dog walking is not permitted in the park, commercial dog walkers may incur higher costs if they have to transport their dogs farther to find areas to walk their dogs, or if they have to reduce the number of dogs they walk at one time because of restrictive regulations in city dog parks or other public lands." A common theme in the discussion has been that there few and declining alternatives. The conclusion on page 26 ignores the obvious that any small business segment will be a small part of regional GNP. "Estimated total spending by all local visitors to GGNRA accounts for 0.0008 percent of the total gross domestic product for the San Francisco metropolitan statistical area in 2005." Again, an embarrassment to have this kind of analysis in a formal SEIS.

On page 31 the SEIS cites the use of "Point Isabel Regional Shoreline, which is a state park area managed by East Bay Regional Park District and one of the most heavily used dog parks in the country." but fails to examine any of the successes that are so characteristic of this park, a potential framework for GGNRA dog management.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4225	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Los Altos Hills, CA 94022 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:16:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The proposed northern boundary for off-leash dog walking above the beach at Fort Funston under the preferred alternative could easily be expanded northward without any negative impacts. This area is currently dunes covered by non-native ice plants.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4226	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94124 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:17:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

I am a responsible, law-abiding dog owner and I am very upset that some of the most important

---

traditionally dog-friendly places in the city may no longer be available to me and my dog. There are already laws in place to manage dogs in public places, which can be enforced, and it is unnecessary to close the parks to off-leash dogs. For example, Fort Funston is a park for dogs, that's its main purpose, and to close it to dogs or make it on-leash is ridiculous. There are more dog-owners than there are parents in SF, and plenty of places already where dogs are not allowed off-leash where children and adults can play. That's the beauty of the Bay Area. In addition, plenty of spaces to run make for healthy, happy dogs, who co-exist with people peacefully.

Please reconsider this unreasonable policy.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4227	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:19:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4228	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Orinda, CA 94563 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:28:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I travel from Orinda to bring my dog to the beach. I oppose the plan.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4229	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:30:08				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4230	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:33:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Eric E. Davidson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4231	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 18:34:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I regularly enjoy running with my dog and this would be nearly impossible on a leash, so I take him to Fort Funston, where we've been 3 miles each weekend for years.

Sadly, the new Dog Management Plan strips me of this privilege. Yes, I do recognize it is a privilege, but it seems like such a healthy way to enjoy all the beauty that's out there.

If you move ahead with this plan, I'm afraid you'll be robbing me of recreation.

I truly hope you decide not to proceed with this plan as most recently written. I have learned that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of Fort Funston, so i hope this at least stalls the process.

Thank you for reading my comments,

Mike Dahlin

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4232	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Board of Directors Scott Valley Homeowners Assn Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I regularly take my dog to on the Alta Trail in Mill Valley.				

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% othe Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4233	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:37:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Sirs,				

New information has recently come to my attention regarding the draft proposal for the reduction of off leash dog areas at Crissy Field. Recent data (2013) released by the GGNRA shows that , despite thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have been only a handful of dog related incidents of any kind. The reported incidents involving people are substantially higher. This data clearly negates the theory by Mr Dean, who claims that dogs are creating so much havoc at Crissy Field that the expenditure of \$2,000,000 is required to hire more rangers to police the area. This simply is not true and is proven by this

recent data. No more "could be a problem" but just the facts borne out by this data. Additionally, when Crissy Field was created, one of its stated purposes was to create more area for off leash recreation, in anticipation of the increased growth in popularity of dog ownership. Proposing the reduction of such areas at Crissy Field is an unjustifiable reverse of course. It will lead to the opposite situation where cramming an evergrowing number of off leash recreation into a sharply decreased area will have a negative effect on both dog owners and the environment. I find it ironic, as someone who has visited Crissy Field at least 3 times a week, with my dog, for the past 11 years, to hear the GGNRA continue to press for the reduction of offleash use areas. I can tell you that 90% of the time when I visit the area, there are very few users beyond dogs and their owners, who comprise such a small number that I recognize the same faces day after day, year after year. The only time I see much use is on holidays and an occasional hot afternoon. To say dogs are encroaching on the ability of the public to enjoy Crissy Field is just plain wrong. In addition, virtually every dog owner I know goes beyond the call of duty when it comes to being a concerned guardian of the wildlife and natural environment of Crissy Field. When we see any kind of problem, such as an injured animal or bird, we are the first to contact the appropriate authority and will stand guard over the injured until rescue comes. Yes, there is the occasional bad dog owner, just like there are bad parents of children, but based on last year's data, that number is extremely small and does not justify such a radical reduction of off leash area. Shove too many dogs and owners into a too small area and you will create the exact situation that the GGNRA claims to want to prevent.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4234	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:40:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to some GGNRA trails

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Regards

Patricia Goodberg

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4235	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,15,2014 18:41:28**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a home owner and 16 year tax-paying resident of San Francisco I request that there are NO FURTHER RESTRICTIONS for off-leash OR on-leash dog walking in San Francisco parks. I bought a house in a neighborhood that borders Ocean Beach and Golden Gate Park SPECIFICALLY because it offered on-leash and off-leash recreation areas for me and my dog. If that right is taken away I am being denied my rights as a resident and tax payer. I am particularly concerned about the limits proposed on Ocean Beach and Fort Funston. These are the places that we go with our dogs EVERY DAY to relax and exercise. These restrictions mean that our dogs will have to stay on leash on pavement which is cruel and will not allow them to get proper exercise. It also means that if I want to enjoy Ocean Beach or Fort Funston I would have to go there without my dog, which I would never do...so then I am paying taxes for a park that I never use?! It's absurd. And another denial of my rights. Let responsible dog owners who have well-behaved dogs and who always clean up after their dogs keep the choice to walk their dogs and let them run off leash WITHOUT RESTRICTIONS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4236 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,15,2014 18:41:45**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. In fact, it's one of the reasons we live in San Francisco.

thank you for your consideration,  
Karen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4237 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,15,2014 18:42:09**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is a joke and you, GGNRA, are very hypocritical. How can you say dogs damage the environment and then turn around and plan to install a 200 car parking lot complete with facilities and lights on Mt. Tam? Dogs are temporary where a parking lot is forever.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4238 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080-4135  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,15,2014 18:44:41**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was born and raised in San Francisco and am now retired . I have always had dogs, and for the past 30 years I have taken my various dogs to Fort Funston. I know the importance of exercise

for dogs so they remain "well behaved ". They can't do this on leash! And it's not just about the dogs, it would also diminish my life. The walks are essential to my well being so I can maintain a happy and healthy life style. Walking with my dogs at Fort Funston five days a week does this for me. To close the Fort Funston or limit the access for "off lease dogs" would definitely be a mistake. Think of the impact it will have on neighborhood parks. Also the impact on thousands of responsible and loving dog owners who will be denied the opportunity to socialize their dogs, exercise their dogs and contribute to the city by having "well behaved dogs"

I understand that not everyone is a dog lover, or needs to be. But there are thousands of parks available to people where dogs are not allowed, even on leash. There are so few areas left for us dog owners. Please do not allow the GGNRA to change the rules on "off leash dog areas"....that would be a crime.

Judith LaRosa  
650 873 1938

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4239	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:45:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As recently as Ms. Pelosi's Forum in Stern Grove, you and Howard Levitt have been telling the public "there are so many more dogs and people now, we have to do something". This is an excuse and totally unjustifiable.

Increased usage over time was anticipated when this National Recreation Area was created. The House Report No 92-1391 made clear that the GGNRA would be confronted with problems in San Francisco that would require careful planning because of the high volume year-round visitation:

"As a national urban recreation area, this new component of the national park system will be confronted with problems which do not frequently occur at other national park and recreation areas. Great numbers of people can be expected to use the area-particularly those portions located in San Francisco County." (pg. 11)

. In October, 1977, Rolf Diamont, GGNRA "Environmental Coordinator" prepared a memo proposing a "Draft Dog Policy for San Francisco Unit." His memo enumerated the following guidelines:

1. "No regulation, verbal or written, should be attempted that cannot be reasonably and consistently administered."
2. "Dog regulations should be different for different areas of the park reflecting public needs and attitudes as well as urban geography and our capabilities."
3. "When we discourage or restrict dogs in any area, whenever possible, an alternative site where dogs are allowed should be suggested."

- The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.
- There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.



- The GGNRA incident reports show that it isn't the dogs causing the problems.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4240	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:49:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I previously owned a dog and regularly walked it off-leash in the GGNRA. It was good for my dog, for other dogs we encountered, and for the dog owners. It caused no harm to people, property, or wildlife. I do not currently have a dog but hope to get another one in the near future and hope to be able to walk it off-leash in the GGNRA in the same manner as I did with my last dog.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4241	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 18:52:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.				

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4242    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 18:57:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs are one of the most important part of our lives. Please help us to make them happy and run and enjoy the bay with us. Some people find it difficult if the area is reduced.

A Happy dog is a happy family

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4243    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 19:04:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have a strong interest in the vegetation that occurs in the Presidio part of the GGNRA, and am particularly interested in the overwhelming presence of the Eucalyptus trees that seem to be growing out of control. I ran across the plan for the GGNRA and particularly the section which indicates that pets can be a source of "exotic plant seeds". I noticed that this section suggests that reducing or eliminating dogs from the GGNRA could reduce the appearance of non-native plant species. Unfortunately, this section makes this claim without showing any evidence that any such species have ever arisen from dog feces anywhere in the national parks. Isn't it well-known that Birds are most common means of transportation for seeds? The report provides no direct evidence at all that elimination of dogs from trails in the GGNRA would impact this issue.

I was surprised to see these sections, which claim to be presenting a scientific case for a change in policy, but which are only making unsupported claims about the impact of dogs on the parks. If the NPS regards the introduction of non-native species as a high priority, I would prefer to see proposals for policy changes in the GGNRA that could have an impact on this problem. I am disappointed to see the NPS misusing the problem of non-native species as an "scientific" argument for a change in dog-walking policy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4244    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 19:09:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA SEIS for Dog Management. Congress created the GGNRA to allow for urban open space and recreation. Unlike a National Park, the emphasis here was on recreation to

---

enhance the quality of life for Bay Area residents. And Congress specifically referred to off leash dog walking as one of these recreational uses.

Contrary to Congressional intention, the current GGNRA plan restricts off leash dog walking without factual basis, relying instead on outdated data and undocumented assumptions. It does not demonstrate that problems within the GGNRA are actually attributable to dogs and not to other factors such as crowds for special events, wildlife, and even nature herself. And these restrictions will negatively impact the few remaining areas allowing off leash walking.

I suggest you establish a community forum of GGNRA users, including dog walkers, to assure a balanced, fact based review of management decisions going forward.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4245	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 19:14:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not restrict access to the National Park for me and my dog. As I approach 70 years of age, it is the only place accessible.				

When the GGNRA took these territories, they agreed to preserve traditional recreational uses. Please do that by allowing off-leash dogs in these traditional places.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4246	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 19:20:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello, my name is Stephanie and I have a four month old yorkie poodle named Momo. He is my pet as well as my partner. I've never had a companion quite like him. Today was his first time taking a walk through Fort Funston. Momowas on a leash because he's a puppy, but I enjoy seeing other dogs coming up to greet him and he seemed to love the attention. I love the area because of the friend dogs running around. I have never met a dog otherwise. I hope you will take consideration of the discrimination that is occurring when saying that all dogs are dangers. There's no such thing as a bad dog, just bad owners.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4247	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 19:21:29				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't take away my dogs happy place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4248    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As longtime resident and one who loves the wild beauty of San Francisco, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog, and my family for our own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. It wasn't until I became a dog owner myself did I truly appreciate what the city has to offer particularly on the lands of GGNRA and thus exponentially enjoy the exercise and recreational opportunities provided to us the residents and our visitors.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Mendes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4249    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 19:25:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service wants to restrict off-leash dog walking. One possible reason for a change in policy is that off-leash dog walking may increase the incidence of dog-bites. The report cites evidence for 95 dog bites and attacks throughout the 2008-2011 time period as evidence in support of a change in policy.

For all of the GGNRA, this data amounts to a total of 2 dog bites each month, or only about 25 each year. Elsewhere, the report states that there are 4.5 million dog bites throughout the US each year (more than one dog bite for every 100 citizens). For comparison, the GGNRA is immersed in San Francisco, with a population of almost 1 million, represents 1 in 300 of the of the average US population. If the average incidence of dog bites in San Francisco was an appropriate fraction of the 4.5M bites in the US every

year, we would be suffering more than 15,000 dog bites per year in San Francisco. If only 25 of the 15,000 dog bites suffered in and around San Francisco were taking place within the GGNRA, the data suggests that these environments are actually much safer for people than other places in the city and in the US.

In this report, the occurrence of 95 dog bites in 4 years is cited many times as evidence of a need for a change in policy. I actually think this data indicates that **THE PRESENT POLICY IS EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE** at minimizing dog bites. I see no evidence suggesting that a change is needed.

Furthermore, this lengthy report provides no data comparing parks with comparable numbers of visitors and different dog-walking policies to prove that the proposed policies will have the desired impact on the incidence of dog-related attacks. Instead of using evidence, the report makes an argument, based solely on the report of 96 dog bites in 4 years that a change in policy is needed. Then, the GGNRA proposes a specific set of policy changes that, according to their own data, seems likely to increase the number of attacks and bites.

A more logical conclusion from the data provided by the NPS is that off-leash walking actually promotes better behavior by dogs and among dogs (something frequently observed and commented upon in locations with high densities of unleashed dogs, such as Ft. Funston).

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4250	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 19:26:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I walk regularly with my dog in the Fort Funston part of the GGNRA. I'm writing to express my vehement opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. It will also discourage use of Fort Funston, which will only increase existing problems with vandalism and drug use by reducing the numbers of law-abiding and considerate citizens there. This ill-advised new policy will almost certainly increase the costs of maintaining Fort Funston at a time of severe budget challenges for the Park Service.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Should this unfortunate plan go forward I will contact Congresswoman Speer and Senators Boxer and Feinstein as well as other elected officials to express my dismay as ask them to intervene to reverse the new policy.

Sincerely,

Kevin Shannon, MD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4251    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Bodega Bay, CA 94923  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 19:27:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We no longer live in SF, having moved north. However, I cannot tell you how important the off leash dog areas were to us and our dogs when we lived in the Bay Area. Every day I drove our dogs to Ft. Funston, met other dog owners and their dogs, and had a wonderful time socializing. The off leash experience was so very important to the well being of our dogs and made several wonderful human friendships as our dogs played freely together.

Even though we no longer frequent Ft. Funston, we want others who love their dogs in the Bay Area to have the opportunity to let their dogs run off leash. A well exercised dog is a happier and healthier dog. And the same goes for the owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4252    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** El Sobrante, CA 94820  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 19:28:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Laurie Przybylowicz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4253    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

With so few options for taking dogs off lease, the preferred alternative would not represent the wishes of the vast numbers of people who have dogs. In fact in San Francisco dogs outnumber children. There are an estimated 120,000 dogs in San Francisco, according to the city's Animal Care and Control department. There are anywhere from 108,000 to 113,000 children, according to U.S. census figures from 2000 and 2005.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kathy Battat

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4254    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Laurie Page

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4255    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 92702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 19:32:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Mark Hardwicke

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4256    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Feb 16, 2014

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Dear Superintendent Dean,

As national park supporters we have a keen interest in the preservation of park resources and values. We have reviewed the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) and have the following comments to offer:



1) The SEIS fails to demonstrate that commercial dog walking meets the NPS criteria for Special Use Permitting as set forth in the Organic Act, the GGNRA enabling legislation, and NPS Director's Order #53. In order to meet the NPS criteria as an appropriate park use, any considered activity should; support the mission of the National Park Service, accommodate park visitors, add to the public understanding and enjoyment of the park, promote a sense of ownership and stewardship for the park and its resources, enhance the protection of park resources and values, and provide for an increased level of visitor safety. Furthermore, the considered park use must not; be contrary to the purpose for which the park was established, create impacts on park resources and values, disrupt the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, create an unsafe environment for other visitors, or result in conflict with other existing uses.

The SEIS fails to enumerate or to apply these criteria to an evaluation of the appropriateness of commercial dog walking in the GGNRA, and fails to express sufficient conclusions that justify the inclusion of commercial dog walking as a component of the Preferred Alternative. As a decision document, the SEIS fails to articulate a rational connection between the presented material and the final decision. As such, we urge the Park Service to eliminate the commercial dog walking component from the Preferred Alternative.

2) The Preferred Alternative is discriminatory in that it establishes two different standards for the allowed number of dogs per walker. All dog walkers within the GGNRA should be equally limited to a number of dogs that can be reasonably managed in a manner which is consistent with all applicable laws, regulations, executive orders, and management policies. Establishing a policy under which some park visitors are permitted to walk more dogs than other park visitors is clearly discriminatory. Establishing two separate standards, will only lead to public confusion and misperception of the rules, and a higher degree of non-compliance. We urge the Park Service to hold all dog walkers to the same standards.

3) The SEIS fails to provide evidence that voice control is an effective off-leash dog management option. While the SEIS does loosely describe and discuss the concept of voice control, it does not evaluate voice control for its degree of effectiveness, nor does it demonstrate the abilities of the general dog walking public to employ such a method. Unless it is clearly demonstrated to be as effective as the use of a leash, voice control should not be considered as an option for use in any area of the GGNRA that is open to multiple visitor uses.

4) The Preferred Alternative fails to specify how visitor safety and resource protection will be achieved in the vicinity of the ROLA's. The Preferred Alternative does not describe how park visitors will be adequately informed of the ROLA boundaries, nor does it clearly ensure that off-leash dogs will be contained within the ROLA's. These shortcomings are potentials for excessive conflict.

#### Closing Statement

We believe that the National Park Service should not be in the off-leash dog play business. It is neither the mission nor the responsibility of the National Park Service to provide federal, national park lands to accommodate a local, urban need at the expense of visitor safety, park resources and national park values. Off-leash dog walking is a proven source of conflict within the GGNRA which generates additional management and enforcement expense. We also believe that requiring all dogs to be on-leash is the best method to ensure visitor safety, protect resources, preserve national park values, and keep management and enforcement costs at a minimum while still providing for recreational dog walking in the GGNRA.

Municipalities adjacent to GGNRA lands have ample resources to provide and maintain dedicated off-leash dog play areas, as these are among the wealthiest counties in the nation. It is not difficult to imagine that if presented with an elimination of off-leash privileges within the GGNRA, local municipalities will

realize their own resourcefulness and capability to meet the demands of their citizenry.

Providing recreational on-leash dog walking opportunities on multi-use trails throughout the GGNRA is a more than generous exception to the standard national park dog policy and we support a management plan that would provide for those opportunities. We urge the Park Service to eliminate off-leash dog walking from the Preferred Alternative.

Respectfully submitted by,

Matthew & JoAnn Zlatunich  
749 8th Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94118

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4257	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94602 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 19:35:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Last weekend my family, consisting of my spouse and my 19-year-old son, Sam, traveled to Muir Beach to see the recently completed restoration work on Redwood Creek. Sam loves beaches (as do his mother and I) and so a much anticipated secondary purpose of our trip was to take a walk along Muir Beach. However, our trip did not include a beach walk. Why, you may ask, did my family's visit to Muir Beach not include an activity that members of my family greatly enjoy? Let me explain.

Sam is afflicted with an autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Like many ASD kids and adults, he has certain sensory sensitivities, aka phobias. One of these sensitivities is triggered by off-leash (but not on-leash) dogs. This sensitivity may stem from a childhood experience in which he was threatened by a dog that he encountered. The point is that this sensitivity exists. At the current time, as GGNRA officials well know, Muir Beach is open to off-leash dog use. On the day of our visit the beach was crowded with off-leash dogs, with little effort that was apparent to us on the part of the owners of these dogs to exert control over or limit in any way the movements of the dogs. (Some public park managers, the EBRPD being the principal case in point, indulge in the fiction that dog owners can successfully be instructed to keep their off-leash dogs "under control.") So the universal presence of off-leash dogs at Muir Beach precluded us from visiting the beach, something we otherwise would most certainly have done. The access exclusion that we experienced constituted a clear and indisputable violation of the GGNRA's obligations under the Americans' With Disabilities Act (ADA) not to discriminate against persons with disabilities in managing the park areas under its jurisdiction.

I understand that the revised dog management plan that the GGNRA currently has under consideration will alleviate at least some of the conditions noted above at Muir Beach and elsewhere. If so I strongly urge its adoption.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4258	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 19:39:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Melaine DiLuzio

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4259    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 19:45:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 809 Noe Street  
San Francisco, CA 94114  
February 15, 2014

Frank Dean  
General Superintendent, GGNRA  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent Dean,

Three years ago at the tender age of 67 I wrote you in disagreement with the Draft Dog Management Plan. At that time I attributed my good health and spirits, and those of my 11-year old rescue dog, in large part to the time we spend at Fort Funston, exercising (both of us off leash!)and enjoying its beauty.

We're both back again, now aged 70 and 14, and even more convinced that our well-being has been enhanced by the physical and social benefits of off-leash walks. What I said previously is still true:

"My dog is mellow, well-trained and well-behaved - he brings smiles

---

to the faces of the children and families we meet. We are respectful of the land and vegetation and give thanks for every minute we're able to spend at 'The Fort.'

I've been concerned about the environment all my life and am a regular contributor to The Nature Conservancy, Marine Mammal Center, California League of Conservation Voters and The World Wildlife Fund, among others. I am committed to preserving and protecting our natural areas."

The current Draft Plan comes across as restrictive and arbitrary as there is no sound evidence that off-leash dog-walking is detrimental to GGNRA lands. The 1979 Pet Policy was a fundamental part of the agreement by which the GGNRA acquired this land. It has been working well for 35 years and I hope you will respect both its intent and track record as we trusted you to do. I believe that something better than this extremely harsh policy must be worked out.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Nancy Prowitt

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4260	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 19:48:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco, a senior citizen and walk with my dog under voice control at Fort Funston and Ocean Beach 3 to 4 times per week. I have been doing this for the past 30 years. I do not support your dog management plan as it is too restrictive and does not provide a balance between responsible dog walking and other activities. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy plus off-leash/voice control access in San Mateo County and in lands that the GGNRA may acquire in the future.

My specific objections to the Dog Management Plan are as follows:

â€ In the revised plan, it is fairly obvious that you did not take proper account of public opinion. Although you did not share specific results of the original plan with the public, independent reviews show that the comments to the original plan were at least 3 to 1 in favor of dog walking.

â€ The plan proposes using fences to delineate dog play areas at Fort Funston and other areas. The fences will feel like pens and will make visitors feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder the movement of wildlife. A person and his dog will not be able to exercise in such an enclosed area.

---

â€ I oppose the Monitoring-Based Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Strategy because the GGNRA can change the rules even if there are no environment impacts.

â€ The SEIS still lists impacts that "might", "can", or "could" happen while providing no evidence that any of these impacts are or have occurred. The point was raised previously and should have been addressed but was not. Without site-specific studies there is no proof that impacts are occurring. The GGNRA even admits to the lack of studies on page 373.

â€ Impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative still have not been adequately analyzed despite the fact that the analysis was requested by public comment on the original plan and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The revised plan merely says that the GGNRA believes people will continue to walk their dogs in the GGNRA even though the space for doing so has been reduced. No evidence is given to support this statement.

â€ The most recent data released by the GGNRA (2013) does not support the statement in the plan that says dogs cause major safety problems. In fact, during 2013 there were only 6 reported dog bites, 5 dog fights, 2 cliff rescues, 1 wildlife killing, 1 horse bite and 2 complaints where people were scared. This data does not support the need for more restrictions on dogs and certainly doesn't justify an additional \$2 million per year for rangers.

â€ The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The plan notes that "In many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities." (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - "The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to ... expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972)

â€ The plan still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who don't want to be around dogs. It ignores the fact that right now these people can easily go to areas where dogs are not allowed. The plan neglects to discuss a visitor experience in which people want to be around dogs.

â€ When Crissy Field was created, one of its stated purposes was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors. The proposed reduction in off leash space is a change of course without a basis. In fact, all visitors will be impacted negatively if dogs are crowded into smaller areas.

In summary, this dog management plan appears to be very biased, not only against people who want to walk with their well-behaved dogs but against recreational uses in general. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Congresswoman Jackie Spier are opposed to this plan. Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi has written a letter expressing her concerns. It seems to me, at this point, the GGNRA should engage the community to discuss a way to provide true balance.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4261	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 19:49:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am strongly opposed to the banning of dogs on these public lands.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4262	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,15,2014 19:55:38**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** To Whom It Concerns,

I write to you as a taxpayer in the City of San Francisco, California and The United States of America. I am avid, high frequency enjoyer of both Ocean Beach and Fort Funston under the current management plan.

I do not endorse the new proposals and wish to see no changes made to the current management plan.

Sincerely,

Matthew Gorman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4263 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,15,2014 19:57:56**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Kim Dang

1714 Ulloa St.

San Francisco, CA 94116

February 15, 2014

Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Fort Mason, Building 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

Attn: SEIS

I am a resident of the Parkside neighborhood and the owner of a 22 lb bichon/mixed breed dog. She loves to run, especially in open outdoor settings. We go very rarely to Crissy Field and Ocean Beach but very frequently to Fort Funston, practically every weekend. She walks almost every other day at Stern Grove and around Pine Lake. We adopted our dog from a local rescue shelter over a year ago. Since her adoption in our family, I walk approximately 45 minutes a day more than I otherwise would, and I have come to appreciate the natural beauty of the city's parks and beaches in a way I never could have before. My dog has made going outside and enjoying natural beauty a central activity of our family's life. I would also like to add that we always clean up after our dog. Even at dusk or nighttime, I bring a flashlight and make sure that there is no trace left in public areas. I often pick up trash and litter whenever I see it in the parks. I also always carry extra biodegradable waste bags and give them to other people if they've run out. My dog is under complete voice command and we obey all leash laws and signage.

I am writing to disagree with several aspects of the dog management plan that has been proposed by the GGNRA.

The current proposal (Preferred Alternative) is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. My dog is smaller sized and becomes nervous being in a pen with other dogs because she does not have a means to escape from larger dogs and also cannot easily run. My observation is that dogs and people feel less free in pens and fights are much more common. This is not a way anyone can enjoy the public parks. I would not visit these areas if they were like this.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. This is not a direct or effective way to address a compliance issue.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. Vigorous dog walking and jogging produces fitness and mental health benefits for a large number of city residents. It reduces the level of overall stress among people and animals in the city leading to less conflicts and incidents due to anxious, under-exercised dogs. Finally, it produces an atmosphere of stewardship about natural resources among the people who come to care for these open areas.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. It is very clear to those who use these open areas that the proposed restrictions will dramatically change the character and enjoyment of these areas. The usage of these areas will decrease. It is unclear why the GGNRA wants to reduce the use of these areas, as their charge should be to increase the recreational value of these areas for the public.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. Therefore these are speculative claims.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdotes. The areas where dogs and their owners frequent benefit from the stewardship that results. Dog walkers tend to care about these areas and notice and report small changes that could endanger the areas. Educational efforts and involvement of dog owners in maintaining these areas would be more effective than simply shutting them out.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space." GGNRA proposes to mummify the parks to make them showcase or display areas as opposed to living, useful, open physical spaces for public enjoyment and recreation.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it has been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra. Again, this is a major decision against a current practice, implemented without supporting evidence.

Respectfully,  
Kim Dang  
San Francisco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4264	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 20:02:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The GGNRA needs to provide equal areas for hikers, cyclists, families with children, and families with dogs. The current GGNRA plan proposed to completely ban dogs from 6 major trails and only allow dogs off-leash at Rodeo Beach is a very short-sighted and selfish plan. It's no secret dogs are man's best friend. It seems to be ok to use/work dogs to search through earthquake/hurricane debris to save lives, to sniff out explosives to avoid mayhem in our cities, to work with border patrols, to act as guide/service dogs, and to visit sick and elderly people to enhance their quality of life. Shouldn't ample recreation areas also be provided for such important members of our society? When will the GGNRA come to its senses?				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4265	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Redwood City, CA 94061 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 20:06:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep the off-leash areas as they are. It is what makes this part of the world a great place to live, for humans and canine alike.				

---

Thanks,

fabrizio

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4266	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 20:29:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have a dog; as a single man and self-employed professional, I gladly pay more than my fair share of taxes; and I vote in every election.

My dog Jimmi is like a child to me, and while I don't expect anyone else to share in the unspeakable joy I feel seeing my dog run and play in the surf at Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, others should not expect that I share in their joy or their interests in use of these beaches. We all should, however, be able to accommodate each other.

Granted, some dogs are troublesome and some dog owners are irresponsible, but so are some people. I doubt it's possible or useful to tally and compare the burden or cost of troublesome people and dogs, but let me just say that no one will ever have to pay taxes to educate Jimmi, he will never drive drunk and cause injury, and he will never hold up the corner store. So when others say that Jimmi should be kept leash because on some other person's dogs troublesome, or because (God forbid) he serves as an unpleasant reminder of how some other dogs have behaved, it falls on my deaf ears.

Please don't misunderstand me: I love children (and most children love Jimmi). I also believe in the idea that it takes a village, as Hillary says, and I gladly participate in the village. I just want the same accommodation from others.

Keeping dogs on leash is not a compromise or accommodation, anymore than would be a requirement to keep children on a leash. Jimmi is a 40 lb. Retriever mix, he is active and curious, he likes to run and chase sticks into the surf, and neither he nor I would find any joy in use of the beach and would not do so if I had to keep him on the leash.

I highly suspect that the movement to curtail use of the beach by dogs and dog owners stems from a few people have had a bad experience with a dog, and very many rangers and bureaucrats who are tired of having to manage the disputes concerning use. To the rangers and bureaucrats I say it's your job to make the beach pleasant and safe for my use, as well as for tourists and non-dog owners. In my memory there was a time when Ocean Beach was a haven for gangs and drug use, but no one suggested that the beaches be closed, or that suspected users or gang age teenagers be prohibited from using it.

Most often when I vote, I do so on the basis of national issues. This is a local matter that is so very important to me, personally, that a prohibition against dogs off leash it would turn me into a single-issue voter and activist. Look at the numbers of dog owners who visit the beaches and the bumper stickers in the beach parking lots ("I have a dog, and I vote") and you'll know I'm not alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4267    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112-3411  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 20:31:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to you to comment on the GGNRA Dog Management Plan currently under consideration by the NPS.

I am a long-time resident of San Francisco and a dog owner. I am concerned that access to Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Ocean Beach be preserved for use by people with dogs, off-leash under voice control.

---

The GGNRA parks in San Francisco are more than just federal park lands. They are urban parks that serve the needs of a dense population that includes dogs. According to the City and County of San Francisco Department of Animal Care and Control, there are approximately 120,000 registered dogs in The City (<http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=1047>). Those dogs and their people require space to run, space to play, and a safe place to be outdoors without a leash. In the 25 years I've lived in San Francisco, I have seen the above-mentioned parks be exactly that kind of place.

Even after reading the Management Plan in all its great detail, I cannot see a defensible argument for closing those parks to access for off-leash dogs under voice and sight control. Certainly, it makes sense to close sensitive habitat for nesting birds. Certainly, it makes sense to require that dogs be under control and not represent a threat or a nuisance to other visitors. Those sensible rules can be posted and are easily enforceable by Park staff. Contrary to the argument in the Plan, requiring all dogs to be on-leash in the parks would breed open noncompliance with the law, and there is no way such draconian rules could be enforced. Having such ridiculous rules in place would breed the very conflicts that the rules are supposedly intended to reduce.

As a San Francisco resident, I urge you to take what action you can to preserve open-space access in the GGNRA parks for people with their dogs, off-leash and under voice and sight control. Please do not allow the National Park Service to create a serious problem where none exists. Imagine the thousands of dogs who now play and exercise off-leash in the open spaces of the GGNRA suddenly crowded into the limited number of dog-friendly parks run by Recreation and Parks. The new rules will breed conflict and defiance of the law. They will not protect the parks nor anyone in them.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4268	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	novato, CA 94945 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 20:32:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	2/15/2014				

Hello,

I appreciate you taking comments from the public. From when I was a teenager (44yrs ago), to the present, I have frequented Stinson Beach. I love to walk the beach with my dog, Angel. She is my companion since my husband died of ALS. We go to the dogs allowed, north side of the beach. Anyhow I just want to express my love of going to the Beach with my dog, and dogs of the past. Many, many wonderful memories, and hopefully future walks with my dog and friends.

Hope you have a great day! Sincerely, Kathleen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4269	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 20:33:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to support the new policy to restrict off-leash dog walking. The behavior of dogs at GGNRA beaches is not only disruptive to the enjoyment of the area but is also				

---

threatening and potentially hazardous to people, especially children.

I have visited GGNRA beaches regularly for the past thirty-two years. Since the birth of my children, I have been particularly aware of the problems dogs pose to other beach users. When my children were infants, they were routinely bothered, terrorized, or knocked down by dogs chasing a ball thrown by its master or by a pack of out-of-control, "happy" dogs playing. If, after such incidents, I had a dollar for every time an oblivious dog owner said that their dog was friendly and loved children, I would be a very rich man. I grew tired of having to console my crying daughter after she was chased and/or knocked over by a dog at the beach. This was especially problematic at Crissy Field, so much so that we had to stop using the park entirely. This is not a live and let live situation - there are victims here.

I think that dogs should be banned from the GGNRA beach areas or be required to be on a leash. There are hundreds of acres in the nearby parklands for dogs to run free. Unrestricted off-leash dog access to the beaches is unacceptable due to the disruption and hazard it poses to individual users (especially children) of these natural areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4270	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 20:41:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm a California native, born and raised in San Francisco. I grew up visiting so many of the parklands which are very dear to me. I have been fortunate enough to continue to live in the city. I am opposed to the Preferred Alternative because the plan lists impacts that "might", "can", or "could" happen while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits that the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.				

I have a rescued dog from the SPCA, our first dog ever, who is a huge part of my family at home and work. She is well behaved. We are good dog owners who pick up after our dog. We have trained her. Please understand how many people this really affects. I believe there are better solutions than taking away a huge part of our lives.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4271	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please listen to what the people want!

Sincerely,  
L. Kucukdogerli

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4272	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94610 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 20:49:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kelly Meech

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4273	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 20:50:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public

lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4274    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 20:53:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an almost 65 year old woman, one of my greatest delights is to walk my dog at Crissy Field in San Francisco. We both benefit by getting exercise and enjoying the spectacular setting in the city we live in.

The community of dog lovers there ensures that everyone takes responsibility for his/her pets by offering bags, picking up dog messes that may have been overlooked, and making sure that the experience of off-leash dogs is fun and safe for everyone involved.

Please do NOT place stringent leash laws on these shared areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4275    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley~ Muir beach, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** NATIVE WILD HORSE PROTECTION Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 20:58:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service~:)

To ban.. dogs from hiking trails, parks.. beaches, would be UnAmerican... we are the land of the "free".

For many people, dogs are healers, family members, companions and crucially important for dogs and their owners to not receive prejudicial treatment, just because their beloved family member has four legs rather than two.

I frequent many hiking trails, beaches and parks with my puppy, a 21 week old Great Pyrenees...to see her pure joy while running freely is ...worth more then.. anything to me and brings so much joy to all who see and know her.

I have watched passers by.. who appear some what sad.. spirits lift.. with an immediate smile and request to pet "happy"my huge puppy..."Faith".

I have observed.. dog owners.. to always act responsibly in Marin, they pick up waste, immediately..keep dogs, on leash who are not under voice control..and muzzle dogs.. who hv difficulty controlling aggression.

We need to open more trails.. beaches.. to our fur leggeds... our pets.. and also our native wild horses and burros...whom used to live here..and when they did.. wild fires were greatly reduced and seeds were carried and land was fertilized and thriving with good health.

When we close our hearts, land.. and water use to our pets and wild ones and can no longer see our own souls and wellness connected and reflected within theirs, all is lost.

Proper stewardship of our parks must involve compassion...too for the four legged's.

Thank you so much, Jetara SÃ©hart

[www.nativewildhorseprotection.com](http://www.nativewildhorseprotection.com)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4276    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 20:58:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Although the revised Dog Management Plan is an improvement, it still ignores the recreational needs of thousands of current GGNRA visitors who visit the many units of the GGNRA on a regular basis.

The NPS claims that there are people who "won't" visit Fort Funston in particular "because of off-leash dogs." Fort Funston is at capacity many days. The parking lot fills and people wait for a spot. Why are the people who aren't visiting more important than those who are? The popularity of this special place indicates the need for more off-leash open space, not less!

The NPS claims that there are (or could be) impacts because visitor use has increased. Wouldn't it make sense to increase the space available, thus dispersing visitor use. Concentrating use (again, particularly at Fort Funston) is contrary to common sense.

The NPS claims to be a champion of "seniors and disabled" (yet hasn't had a sand removal from the asphalt trails at Fort Funston for a very long time). Those who have difficulty walking on uneven ground, wheelchair users, and moms with strollers have effectively been banned. As a senior (I will be 70 on my next birthday), walking with my dogs is my primary form of exercise, recreation, and socialization. We walk from the parking lot out to the "last bench" or down the sand ladder and north on the beach to the beach trail.. Standing in the iceplant where the NPS has designated an off-leash area? That is not recreation, exercise, or socialization for me! My husband will turn 75 this year. He is no longer comfortable walking on uneven ground, so apparently he is no longer welcome at Fort Funston with the dogs. So much for the NPS being supportive of seniors or the disabled!

I live in San Mateo County and served as an alternate on the negotiated rule making committee representing Pacifica. (San Bruno was left out of the negotiations as well as the residents of the coastside communities of Montara and Moss Beach south of Pacifica who have been severely impacted by the Dog Management Plan.) The units in San Mateo County were never actually discussed-each time Jeri Flinn attempted to bring them up, she was told "not now". Cattle Hill (which the NPS had actually proposed as an off-leash appropriate area) couldn't be discussed because it wasn't actually part of the GGNRA yet! Same was true of Pedro Point and Rancho Corral de Tierra (4000 acres where there has to be space for off-leash recreation). In the "Plan", areas that have been open to on-leash walking are now off limits to dogs (and therefore their people).

We went into the Negotiated Rule Making in order (as the NPS said) to make a long time use of areas in the GGNRA legitimate (though a federal judge had indeed found that the 1979 Pet Policy was a

legitimate policy). Instead, the NPS used the process to severely restrict a recreational use that thousands of Bay Area residents enjoy on a daily or weekly basis.

I think that the entire Dog Management Plan should be scrapped. It appears to have been written by people who have little familiarity with the land, little respect for the reason the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established, and no understanding of the importance of off-leash recreation and on-leash walking in the lives of the visitors to the GGNRA. Let's update the 1979 Pet Policy to include areas that have been added to the GGNRA (often funded by dog walkers to ensure that areas that they were enjoying with their dogs remained as open space!).

Sincerely,  
Anne Farrow

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4277	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. San Francisco and Marin are urban areas that have enjoyed off leash dogs for years with no problems to habitat, just because the GGNRA wants to make all National parks dog free or fences in, you cannot compare an urban area like SF and Marin to National Parks like Yosemite and Point Reyes. I used to love to hike Point Reyes and now since I have a dog i have not had the pleasure of hiking my favorite trails for many year, but I have had the pleasure of hiking the Marin trails and the beaches with my dog, dont take that away from us.

Sincerely,  
Cynthia Prosterman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4278	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san franisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 21:14:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

For over 20 years I have been walking my dogs at Fort Funston. Every time I walk there with my dogs I

feel absolutely blessed that I can appreciate the beauty of nature and our city so close to my own house. With the sound and smell of the ocean, I can watch my dogs run and interact with other dogs. I don't know who takes more pleasure in our walks, myself or my dogs. This is our daily form of exercise. We would be too restricted by the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. My dogs are very active and enjoy running much faster than I walk but they are always within response to my verbal command .

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The main reason I continue to live in San Francisco is to be able to wake up and get excited to spend time with my dogs as they enjoy being dogs running leash free at Fort Funston. Please support this position for those of us who do not want to lose ultimate privilege.

Sincerely,

Julie Lesnewich

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4279	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 21:16:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Parking Planning Committee,				

Dear Park Planners,

As an almost daily walker on Oakwood Trail in Mill Valley, I am writing to strongly encourage you to adopt Alternative F, or the strongest possible, Dog Management Plan as an important solution to protect the environment of this beautiful accessible trail and as a protection to the hikers on the trail. I have been a teacher at Tamalpais High School for the last 15 years and often walk the Marin trails after my school day.

First, the amount of dog shit on the trail, especially in the last 2 years, is disgusting, and it is because people let their dogs, large and small, off leash to poop in the bordering forest. If you walk off trail, you will find large amounts of dog shit, and sometimes, people allow their dogs to shit directly on the trail. I have seen and spoken to numerous oblivious people allowing their dogs to shit wherever in a totally irresponsible way. Plastic bags of dog shit that are not retrieved line the path. This kind of environmental insensitivity has grown to epidemic proportions.

Secondly, I have had large off leash dogs jump up on me and nearly knock me over while their owner laughs heartily in the distance. I have had dog walkers with 5 dogs, 4 off leash, watch as their growling dog cornered me near the stream on a hillside. When the dog walker called for the dog, he did not come, and I had to scream and pick up a stick, and the dog walker had to physically remove the dog. The trails are becoming dangerous to walk on when owners do not keep their dogs on leash.

Finally, there is little way to enforce rules on open trails, but by adopting a leash law, people will be more



apt to act responsibly. I can understand that people don't want to carry around a bag of dog shit but that, in my opinion, is simply part of being a dog owner who respects the environment and other people.

I could go on with stories about this. But my concern is that dog walkers will bombard you with comments when anyone who walks Oakwood Trail can see that there is a problem that needs some kind of solution. And a dog on a leash is a very low impact reasonable solution to this problem.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration. Sometimes it's more important to do the responsible thing for our battered environment than to be popular with the huge amount of dog walkers out there. Courage- and please vote in favor of a beautiful and healthy Marin County.

Sincerely,

(Nancy) Claire Blotter

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4280	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	SF, CA 94114 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 21:18:11
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a San Francisco dog owner. but even before i had a dog i loved seeing the dogs have open spaces where they could run and play. It seems most all the reasons for prohibiting off-leash areas have more to do with tourists than with tax-paying residents. Where the reasons are environmental, I feel we have sufficient areas near the city where flora and fauna can flourish. The benefit of having the off-leash areas for our dog friends out weighs any argument against them.
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4281	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,
------------------------	---------------------------

I would like to hopefully persuade you to reconsider the GGNRA alternative new draft dog management plan. The new plan will prevent my dog Nemo and family from enjoying the parks especially Fort Funston. The plan is too limiting and will prevent us from the exercise with fresh air and free room to explore the area with our dog. I have been going to GGNRA properties for over 10 years and always respect the area.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Stephen Liu

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4282    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Dean,

I am writing to you with concern and opposition to the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas preferred alternatives in San Mateo County. Our family walks our dog almost daily in GGNRA Pacifica lands of Sweeney Ridge, Mori Point, Rancho Corral Tierra and occasionally in the San Pedro Highlands. These areas have been open to dog walking for many years and have been a great area for recreation and source of joy for our family. We have been lucky to enjoy the environmental and historical beauty of these lands while exercising with our dog. I understand the need to protect fragile areas and balance public recreation needs but it feels we are being excluded from use of this public recreation resource with years of use and very little environmental impact. I would hope better signage and enforcement could accomplish your goal without restricting the areas we are currently able to bring our dog. 51% of The City of Pacifica is owned by GGNRA. It would be unfortunate to lose our recreation and the associated tax base that dog walkers bring with them.

Sweeney Ridge

I prefer option 19A with the addition of all of the Baquiano trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica to its conclusion at the Portola Discovery site.

I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to:

"Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System

"Over stating of damage caused by on leash dog walking given the historical use of area (once an active military site, 4x4 vehicle trails, gas/water/electricity rights of ways, mountain biking, horse riding).

"Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation.

"No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing.

"Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

"Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable.

"Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Mori Point

I Prefer 17A

I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to:

"Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

"Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (4x4 vehicle trails, motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding).

"Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

"Consideration for ADA accessibility

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a rural park setting.

"Area is in a densely populated area with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience.

"Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking.

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

"Symbolic fencing and signs have been effective in keeping people as well as people with dogs out of sensitive areas.

San Pedro Highlands

I prefer 20E

I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F

"Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

"Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle club/ motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.)

"Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

"Consideration for ADA accessibility

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a park setting.

"Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience.

"Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking.

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Rancho Corral Tierra

I prefer 21A

"I do not support the the preferred alternative of 21F due to

"Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

"Over stating of damage caused by on or off leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.)

"Consideration for ADA accessibility

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a park setting.

"Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash or off dog walking.

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by dog walking.

"Has been unregulated for 30 years

"More research needed due to only being a park for less than two years

As you know the GGNRA is a unique special place that was created to accommodate the recreational needs of an urban area, essentially creating an urban park. Any attempt to mirror dog restrictions used in national parks with a wilderness experience would be misguided and would go against the intended mission of the GGNRA when it was created. Please continue to allow us to recreate with our dog in the GGNRA and consider my concerns.

Sincerely,  
Aaron Read

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4283	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a long-time supporter of GGNRA, I believe the newly planned dog management plan is way too restrictive. I haven't had a dog for 1.5 years and I still love all the off-leash areas that allow dogs. As someone who walks regularly in the GGNRA, I love all the dogs and people I meet, it makes it a lovely time. When I get another dog I want both of us to enjoy the outdoor space and not be fenced in or limited.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sandy Weil, SF Native

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4284	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Marina Del Rey, CA 90292 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I am from San Mateo County, lived for years in San Francisco, and still visit often, with my dogs.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. If there are people not complying with leash restrictions, then the leash rules should be enforced, not a wholesale ban on dogs put in place.

Sincerely,  
Yoncha Kundupoglu

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4285	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	MONTARA, CA 940370745 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 22:04:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4286	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	chicago, IL 60630 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
hope tondelli

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4287	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 22:09:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I was so in two minds as to whether I should bother to comment after massive disappointment in seeing the outpouring (3 to 1 I think it was) against further off-leash restrictions completely.				

You seems to have just reprinted the original one, you did not validate any of the sloppy science, you did not validate anecdotal claims, you did not acknowledge the vast majority of commentators.

However I am dismayed at the DEIS and much opposed to the changes proposed for both generic and specific reasons which I will try to address.

" I have a very active dog, a Border Collie rescue Mix, and being active it requires DAILY running. This running is done by myself and/or our Dog Walker. She is insured and Bonded and, and I am sure of her professionalism. Everyone who knows dogs knows that a tired dog is a relaxed dog, and a relaxed dog is a well behaved dog. Off Leash exercise is so much more than on leash exercise. On leash exercise limits the dog to my level of fitness, and that means that by forcing on leash requirements you are binding the exercise of many dogs to that of handicapped, and elderly owners. My dog forces me to go out every day and take a walk, and although that can be in my local neighborhood it is nothing like our walks in the Marin Headlands, or Lands End paths, or along Crissy Field. Off leash walking is my time with my dog. He is always under voice control because my time at the park is my time with him - we work together. These moments when my dog runs back and forth with a stick in his mouth are the reason I get in my car and go the GGNRA controlled lands. I always carry two rolls of poop bags on my leash and I will clean up other dogs poop if I find it when cleaning up after mine. I also participate in dog owners park cleanups, be it in the City or out at Funston.

" The DEIS does not seem to consider demographics: Answer a question - is dog ownership in San Mateo/San Francisco County/Marin increasing or decreasing? All the studies I have seen it is increasing. Therefore, as caretakers for lands given your trust for recreational purposes by those counties should you not take that in consideration and offer an alternative where you INCREASE off leash areas? Off leash areas, at the time of the 1979 Pet Policy was limited to only 1% o all the lands you administer. Since then new land has been added but you have DECREASED the percentage of those lands to below 1%. hy is there no alternative where you reflect demographics and the desires of the citizens of those counties who gave you the land and offer another alternative where you increase these lands? Alternatively, since you only have 1% o lands open to dogs, why not, if you take certain areas away can you not have an alternative where you give back other lands now currently closed? I would have loved to have seen

somewhere in the DEIS something along the lines of We are proposing removing XXXX from off-leash areas, but are opening up YYYY to off-leash use. You have the space. Why not use it?

" Your purposes, for the GGNRA is for RECREATIONAL purposes. These lands are NOT National Parks - they are ex army installations and they were given in trust for you to administer in keeping with the original deed. You appear to treat Recreation as having an inverse impact on the areas under consideration, ignoring that Recreation WAS and IS one of the four outstanding values mentioned in the 1972 enabling legislation I quote : maintenance of needed recreational open space. When Daphne Hatch your chief of natural resources management and science at the GGNRA says Quote: "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat, But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." I truly wonder if the NPS knows the difference between Yosemite and Fort Funston or Ocean Beach. When I attended one of you open houses I was told that I was told that NPS is mandated by Congress to manage uniformly all its areas she forgot also to tell me that Congress added The authorization of activities shall be construed and the protection, management, and administration of these areas & shall not be exercised in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established. So there is no mandate to match the GGNRAs policies with National Park Service requirements that dogs not be allowed off-leash in a national park.

" Snowy Plovers: Your own research - Forrest Cassidy St Clair and Warren all demonstrate that dogs do not actually impact the diversity, abundance and feeding behavior of the birds. The Hatch report observed 5692 dogs and only 19 chased plovers. Your own studies prove that parents with toddlers, surfers and other park users disturbed the plovers far more than dogs, yet I do not see anything in the DEIS that is further restricting their access. Why are dogs being singled out? Your environmental impacts are a whole bunch of could occur may occur but I do not see a single study that backs this up. You mention Bank swallows, and their nests, but they burrow in the cliffs, areas that dogs simply do not go to. . Ultimately your environmental studies do not seem to support your conclusions and you can be taken to task on this. I have tried to read the DEIS but I have failed to come across any actual solid scientific data that supports your premises. I see a lot of coulds and mayes but no actual evidence and no baselines - None. In fact, the one study I did read in full - the one above - demonstrated exactly the contrary to the results you would have preferred. You had all the time to back up your claims with hard data. The fact is you have not been willing to do so - discrediting the scientific basis of this DEIS, or, worse still, the data contradicted your preferred solutions, and you have chosen to ignore it. I could not find an comparative analysis of the No Action option. The impacts appear based on non-compliance to existing voice control and existing regulations. At some sites, the DEIS prohibits dogs from beach areas to protect shorebirds and stranded marine mammals, yet there is no documentation in the DEIS of current shorebird or marine mammal impacts caused by dogs.

" So if you have no sound scientific data to support the environmental reason to restrict areas to dogs lets look at the safety issue. Well in this case your data is overwhelming in pointing to what are the causes of serious safety incidents - 98% DO NOT INVOLVE DOGS. The problem is people, not dogs. Only 2% involve dogs. This alone should really force you to re-think the whole reason for the DEIS.

" The DEIS is concentrated on dogs, and ignores impacts caused by people and their children, mountain bikers, fleet week, walk-a-thons, feral cats, coyotes, horses, surfers, etc etc. In other words. The DEIS appears to be a targeted exercise. Not a 360 degree look at the panorama affecting the GGNRA

" Why is the current system not working for you? Are you able to enforce the current No-off leash zones? They are 99% of the lands you administer. If you can do it now why the need to change? If you cannot do it now, what additional funding will you require to ensure the new areas will be enforced?

" You TOTALLY ignore the impacts that these policies will have on the surrounding areas. If you squeeze dogs out of GGNRA lands where will they go? To overloaded City Parks ? Have you involved the City in this plan? You also have totally ignored the beneficial and human impacts of off leash interaction with ones pet. As I mentioned above, My mother cannot run so why are you wanting to limit the dogs exercise level to hers? She currently can play with our border collie and use a chuck-it with minimum effort for her and maximum effort for the dog. When I go to the park I see people playing with the dogs of all ages, races and, presumably, financial background. I do not see anything in your study except a rather



curious reference to minorities not coming to the parks because of dogs - The DEIS cites a 2007 SF State study that claims all Latinos and Asians surveyed said that dogs were a problem but if you actually read the study you discover some things: a) the study was not, as the DEIS implies an ethnic minority visitor use experience at the GGNRA but was actually a study born to help connect minorities to the parks. But more damning the study was hardly a scientific one - they interviewed fewer than 100 people and they were not randomly selected. It is this kind of selective scientific use that will have the words Drakes Estero popping up in peoples minds.

In conclusion it appears that this is a misguided solution in search of a problem. Your data simply does not support the existence of the problem, and your attempts to squeeze a NPS agenda on local parks is misguided and contrary to the spirit with which these lands were entrusted to you.

The more I look at the lack of data, the more I fear that, what the Dept. of Interior report said about Drakes Estero can be applied to this DEIS and that it exhibits sloppiness, from a protective approach to data, from a lack of vision, and from an insensitivity to the growing controversy, but not from any obvious intent to deceive, defraud or mislead." I really hope you are not trying to mislead but the lack of any evidence to your premises, causes great reason to wonder if the NPS does have an anti-dog which will be forced upon these Recreational Lands regardless of their negative impacts.

For all the reasons stated above, but in particular for:

- 1) The existence of a Poison Pill compliance override on all the alternatives
- 2) The lack of scientific data supporting your premises - there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I support Alternative A - the No Action Alternative and would also include New Lands area in that  
Respectfully

Alex Norton  
342 Fair Oaks  
San Francisco  
415 794 5315

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4288	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Carlos, CA 94070 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 22:13:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Matthew Pfiffner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4289    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** MONTARA, CA 940370745  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 22:13:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the GGNRA Dog Management Plan as it relates to the Rancho Corral de Tierra property in Montara.

I strongly oppose the plan - it is unreasonable and unjust and will have a significant negative impact on my family's quality of life.

We have been using Rancho Corral to walk our dogs for many years and the land has been used as it is now for decades upon decades.

Use of the open space is critical to the health and well being of my dogs and my family - small backyards which are common in CA are prohibitive to exercise and walking on the street doesn't provide the same amount of exercise, pleasure or safety measures for the dogs or the people walking the dogs. Rancho Corral provides the perfect opportunity for dogs and their owners to get the exercise they need in a safe environment. It also allows for social interaction for owners and their dogs which is critical to the mental well being of both. We have met such wonderful people and neighbors through walking our dogs at Rancho which has enhanced our day to day living and allowed us to feel safe and secure in our community. All of this is truly invaluable.

GGNRA absolutely needs to be respectful of the residents in an around Montara that have used this land for 50 plus years with respect for the land and each other and with little or no incident. My family specifically moved to Montara for access to this green space so removing my right to enjoy it as I do now is unreasonable and prejudiced. Additionally, although before my time, I know that the community historically fought to preserve the land and defeat planned developments and freeways in order to allow the enjoyment that people and dogs have there today. If it were not for the community's passion, efforts and success it might be that there would not be a Rancho Corral today. I pay significant land taxes and expect that in doing so I should have the right to enjoy the community I live in - the GGNRA's ineffective proposed dog management would prevent me from doing so.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4290    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** MONTARA, CA 940370745  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,15,2014 22:16:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Brenna Turner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4291    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123-1110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 22:19:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not limit the dog walking space in SF!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4292    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94159  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 22:22:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Using parks within the GGNRA for off-leash, voice controlled, dog recreation is the only outdoor exercise I practice and I enjoy doing so with my two dogs every day of every week. Please do not take it away.  
Please simply formalize the 1979 Pet Policy (Dog Plan).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4293    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Howe Ng

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4294	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 22:31:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Barbara tam

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4295	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 22:38:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It's not the dogs you need to worry about; it's the humans. Don't you get it???				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4296	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038-0464  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Montara Dog Group Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 22:39:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I walk my three dogs daily for an hour or more in Montara, Moss Beach or El Granada. I carry a bag with water, balls and plastic pick-up bags.

During our walk, I've designated an open area in each of the walks that I call our "playground". I throw a ball for each dog and they fetch and run for about 10 minutes. They love it and so do I.

We've been walking these trails (that are now GGNRA lands) for 7 years and the dogs have gotten to know the other dogs that are there regularly and socialize by sniffing and playing. The dogs that are off-leash are the better behaved and talking with the owners about that, we all seem to agree. People who know their dogs are more aggressive always have them on a leash and tell the passing walkers that is the case so when I see a dog on leash, I leash up my dogs as a precaution.

I've been making a list of how many people and dogs I meet on these walks and there are usually more dogs than people.

I meet local walkers with their dogs every day and am not concerned that if "off-leash" is part of the park plan that it will be over-run with people from outside the coast area. It has been an off-leash area for decades with no problems.

Walking with my dogs is a highlight of my day. Having them off-leash so they can stop and sniff at will (without tugging and pulling) and then run along beside me is pure joy. It takes the stress out of many stressful days at work.

One of the best reasons to live on the coast is the availability of trails for dog walking in Rancho Corral do Tierra. My physical and mental health has improved over the years because of this.

All the dog walkers I meet, no matter what the weather, smile and agree that we love doing exactly what we're doing at the moment; being out in nature with our dogs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4297	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 22:49:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Why is "Recreation" not a stated objective? This plan is a biased farce and must be redone to have any credibility.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4298	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Prerogatives Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 22:57:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

David Wilson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4299    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94146  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,15,2014 22:59:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. After recently visiting other cities with far fewer off leash dog options, I noted far more unsocialized dog behavior. I believe the opportunity that GGNRA lands give for dogs to socialize off leash is an important part in maintaining dog health both physical as well as emotional and is a primary reason that allows San Francisco to be a dog friendly and coveted city for dog owners.

I frequently walk my dog in many of the areas in question and note frequently that these areas would be significantly underused if not for dogs and dog owners. On the rare day of exceptional weather (75 degrees or more), perhaps consider temporary "dog areas" and "people areas" or just simply enforce existing laws.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many concerns and objections of the people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

It seems the GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I hope you will strongly consider the impact of any change to the 1979 law and perhaps even question the use of laws that can be so easily ignored or overturned. Are we just to believe laws to be temporary and up for review every 35 years or so as a new generation steps in?

Melody Jones

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4300	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 23:11:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	From Philip Gerrie 4341 26th st SF CA 94131 Feb 6th 2014				

To the Superintendent, GGNRA, Fort Mason  
Building 201, SF CA 94123

I am a former Commissioner of the Animal Control and Welfare Commission of SF for six years. By which I am very familiar with the issues of off leash dogs on City and Federal property, being on the agenda at many meetings. I am well aware of the efforts of the dog people to overwhelm the NPS with their emails and letters. This, as you know, has been going on for many years. As a Commissioner, I met with several of you at your headquarters a couple of years ago when the first DEIS came out. I was encouraged that you had the understanding to not be swayed by the dog people's protests.

In an effort to see the situation for myself in the City's parks regarding off leash areas, fellow Commissioner Pam Hemphill and myself visited all the designated parks and witnessed plenty of room for dogs to run off leash. The problem was more with poorly defined areas and lack of maintenance rather than lack of space.

In 2008 I had the unique opportunity to visit Fort Funston in order to acquire signatures for CA Prop 2. I needed to list the people that signed by County. It was a great place to gather signatures rather than in front of Trader Joe's. Only a third of the people with dogs were from SF. Many were from San Mateo Co. Dogs are not allowed off leash in San Mateo so they would drive there. The SF Supervisors position against the DEIS is politically driven and without merit. Only one out of three dog visitors were from SF.

The dog people's arguments that their dogs need exercise only provided by running off leash in the GGNRA to be false. They have no right to use federal land to the exclusion of other uses by visitors. Many people in SF have small dogs and have no means to drive to GGNRA lands, simply walking their dogs in local parks or on the streets. I owned a dachshund for many years and it never occurred to me to let it run in a park or take her to the GGNRA.

In short I support the NPS efforts to regulate dog walking in the GGNRA and to adopt a Dog

Management plan that adheres more closely to established NPS policies to provide a National Park experience for all.

I was involved with the licensing of Commercial Dog Walkers in City Parks. They do not need a license to walk/run their dogs in the GGNRA. Some may use the GGNRA to avoid being licensed. They provide no benefit nor service to other park users and should not be allowed to use Federal property for private financial gain.

Thank you, Philip Gerrie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4301	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 23:24:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been going to Fort Funston for many years. It has been a great place for my family and our dog to take walks. It is like no other place. We get physical activity and so does our dog. Our children get to play and run at the beach, our dog gets to run, and we get to walk. Making Fort Funston on-leash only or restricting the areas where dogs are allowed would make it terrible for all of us. If we could not take our dog there, it would mean more visits to an enclosed dog run, which means we would get no exercise since the only running is done by dogs in the enclosed dog runs. We are very responsible and always clean up after our dog and make sure he stays nearby. It is important for our health and our dog's that we still have this space for all of us to get some exercise.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4302	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 23:43:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep Fort Funston open for dogs. This is very important. There must be a few places in the city for unleashed dogs. many thanks, Beth homeowner parent dog owner teacher long-time San Francisco resident				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4303	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

And in my own words, really guys? Are you really going to take one of the most dog friendly urban areas in the world and just shut that down?

Sincerely,

Jason Green

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4304	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94707 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 23:58:13
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think that dog owners are an important constituency and dogs have been shown to keep/help make our parks safe. Furthermore, dog owners are invested in and vital supporters of open space and ensure that open space and parks are well respected and cared for. Unquestionably, we need a diversity of park space, some with no dogs, where it is critical to protect the environment, some with dogs on leash only, and some with off leash areas. This only requires creativity, sensitivity and common sense! Dogs make our communities livable for many of us and need extensive space to run. As someone with health challenges myself, my dog walking enables me to maintain my health ( a value not only for me but for my community)We need more off-leash space, not less and we need dog owners as an important voice for the value of parks and open space- not an antagonized rejected group. i know hundreds of dog owners who feel this same way. The idea that, despite a lot of community interest in maintaining and expanding open space, a national decision would ignore community interest, need, and voice is shocking and disappointing. Please! Please! Do not allow that to happen.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4305	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,15,2014 23:58:36
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	
------------------------	--

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to muir beach, Stinson beach and many other trails throughout Marin.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4306	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Ocean Beach Dog Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

To: Superintendent of GGNRA Frank Dean Saturday: 02-15-2014

From: Thomas Roop

SEIS Dog Management Plan

Proposed Comment #2

I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Additionally, in the SEIS the GGNRA asserts they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" as utilized in its enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI and the GGNRA's first Superintendent, the Honorable William J. Whalen, in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA. These promises, along with the conventional definition of the term "recreation", do not comport with GGNRA's current philosophy exemplified by Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management and Science for the GGNRA, who in 2007 was quoted as saying "Ocean Beach without the people is an

incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design.

Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it, e.g. the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management. Alternatively, for sites heavily utilized by dogs and their guardians, such as Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

Mr. Dean where is the Site Specific Scientific Peer Review required by law?

Thomas Roop

Daly City CA

Member of Ocean Beach Dog at Fort Funston:

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4307	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 00:06:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4308    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:52:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern,

As a taxpayer in this state and in the city of San Francisco I am deeply disturbed by the proposal to prohibit dogs (on and off leash) from Golden Gate National Recreational Areas. In San Francisco there is precious little green space for which humans have to enjoy let alone the four legged members of our family. I rely on these area's to take my dog to to let her stretch her legs and run. She is well behaved and under voice command. In all the time I have been using the area's in SF I have never seen a dog misbehave. Does it happen occasionally? Probably, but that doesn't mean we should ban everyone from utilizing the area's we as taxpayers pay for. These areas are meant to be urban recreation area's - to be used by people. These area's have been used extensively for decades and environmental damage is already done. If dogs are banned, people will bring them and themselves to other natural areas and disturb the ecosystems there.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4309    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 01:08:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Andrew Headington

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4310    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 01:37:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Taking away the off leash ares proposed by the GGNRA will be devastating not only to local area residents, but also to any parks around them. The GGNRA believes that dogs are destroying the natural habitat of (specifically) Fort Funston, but in reality dogs are a major part of the natural habitat. Aren't our parks to be used by all Bay Area citizens - that includes dogs/ animals? The proposed parks threatened to be taken as off leash would be a disaster to our entire county and beyond. And then who would use them? As it stands, when my family goes to GGNRA lands we encounter other dogs, families with or without kids, old people, young people, etc... Everyone gets along. Why do you want to force all dogs and people into small city parks where there is no way people/dogs will get along in those crowded environments?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4311    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 01:51:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** GGNRA is a recreational area,not a national park.As such dogs should be allowed to run off leash.GGNRA keeps ignoring the wishes of SF.Under Frank Dean Fort Funston has been mismanaged- -there are 2 benches to sit and enjoy the scenery.One picnic bench in bad repair,placed in a grove of trees.

In WWII the installation of tunnels, barracks,guns would have been banned under present day GGNRA. I strongly support returning the land ceded to the Federal Gov to form GGNRA be returned to SF.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4312    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough

---

people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Andreas Kastilani

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4313    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sarasota, FL 34243  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 05:57:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do not reduce the off leash area at the park. Dogs need room to exercise and socialize, let them roam free (under supervision by their owners) and enjoy their freedom.....Ed

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4314    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Akame (Dog)  
Steve and Magaly (Dad and Mom)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4315    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 08:16:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

As a dog owner who frequents GGNRA parks I am writing to voice my opposition to any plan that reduces the number of off leash allowed parks in the bay area. Due to the high cost of living in the bay area we don't have our own personal property large enough for our dog to run around at all in. This forces us like most others living in such a densely populated area to rely on public parks and lands to spend time

---

with our pets in a healthy fashion. Without these parks our dogs are restricted to the small square footage homes and the busy, polluted city sidewalks under leash. The GGNRA parks have brought lots of joy and healthy recreation to us and our dog and we would hope that we will be allowed to continue to enjoy it in the future. Please do not restrict the areas we can walk with our dog off leash and formalize the original 1979 pet policy.

Sincerely,

Karthik Yogeeswaran

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4316	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I know that people have good intentions and often feel that their dogs are well trained but too often the damage is done before an owner can get the most well trained dog under control. I have seen Fort Funston go from one of the most beautiful areas in the City to a place that is totally overrun with dogs and where regular citizens cannot walk w/o being disturbed by a dog to say nothing of where one can step w/o encountering dog poop. Please don't let this happen to other areas of San Francisco

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

â€ Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

â€ Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4317	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 08:39:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens, visitors using them will feel unwelcome and the cost of building these penned in areas is unnecessary and another burden California does not need on it's already troubled budget.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

C Corrigan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4318    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 08:41:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Throwing the ball for my dog ipa is one of the only forms of recreation I am still able to do after injuring my knee. I understand that some dogs do disturb wildlife but ultimately it is the owners responsibility, and proper training can mitigate this. Please don't ban dogs off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4319    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 08:47:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I walk my dog at Baker Beach and have found that the dog walkers and owners are very responsible. I have never seen an altercation involving dogs in the 30 years that I have lived here. I would not have taken the responsibility of caring for a dogs life if I had thought that living in the city with a dog would provoke an issue about exercise - both mine and my dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4320    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Castro Valley, CA 94546  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 08:52:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It seem utterly ridiculous to me that we should ban our "best friend" from running free on a beach. I'm approaching 70 years and made it through 65 of those year without a dog! And I regret it deeply. They are wonderful companions and watching my "scrufty terrier" run free on a beach is the most wonderful demonstration of utter joy I know of.

And he is not alone in his love of the beach. Why should we deprive him and by extension me of that joy. Sure a few irresponsible dog owners don't manage their dogs effectively but that true of every part of human activity: Consider the wonderful drivers we share the roads with everyday!

---



This ban is a ridiculous and malicious act/plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4321    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Ashland, OR 97520  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 08:54:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am planning to relocate to Marin in the next few months.

After reading this proposal I am reconsidering my move.

One of Marin's appeal is the acces to dog friendly beaches and parks.

Having my little dog be able to enjoy nature with me is a high priority in my relocation decision.

Restricting animals in a natural environment has an element of cruelty to me.

All living creatures should be allowed acces to nature.

To restrict dogs from Muir beach, where local residence exercise and enjoy bringing their pets daily is unfair and short sighted.

I urge you to continue to allow dogs to use this area.

You could consider offering a yearly dog permit fee allowing access to these nature ares that would help offset costs of maintenanc, if that is an issue.

Many dog owners would be open to pay to allow their dogs the freedom to enjoy dog friendly beaches and parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4322    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a birdwatcher, former dog owner and environmentalist who frequently spends time in the GGNRA, I'm writing to support strict regulations on dog walking in our national parks:

â€ I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

â€ Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Thanks for your attention.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4323    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 09:05:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco. One of the best parts about our fine city is the immediate access to beautiful outdoor environments. I am also a dog-lover. A brief walk around San Francisco would show any observer that dogs are part of the fabric of this city!

From what I understand, the current draft plan is far too restrictive. Off leash areas are critical in our progressive city, and I think it is ridiculous that the plan does not include an off-leash area in Crissy Field, among other places. These areas are special and unique to San Francisco, and the use plan should be more inclusive to our community. We are lucky that there is enough acreage available for many uses, and we should embrace this.

I would encourage the public to reconsider the proposal in favor of a use plan that is more reflective of San Francisco's progressive culture.

Thank you,  
Josh Weiner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4324    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 09:20:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA plan to severely limit off-leash areas in Bay Area parks. Responsible dog owners have the right to use set aside land for recreational use with their dogs. There is no specific study supporting the need of a new plan and the GGNRA should present such data before trying to introduce changes.  
Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4325    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 09:23:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in GGNRA, I am writing to oppose the dog management plan. The GGNRA is a recreation site for individuals, families, groups who most often have a dog as a part of the family. Dogs need to run just as humans do. Please do not restrict GGNRA from man's best friend.

Most sincerely,  
Teresa Morrissey

**Correspondence ID:** 4326    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

My faithful beach dog Henry and I have pasted this drafted letter because we think it's perfect.  
Our off leash walks at Muir beach are crucial to our sanity.

We strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, we support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% othe Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Tim ridges and Henry the dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4327    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We STRONGLY OPPOSE Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

We regularly take our dog to the beautiful dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA, like muir beach, coyote ridge, miwok trail, and more. Taking our dog to these places is a huge part of our lives and it would be devastating to lose access to these trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4328    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** martinez, CA 94553  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 09:37:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have a GSP named Emma, both Emma and I look forward to everytime we can make our way to Fort Funston to frolick in the waves and walk the beach. We always enjoy meeting new canine and human friends. Please don't take away our special FUN place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4329    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 09:38:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may Concern,

My name is Tom Dallman and I am a neighbor of the Sutro Heights/Lands End portion of the GGNRA and strongly object to the proposed restrictions of off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA. I earned a Botany Ph.D. in 1988 and have been a science teacher at an SFUSD high school since 2004. My students volunteer with groups performing habitat restoration in local parks, including the GGNRA, as part of my curriculum.

I also have a Service Dog that accompanies me to work and performs her duties above and beyond the call of duty. A primary reward for her service is off-leash time, often in the voice-command off-leash areas in the GGNRA adjacent to my Neighborhood (Fort Funston, Lands End, Presidio) along with SF Rec. and Parks off-leash dog areas.

I recognize that a small minority of dogs and people act improperly as with the following behaviors:

⌘ Leaving behind waste

⌘ Unmanageable pack sizes for dog walkers

⌘ Digging (ie for gophers)

⌘ Flushing Birds (mostly at the beach)

A majority of dog owners disapprove of these behaviors, pick up the waste of others dogs and approve of strict enforcement and enhancement of rules against destructive dogs and their owners.

I strongly believe that current heavy handed and unnecessary plans by the NPS to radically reduce off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA grossly overestimate the effect dogs have on park habitat and will be seen as a historic black-eye for NPS policy and management. City and County of San Francisco acreage transferred to GGNRA was intended to remain Recreation Areas to be enjoyed by people and animals

alike. National Parks within an urban setting are different than wilderness areas, like Yosemite, and require sensitive management models that balance the needs of both human and wild populations.

I passionately support habitat restoration but don't see current off-leash dog policy as a problem that negatively impacts this goal to the nearly the degree of other management issues. I have seen beautiful widespread pruning of Cypress trees, impressive to tourists and locals alike, negatively impact bat and song bird populations by allowing raccoons up into the high canopy and significantly reducing insect habitats. I love seeing coyotes catch a rodent meal yet this can cause a proportion of the digging damage blamed on dogs. I have also seen impacts of overnight camping negatively impact habitats to a lesser degree. I believe non-politicized and non-biased scientific studies would bear out these observations.

Dog walkers/owners are natural allies and supporters of parks and environmental groups. The NPS plan to curtail off-leash dog areas throughout the GGNRA will create long lasting animosity and conflict, legal and otherwise, that will unnecessarily divert vital resources from worthy projects that enhance restoration efforts, like the day-lighting of Tennessee Hollow that benefits everyone and acts as a proof of concept for Urban National Parks.

Sincerely and with appreciation of the hard work of everyone with the shared goal of a beautiful and diverse GGNRA,

Tom Dallman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4330	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

David Kianian

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4331	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 09:51:09				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Laura Sweet

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4332	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 09:53:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. I must state with the firmest voice that this is NOT a "preferred" plan by anyone I know in San Francisco.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. This plan essentially tells thousands of people who use this park everyday that they are no longer welcome in a place that their tax dollars support.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. If you insist on going forward with this ill-conceived plan, then at least refrain from billing me through taxes to pay for the GGNRA parks or any of the Federal Parks system, as you will have effectively barred my use of same.

Sincerely,

Notty Bumbo, Kate Donohue, and Yeats

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4333    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAn Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 10:01:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My Husband and I live in the Richmond District and although we are not dog owners, we feel that curtailing the areas for dog walking is bad for the character and the freedom of the area. We often go to these areas just to interact and watch the dogs play and exercise. Shrinking these historically open spaces is not beneficial to a uniquely urban national park. The areas where the dogs can run even now only represent less than 5% othe total acreage of the GGNRA. I would bet that these areas are the most utilized by the local citizens. To confine them to an even smaller space will only create larger problems. When we gave you these lands to manage it was with a crystal clear understanding that specific sections were to remain off leash and open for dogs and their owners to exercise. I see absolutely no reason to change and shrink the already well-used and well-loved 5 percent of the park that is dog-friendly. With over 95% It for wildlife. Angering the large population by shrinking their areas will lead to larger problems of enforcement. I suggest that you keep these historically dog friendly areas open and continue with your excellent management of our beloved GGNRA, which is an excellent balance for these lands.

Abby Draper

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4334    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 10:01:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4335    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

access in San Mateo and San Francisco Counties and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Gloria Nomura

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4336    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Hayward, CA 94541  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 10:12:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off leash open space is incredibly important for dog owners and dogs. Dog parks are dangerous with overcrowding and the inability for a dog to avoid or move away from aggressive dogs. On leash walks are great and important but does not truly provide the dog the exercise and enrichment it needs. Off lease walks with my dog are how we both get exercise and 'me' time. We are responsible and well trained. Please keep these places open to us. They are very important and needed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4337    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 10:21:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I regularly walk with my dog on the Oakwood and Camino Alto ridge trails. We would like to enjoy the multitude of other beautiful trails available as well, but they are off limits to dogs. These are some of the only trails left that allow my dog. I don't really understand the limiting of dogs on trails. I think dogs are more gentle on trails than humans. Dogs don't build illegal trails to zoom along on their bikes. Dogs don't start forest fires by throwing out lit cigarettes or not putting out their campfires. They also don't leave trash and other garbage behind. The only thing they do leave behind (if their human doesn't pick it up) is completely biodegradable. A few dogs are misbehaved but most are well behaved and under voice or leash control. Dogs are just happy to be outside and they get their humans outside too which is healthy for everyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4338    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** As someone who has a dog walker walk my dogs in the Ft. Funston, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for 14 years. In my home, my dogs are treated as dear family members.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco and San Mateo Counties and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

G. Nomura

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4339	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	9 Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 10:29:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Oren Rubinstein &  
Megan O'Connor

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4340	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Fort Funston Nursery Volunteer Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 10:38:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Comments to the Dog Management Plan

I urge the NPS to regulate dog walking in the GGNRA and agree with the "Preferred Alternative F Plan" concerning Fort Funston (FOFU). The most important issue is the reduction of the number of dogs a person is allowed to walk. Walking through FOFU is like walking through herds of sheep running out of control causing degradation of plant and animal life.

The parking lot and the old hangar site will provide a large ROLA site for running but it is difficult to define a trail in FOFU because it is crisscrossed by trails and new ones that appear all the time.

From the "Special Species Status": Common Raven is nest predator of Bank Swallows. However, ravens are also attracted to FOFU because visitors feed them. Flock of ravens often perch near the entrance and/or hang around cars waiting for handouts. For instance: a driver feeds the ravens; a dog walker comes with dogs that chase the birds; and, the driver and the walker think that it is hilarious.

From "Alternative A and B": Habitat Protection Area to protect native plant communities. There are few native plants growing at this site. About ten years ago, when the site was fenced in, dog walkers protested. FOFU nursery volunteers were told not to enter the site when lead deposits were found from its former use as a rifle range. Instead of the Habitat Protection Area, protect the original Bank Swallow Site, which has been kept weed free by volunteers for the last seventeen years. Rotting fence posts, falling cables and blowing sand are an invitation for new trails. After a blow out a population of Beach Pea (*Latyrus littoralis* rare in San Francisco) appeared, but new social trails could put them in peril.

Page 1052 of the "GGNRA Dog Management - SEIS" states that off leash play areas are important to walk to the site: During the last fifteen years I have seen only one person walking into FOFU with a dog.

Please adopt the ruling which helps nature and most of the visitors.

Ingrid Cabada

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4341    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 10:38:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,

---

there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Abraham Nachbaur

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4342	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94224 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 10:40:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

StephenOrdway

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4343	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 10:47:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is

way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. Eliminating access to places like Ft. Funston, Crissy Field and Baker Beach would cause severe over-crowding in other places like local parks and small enclosed dog parks.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you for your time and consideration to being our voice!

Sincerely,  
Julia Mason and my dog Sophie.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4344	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 10:48:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing only in response to the Fort Funston portion of the plan. We use the park with our dog frequently (1-2x per week). I am also a long-time resident (more than 50 years).				

While the newer version of the plan is an improvement on the original, more off leash areas should be utilized to continue to make the park attractive to dog owners/walkers. The dog people, when behaving well, have benefited the park. The resource attracts families, keeps the park busy, and gets dogs needed exercise. Before the Fort became popular for dogs, it was not a great place and did not attract the wide range of users it does now. It instead attracted a crowd not conducive to families or family activities.

A better balance of off-leash activity and species protection should be relatively straightforward. Restrictions that only discourage dog owners from using the park will have an overall detrimental effect on park users and the park.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4345	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 10:53:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRA needs to retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy! The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to locals. It's not Yellowstone where it requires different management for wildlife. It will force us to be in our cars in search of a place to walk our dogs, which is bad for the environment!				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4346    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 11:05:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not restrict access to dogs and owners but rather craft laws that inform dog owners of any areas where sensitive species exist and damage that could be done by their dog. Dog owners who do not keep their dogs on the trail should be ticketed but the residents who wish to enjoy the outdoors with their canine companion responsibly should be welcomed and encouraged. I personally would be happy to pay for an annual license to walk with my dog in all Marin's open spaces (National Parks, State Parks, Water district etc). The license would have a test to show my dog would stay on trails, I could be educated on areas of concern and I would be allowed on trails on weekdays when use is lowest.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4347    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 11:13:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Schadt

You are receiving this email because you requested news about dog walking at Fort Funston.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4348    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Helen Schneider

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4349    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 11:19:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are a family in San Francisco with a 1 yr. old pup, Juno. We have always valued the amenities in SF for being a dog loving city.  
Places that we often frequent with our pup includes Fort Funston, Ocean beach, and Golden Gate Park. Being able to take Juno to off leash areas are greatly important for the health of our high energy dog. At the same time, she socializes with other friendly dogs visiting. We always pick up after ourselves and stay by a leave no trace habit. We implore the city to help maintain these benefits that have made what we love about this place that we call home.  
Thanks,  
M

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4350    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 11:23:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Barry Cynamon

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4351	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 11:27:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Joanna

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4352	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 11:28:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Parker

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4353	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 11:31:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sara Corrigan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4354	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Kensington, CA 94707 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 11:45:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to several GGNRA trails and beaches here.



Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4355	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 11:46:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** The proposed limit on dogs off lease is just stupid! The only way to "completely" protect these "vital" areas is shut down the planet! That's right just kill all the humans and it will solve all of your supposed problems. On a lighter note, what you should be doing is opening up some of these places in the Urban Areas so people won't have to go to ever more sensitive spots... That's right open places like Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and others in urban areas to protect these areas that actually need it. THE URBAN AREAS SHOULD BE OPEN PERIOD, THE SHIP SAILED ON THIS ISSUE MANY, MANY MOONS AGO, SO GET ANOTHER (PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL), AGENDA UNLESS YOU ARE READY TO EXTERMINATE THE HUMAN RACE.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4356	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 11:49:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am a daily Fort Funston user and I request the GGNRA maintain current off leash dog privileges at this site. Like so many of us at Funston, I am older.

My life line is walking my dog around the top of Fort Funston each day. This is where I meet people, get exercise and serve the community - by picking up extra poop.

One change I would like to see at Funston is a change in management. The rangers there are surly and distant, there is no active volunteer program - all signs point to an abuse of power and no strength within the organization to develop and maintain operating systems.

I wonder if any of you have ever spent time at this site.

The GGNRA clearly does not want to manage sites that include off leash dog privileges. I am sorry you are in this position.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4357	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Concord, CA 94521  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 11:51:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The whole Idea of preventing folks to watch their dogs play and enjoy being free is alarming. While my family doesn't leave in the San francisco neighborhood, we are a frequent visitor to the Golden Gate Recreation Area and our dog(s) joins us whenever possible.

Like many before me I urge you to take a more constructive examination of your plan and provide a robust public peer review.

My Dog has become my main motivation to get out an enjoy the vast outdoors. We have so many limited oppurtunities, please don't take another form us.

Best regards  
Alexander Family

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4358    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Petaluma, CA 94952  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 11:53:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County, Marin County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Access for off-lead dog walking is a welfare issue. Historical use of these lands has merit and should be honored.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4359    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 11:55:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The report includes a section that makes some statements about how the policy change is needed in order to reduce the incidence of unleashed dogs attacking guide dogs. This section does not include any data or evidence that there are an unusual number of unleashed dogs interfering with or attacking guide dogs. In the absence of any data or evidence, there is no basis for imposing a change in policy.

I understand that the purpose of this process is for the NPS to present its reasons for imposing a substantial policy change within the GGNRA. Quite frankly, I do not understand why this section was included in this report, as it does not provide any evidence that the proposed change would have any

effect on the problem being discussed.

In general, if the NPS is unable to provide evidence that the proposed policy change will have the intended effect, they should be prevented from imposing the policy change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4360    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is a city where there are more dogs than children. We're not asking for much. We're not taking any parks or open areas away from children or adults. We need areas where we can exercise our dogs. The proposed Preferred Alternative is too restrictive and there is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

I support the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash area feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash law status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\*\*\*\*\*If you drive by Fort Funston or Crissy Field, for example, on any day of the year and in any type of weather, rain, fog, heavy drizzle, windy- -there is always somebody using the park with their dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4361    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 12:07:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I ask you to please, please keep the open field of Rancho an area where dogs can run free! It is essential to the health, well-being and socialization of dogs to be able to run and play off-leash. I have been walking/running dogs off leash in this area for close to 30 years. I am on my third dog. I know there have been many letters that have addressed the specific issues in the Dog Management Plan, from lawyers to concerned citizens, that have more than adequately argued for less restrictions on dogs. I am writing as a daily walker of Rancho.

At an open house on this issue in Pacifica a ranger told me that to keep running my dog off-leash I should go to Fort Funston. I do not see how driving round trip to the City every day to exercise my dog is better than walking to an open field that is a block from my house? This is nonsensical and hardly makes for a good environmental choice.

Please be reasonable. Do not ban off-leash access to Rancho. This will be detrimental to a way of life that has existed in this area, my home, for decades.

Sincerely,

Trish McGrath  
Montara Resident

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4362    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 12:07:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lena Zuniga

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4363    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 12:12:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** First, some background for my comment. I am an Engineering Professor at Stanford University, and I spend a great deal of my time reading, writing and reviewing research reports. I also live in the City, and own two dogs and make regular use of the Presidio open spaces. Just this morning I was at Crissy Field, where I observed a large number of people and dogs all having a wonderful experience.

I've just finished reading the section of the report on "Dogs and the Visitor Experience" and I found the presentation of evidence and the logical arguments presented to be very weak. In particular, the report cites results from a number of surveys of visitors related to their experiences with dogs in the GGNRA. The report avoids presenting a complete record of the comments or even the quantitative survey data - instead, the report selects a few specific comments and a few specific results that support the decision that the NPS prefers. This is not a scientific analysis in search of the best outcome - it is cherry-picking to find facts in support of a pre-selected conclusion. I was very sad to see the NPS representing its process in this way.

For example, the report states that "...In this report, 71 percent of public comments favored allowing off-leash dog walking in selected GGNRA sites (option B) and 28 percent of public comments favored the enforcement of existing leash laws in the GGNRA (option A) (NAU 2002a, 5). More than 500 respondents affirmed their belief that it is their right to walk dogs off leash at park sites. ..."

Unfortunately, the first result, that 71% favored off-leash walking is unhelpful, as it does not state the question that was asked, what the other options were, and what the probability of all the other answers being given. The second result, that 28% favored enforcement of leash laws, is similarly flawed, as it also does not indicate what alternatives were offered, or what the other 72% of answers were. Finally, citing that there were 500 people who believe it to be their right to walk dogs off leash is unhelpful, as the percentage of respondents with this response is not given, nor are the other possible answers to this question and the distribution of answers provided. Throughout this analysis, the presentation of incomplete excerpts is not consistent with the use of such data to identify a best course of action, but rather with the use of data to support a pre-existing conclusion.

Another example, "...Almost one-third of visitors from each of four counties surveyed who had seen off-leash dogs while visiting GGNRA sites viewed that experience positively, but the largest proportion of visitors from each county stated that off-leash dogs had neither a positive nor negative effect on their experience at GGNRA (NAU 2002b, 20)...." Based just on this statement, that 1/3 favored off-leash walking, and that the largest group were ambivalent, it is clear that the fraction that opposed off-leash walking has to be much less than 1/3. The report selects a fraction of this particular result, describes it in an unbalanced way, omitting the part of the result that is inconsistent with the pre-existing conclusion. This is a textbook example of biased reporting.

Another example of misleading reporting : "Of the dog walkers that responded to the survey ... 30 percent of individuals were not satisfied or slightly satisfied with off-leash dog walking opportunities their most frequently visited sites at the park (NPS 2012a, 11, 16)" By omission, does this mean that 70% of dog walkers were "highly satisfied" with the off-leash dog walking opportunities? As with the earlier examples, the GGNRA report selects a portion of the factual record, and describes it in a biased way.

Overall, my experience in reading the report was similar to the experience I have when I watch Sean Hannity on Fox News - His entire segment always consists of a carefully-screened selection of facts that support his prior conclusions, presented in a way that distorts the information, incorporates his pre-existing bias, and excludes all contradictory evidence. I understand that the NPS would like to change the policy for the users of the GGNRA. I am upset that the NPS is behaving like a fox news "reporter" in this process, presenting bits of data and information out of context to justify a policy change.

From my perspective, the data presented does not justify a change in policy. The present rules and arrangements in the GGNRA are not perfect, and can probably use some tuning, as well as some added limitations in a few especially sensitive areas. However, this report does not show that the proposed policy changes will have the intended effect. For the information on this section on the "Experience", it seems clear to me that the present policy has very many desirable effects, and that the proposed changes will mostly have negative impacts on this experience.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4364	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94945				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 12:23:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Enjoying the recreation areas with my dog is an important part of my life and why I chose to live in this area. I feel that the parks belong to all of us, dog owners included. As with all societies, there must be rules. But most dog owners are compliant and respectful of the rules. Penalize the ones who are not but do not restrict those of us who are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4365    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 12:24:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have carefully read the document provided in support of the proposed policy changes for dog walking in the GGNRA. I was astonished to find a section of the report on "Environmental Justice", and read this section carefully to try and understand the argument being made.

This section presents data suggesting that minorities are especially concerned about the problems associated with off-leash dog walking : "...Research found that these minority groups mentioned dogs, especially dog waste, as a barrier to park visitation, and overall, Latinos were the most concerned with dog owners' lack of concern or control of their dogs (Roberts 2007, iii)."

However, even throughout this section, the data presented frequently contradicts the conclusion offered by the report. For example, "...in the telephone survey conducted by Arizona University's Social Research Laboratory, 39.4 percent of respondents of Hispanic origin supported (strongly and somewhat) off-leash dog walking and 39.9 percent of respondents of non-Hispanic origin supported (strongly and somewhat) off-leash dog walking (NAU 2002b, 93)." Here, there is no detectable difference between the opinions of different groups. Basically, this "evidence" does not support any particular conclusion or policy. Why is this presented? A careful reading of this entire section of the report does not produce any evidence to support the GGNRA presumption that the current policies are "unjust".

Even worse, I find this entire section offensive because of the way it presents stereotypes and racially-biased comments throughout the analysis. Furthermore, I am upset that the NPS would go to this trouble in attempting to manufacture a racial justice argument to support their objective. Is the goal of the NPS to divide and conquer? Is it so important to restrict off-leash dog walking that the NPS would try to divide us along racial lines in order to do so?

Even more so, I was greatly surprised to see that the authors of this report are so intensely focused on presenting evidence to support their chosen conclusion that they would include such an offensive section in the report - ESPECIALLY because the information presented in this section does not even give any direct support for the proposed policy change. The only thing that could possibly be accomplished here is to generate a division along racial lines which could be exploited to justify a policy change. I just find this whole tactic offensive.

Why even bother to include this section, as it is offensive and otherwise meaningless?

For me, this section has had one other sad effect - It has degraded my previously-positive impression of the National Park Service.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4366    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 12:30:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please please please do not take away off leash rights in San Francisco! This is an integral part of life for dogs and their human companions. It helps us all have fun, exercise, socialize, and be happier people and animals. Taking away this right is a waste of time, energy, and resources that could be better spent on a million other projects. Also, perhaps you have not thought of all of the after effects to something like this that will ripple through San Francisco, including, less adoptions for the homeless dogs in shelters, more damage to homes/apartments because dogs have less outlets for play which could in turn increase rents, drive good people out, etc. and also, unhappier people!!!! Don't you want your city to be a happy, healthy, compassionate city? Dogs, exercise and fresh air make everyone happy! If I didn't have my dog to go out and enjoy parks, hike, explore and play with, I know I wouldn't get enough exercise. Please please please think twice! This affects all of us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4367    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 12:42:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not restrict dogs to leashes on all the GGNRA beaches. Our dogs swim and retrieve sticks from the ocean. This cannot happen if they are leashed. The dogs swimming pose no threat to people or wildlife enjoying the beaches. In fact, the dog owners are among the most committed citizens for beach clean ups and patrols. Thank you for considering these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4368    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Stinson Beach, CA 94970  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 12:45:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Our community loves our beach and takes terrific care of it. Our dogs need the space to run and fetch and swim so that all of us can enjoy the beaches and parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4369    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 12:53:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Chrissy Fields, and other GGNRA Trails

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,

Lavonne Rasmussen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4370	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 12:55:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Karyn Ritter

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4371	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 12:59:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The 2013 Environmental Impact Statement appears to be biased against dogs. Studies which have found minimal impact from dogs have been suppressed.				

---



For example, in the GGNRA's own Draft Dog Management Plan/EIS of January 2011, it cites a study by Bekoff, M., and C.A. Meaney, saying "off-leash dogs generally travelled less than 6 to 15 feet off trail, for less than 1 to 2 minutes. They further noted that dogs traveling farther off trail were often lured there by the people responsible for them (throwing sticks, balls, or Frisbees, or going off trail and calling their dogs to follow)." The same study found that "off leash dogs generally did not travel far off-trail and rarely were observed to chase other dogs, disturb people, chase wildlife, destroy vegetation or enter bodies of water."

This study by Bekoff and Meaney is nowhere to be found in the 2013 DGMP/Supplemental EIS.

My particular concern is the Baquiano Trail on Sweeney Ridge, because that is closest to my home. Considering slope and trail width, allowing dogs on the western, coastal part of the trail and disallowing dogs on the eastern part is exactly backwards.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4372    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 13:11:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Please keep Marin a dog friendly place.  
there are more dogs than children in Marin County.....

Please keep Muir Beach open to dogsâ€¢  
Ajita Kardon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4373    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 13:12:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA members,

My name is Judie Doherty. I live in Pacific Heights, San Francisco and I often walk, and play with my dog at Crissy Field.

I am deeply concerned about the GGNRA Dog Management Plan in several areas and I am hopeful and confident you will find my concerns and those of other dog owners substantive and deserving of your consideration. And encourage you to provide an open a dialog with dog owners and all residents in our city of San Francisco and the 3 counties.

Here are just a few of my concerns:

In 1972 the GGNRA was created by an act of Congress to allow for urban recreation and open space in the Bay Area and continued development of this major urban area. The GGNRA was built and created for dog walking to better the quality of life of the residents and their dogs and making this a priority.

Regrettably, the plan has forgotten this priority, and now not only wants to remove and limit off leash walking, it prevents future off leash in new areas.

The plan includes many unsubstantiated assumptions and implications that must be substantiated.

The SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA. How can you justify this?

The process to date has been very one sided. Respectfully, the GGNRA should set up a forum of pet owners, dog-walkers, and GGNRA members. One sided decisions never work and always require tremendous follow up energy and money, and generally build of of ill-will on all sides. Please I encourage you to consider this and make it happen.

Relative to the comments about visitors, I strong disagree, while there there may be a few exceptions, the visitors I have experienced love to see the dogs, I have seen their joy and taken more pictures of them with my dog then I can begin to count . The welcoming dogs make a statement on behave of our City, they say we are friendly, and love animals. The visitors like that and it is good for the city too !

Most pet owners are responsible if, there are any irresponsible pet owners I say hold only those accountable please don't make all of us and our dogs suffer for a few. Revoke their privilege and or fine them.

Lastly, Little if anything has been done to make the public aware of this plan, when so many will be negatively effected.

If it were not for the email I received from friends with pets that are aware of the GGNRAs actions and intents. I have seen ZERO information regarding this plan. So how many other pet owners do not even know to respond or comment.

Please consider this when you are counting the responses you receive..

While I believe the GGNRA intentions are well meaning there appears to be the loss of insight of the original purpose of GGNRA and I am hopeful and encouraged that you will listen and respond positively to the original intent of this organization and the thousands of people and their pets in the 3 counties, effective by your decisions.

Respectfully,

Judie Doherty  
2170 Vallejo Street  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
415 595 4088  
judie543@gmail.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4374	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 13:16:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** It is sad and unsettling to encounter the too common bad dog owner whose off leash animals fight other dogs, bother/scare people and randomly attack and harass wildlife. I frequently see dogs not even in visual range of their owners, let alone under voice command. Sadly, this knucklehead minority of bad dog owners necessitate more rigorous protections be put into place, and most importantly that implementation and enforcement of rules be a priority for law enforcement. Periods where citation can be expected by bad dog owners, with serious enhancements for repeat offenders, will get the word out and alter behaviors with a minimal investment by NPS. I think the recommendations of the Audubon Society are a reasonable minimum that should be adopted to preserve the wildlife and enjoyment of the area for the vast majority of people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4375    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 13:26:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I frequent Fort Funston regularly as a place to safely allow my dog to be off-leash.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4376    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 13:28:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Epstein

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4377    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 13:29:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In a town such as San Francisco, where decent-sized back yards are a premium, I find off-the-leash public dog spaces to be invaluable. As the owner of two larger breeds, they need exercise that our home grounds cannot provide. When I first moved to SF, I was told it was a very dog-friendly city. Please don't take that away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4378    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 13:31:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sirs/Madams,

My name is Alexander Dozier and I live in San Francisco California. I visit Chrissy Fields Fort Funston along with other off leash areas around the city of San Francisco. I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. Open areas for dogs to run off leash in urban areas are necessary for their health and general well being. I feel some of the possible out comes of this plan do not provide adequate attention to that fact. By taking away a large portion of the off leash areas we run the risk of not giving dogs the stimulation they need. I also object to the proposal to fence the areas where dogs are allowed as if dog owners should be separated from the general population. I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Alexander Dozier

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4379    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94949  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 13:31:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Please keep Marin dog friendly and stop this legislation

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4380 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Amanda Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 13:40:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in the outer Richmond near Golden Gate Park and Sutro Park most of my life. As a current resident I see the benefits to dog and man of access to open space. I enjoy the privilege of walking my dog on and off leash. I want to continue to have the option to allow my dog freedom, I also want visitors without dogs to enjoy the space as well.

Rather than imposing restrictive policies consider creating dog friendly spaces which will encourage dog owners to congregate is a space better suited for dog play, out of the way of main paths or attractions.

Positive reinforcement of the behaviors you want increases the behaviors likelihood, its basic dog and human training.

Amanda Peltier

415 672 3346

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4381 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94901

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4382 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94933

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands, other

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4383	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 13:43:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean:				

I am disheartened that we have to fight this SAME fight so many times. Every few years, we come up against this same problem and it's so tiring. The people have spoken and we dog owners make up a huge percentage of the population.

We are a dedicated group of dog owners and walkers who need to have the open space to run our pets. I have personally picked up garbage and of course my dogs' mess every single time I am there. There are monthly cleanups to keep the area in good shape. The people who use Fort Funston regularly are very conscientious about keeping the area clean, respecting other wildlife that is there & not leaving any garbage behind.

People who own dogs have them for all kinds of reasons, and many of those are emotional, physical, etc. People need to have a place where their dogs get adequate, off-leash exercise. It makes dogs better behaved and quieter.

PLEASE keep the area open to us and our pets!!!

Thank you,  
Dee-Dee Sberlo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4384	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94930				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4385    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94920

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4386    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94930

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4387    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4388    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Pacifica

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4389    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, other



---

**Correspondence ID:** 4390    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4391    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4392    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94577  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

---

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Half Moon Bay

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4393    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Albany, CA 94706  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 13:57:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Please consider the needs of the region's many dog owners as you deliberate the new plan. it seems to me that, given the importance of the National Recreation Area to its users, your decisions should include careful compromise. Most of us dog owners are responsible citizens and taxpayers with well-behaved dogs. Our dogs are part of our families. The current plan is much too restrictive!

Thank you.  
Sincerely,  
Carolyn Willard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4394    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Walking my dog near my home is one of the highlights of my day, and my dog's as well. Watching her run off leash brings Joy and happiness to our entire family. I can't think of a more wholesome and healthy family activity. We live in Marin to be able to enjoy the beautiful national parks that surround us. As a tax payer I hope to be able to continue to be able to use and enjoy these areas with my dog.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4395    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4396    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:**  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4397    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

---

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4398    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94949

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4399    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94960

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4400    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Marin Headlands, Other

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4401 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4402 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4403    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 14:11:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Although the revised Dog Management Plan is a slight improvement, it still ignores the recreational needs of thousands of current GGNRA visitors who visit the many units of the GGNRA on a regular basis.

As you well know, close to 90% of the people visiting Ft. Funston are with dogs. They come to walk their dogs off-leash so that they and their dogs can benefit from true exercise and fresh air. And most of the other folks come to see the array of dogs and the hang gliders. Ft. Funston is the area where I've walked my series of dogs almost every afternoon since 1978. Yes, that makes me now a senior writing to you to comment about a specific lack of balance that you keep stressing is your goal.

The NPS claims to be a champion of seniors and disabled. Your plans to make the asphalt trails, which BTW have not had the sand removed for a very long time, on leash only means that the many seniors who might be a bit unsteady, or use canes, a walker, a wheelchair - not to mention the families with strollers - will be unable to walk with their dogs at FF.

As with other seniors, walking with my dogs is my primary form of exercise, recreation, and socialization. We walk from the parking lot out to the last bench or down the sand ladder and north on the beach to the beach trail. Standing on a sand dune or in a patch of ice plant where the NPS has designated an off-leash area is not recreation, exercise, or socialization for us. [And BTW no maintenance of the few benches has been done in 20 years - most have only one single board for sitting or have been buried]. Therefore, with your current plans, many of us will no longer be welcome at FF with dogs. So much for the NPS being supportive of seniors, the disabled and even families! Where is your balance?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4404    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94804  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 14:12:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have a dog trained to voice command who is always with me, including at work. I know that some people have dogs that are almost completely untrained, who sometimes even don't know their own names. These irresponsible dog owners probably do damage the environment. I want to be fair in saying this.

But if the law is going to take the trouble to enforce banning dogs or enforcing leash laws in a way that

---

harms everyone, why not simply create and enforce laws that protect the environment and allow people with well trained dogs to have access to the parks? At Muir beach ticket people who allow their dogs to hurt the new project, which is the point. No one believes dogs are harming the sand.

If there are going to be police out there issuing citations, why not have them issue citations for the harmful activity? Making the whole beach leash only punishes the innocent majority. Moreover the people who let their dogs roam on the newly planted area are unlikely to respect the leash law anyway. Ticket people for the harmful activity and it will be discouraged as much as ticketing everyone with a dog off leash,

I want to point out that the purpose of parks are for people to enjoy, not to sit as an example of a pristine environment. There are miles of coast land and acres of wilderness in the park where no one ever goes and thousands of square miles that are not park in which the environment is untouched by man. The job of the park service is to provide land that is cared for by the park service for people to enjoy and use, which includes dogs.

I understand that in this political climate it is hard to get funding, but I hope these dog laws are not to raise money from tickets.

Recall what the purpose of parks are, a place for people, and their dogs, to see nature. There may be a political agenda that the parks are the "natural environment" but they are not, they are parks. The natural environment is found outside parks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4405	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94114				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4406	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94116				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				

**Correspondence Type:**

---

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4407    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94080  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4408    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94949  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.  
I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach



<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4409	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94127				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				
	I love my dog and I vote.				
	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				
	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				
	I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.				
	The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.				
	Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4410	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94132				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>					
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				
	I love my dog and I vote.				
	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				
	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				
	I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.				
	The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.				
	Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston				
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4411	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94131				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 14:22:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the proposed Dog Management Plan. In addition, please add that off leash areas be clearly marked, with boundaries and with enforcement so that park visitors, leashed dogs and wildlife are safe in the rest of the park.				
	My toddler was knocked down by a large unleashed dog at Crissy field and developed a fear of dogs that lasted years.				

There are too many places in the park where a family cannot sit down with young children or food and be safe from invading dogs. The alarming sight of uncontrolled dogs running down shorebirds and horses must stop.

As a former dog owner, I believe that the proposed dog management plan has ample off leash dog play areas. Having dogs held on leash is the only way that miles of trails can be enjoyed equally by dog walkers and everyone else.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4412    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94117

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan  
I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4413    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94115

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 14:24:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Come for a walk with us. We humans pick up our dog poop, plastic bottle caps, paper trash cans and bottles all while our dogs romp leash free on GGNRA open space. Because our dogs can run free, any dog aggression runs away.

Leash us, watch us growl, snarl, become grumpy and make our humans grumpy.

Watch humans in GGNRA open space. they startle the snowy plover, leave trash,ride their bikes too fast in crowds,and leave a more lasting "footprint" not paw print.

KKeep us "free at last."

sincerely,  
Nancy Wright

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4414    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94131

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:**

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4415	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dogs and family in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me, my husband, and daughter from recreating with our dogs for my own health and my dogs' health the way I have on GGNRA properties, most specifically Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Ocean Beach for 20 years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Anne Stanton Malone  
80 Cragmont Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94116

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4416	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>					

---

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog: Fort Funston, Marin Headlands, Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4417    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** LILE ADAMS

310 Jersey St

San Francisco, CA 94114

January 5, 2014

Superintendent Dean

GGNRA

Fort Mason, Bldg 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

RE: GGNRA Dog Management Plan

Dear Mr. Dean:

I am an 86 year old resident and home owner in San Francisco, as well as a life-long Democrat who believes in a strong federal government. However, you are one federal agency totally out of control when it comes to your Dog Management Plan and the money you have wasted pushing it on us. This plan does not meet the needs of the 180,000 dogs and their owners that reside in San Francisco. You have absolutely no regard for the impact your plan would have on city parks. You are trying to turn Fort Funston and Crissy Field into another Yosemite, which they are not. I reject your entire Dog Management Plan and want the rules established in the 1979 Pet Policy to be enforced.

Sincerely,

Lile Adams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4418    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** January 21, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Carol Schlesinger, am 64 years old, and I live in San Francisco. I am writing to oppose the

GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I have walked my dogs at Fort Funston since 1996.

I am able to walk up and down the cliffs and pass folks half my age because of the exercise I get at the beach with my dog. Fort Funston has been my sanctuary. I worked for almost 15 years at Hospice By the Bay as their Bereavement Coordinator until the middle of last year. The three days I walked per week helped me stay present for others in their grief process. I now walk almost every morning with my new dog. The sense of community is very strong, as well as the sense of taking care of the land. It is a place where women can walk alone and feel safe. It is a sacred space for many people and their dogs.

The GGNRA can accommodate both recreation and conservation. It was designed as an urban recreation area, not a pristine wilderness areas like Yosemite. In fact, the courts have repeatedly upheld the existing 1979 pet policy. They have said that it was consistent in both fact and intent with the original mandate for recreation upon which the GGNRA was founded.

This plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily excludes the Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their canine companions. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others.

The GGNRA draft management plan does not provide evidence to justify such drastic changes to 40 years of healthy dog and human recreation. The Park Service should revise the dog management plan to:

• Honor the original 1979 Pet Policy. Respect dog-walking as legitimate recreation.

• Provide for extensive off and on-leash dog walking on all trails and other lands acquired by the GGNRA since 1979, especially in San Mateo County.

• Exclude speculative, exaggerated, biased, or misleading statements and studies.

• Provide reasonable ways to address any significant adverse impacts from recreational activities. Use objective standards applicable to other recreational activities (e.g., equestrians, boaters, fishermen, surfers, bicyclists, beach-goers, joggers, walkers, etc.).

• Eliminate "compliance-based management," which will allow additional restrictions to be implemented without any public input.

Sincerely,

Carol Schlesinger

51 Melrose Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94131

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4419    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 14:44:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a Marin County native and resident, I strongly encourage you to adopt Marin County Supervisor Sears' alternative to the plan that restricts dog access in the GGNRA. Not only is the current proposal draconian and discriminatory towards dog owners who deeply respect and enjoy their parklands, but would discourage people from accessing and investing energy into protecting their natural environment. Restricting opportunities for visitors and residents to learn experientially about our natural treasures will lead to disengagement, disinvestment, and eventually, disregard.

If you want to protect our parklands, you should be supporting RESPONSIBLE and REGULAR access to them, canine companions included.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4420    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Woodside, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,22,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Other  
**Correspondence:** AMEN, TOM.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4421 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 14:45:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My dog Cady loves running and playing, and she is particularly fond of Fort Funston and Crissy Field. My husband and I very much enjoy our family excursions, and having to keep our dog on leash would prevent us from enjoying the Golden Gate Recreation Areas. I support the parks, and make a monthly donation to them as they have given me so much. Please don't make us leash our pets there. Not only will it diminish the enjoyment I get by going there, but it will cause extreme crowding in other off-leash parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4422 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA NA  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Muir's Beach dog friendly

Free Thank you!!

Support no action on the alternative

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4423 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** MV, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Jan 2014

Support 'no action' alternative of  
1979 Pet Policy OK.

Keep Muir Beach

Dog friendly!

Thank you!

Keep MB Dog friendly!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4424 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Piedmont, CA 94611  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 14:55:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We live in the East Bay but have just bought a condo in San Francisco for our retirement. One of the main reasons for this is that we love walking our dog at Crissy Field, Rodeo Beach and Marin Headlands and occasionally Fort Funston. Our dog is a very smart Border Collie/Greyhound mix who was a physical and emotional wreck when we adopted her at 1 year of age. She is now 7 years old but still very active and athletic. Most of her progress we attribute to patient training and LOTS of off leash walking, running and swimming. We are not very active ourselves because of various health problems relating to joint problems and find the off leash areas a great way for Flit to exercise and us to keep up with her to the extent we can while being able to see her. Off course we have trained her to return from large distances instantaneously either by whistle or hand signal. i worked with Border Collies herding when I was younger in Scotland and am absolutely sure that dogs with this degree of activity level really need large open spaces and extreme exercising to be calm and well behaved. if you restrict the current off leash areas more it will greatly reduce the quality of life for many dogs and their people. Why not take a walk over to the beaches at Crissy field and see how well behaved almost all of the dogs are? if the United Nations ran this well there would be peace in the world. Or maybe we should just put politicians on leashes and see what that does for their mood?

Please don't harm dogs and those among us who are not able to run with their dogs on a leash because of physical disabilities and encroaching senility.

The Tai family, Ernie, Donna, Trent, Blythe, Emma, Griffith, and Flit the dog

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4425    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 14:57:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the new plan for "dog management" in the GGNRA. Dogs need places where they can run and play off-leash. There are far too few of these areas now. The plan that has been proposed is not supported by facts or research and is unfair to dog owners and dogs in the Bay Area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4426    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 14:59:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

Before he passed away earlier this year, my husband and I used to take our beloved white lab, Bucko, to Muir Beach almost every weekend. Bucko visited Muir Beach frequently his entire life, and I am certain that in last years of his life the salt, sea and other dogs were vital his health and happiness. Some of our best memories with Bucko are at Muir Beach, and we treasure our photos of that beautiful time we had with him.

We still go to Muir Beach, and although now it's just the two of us, we find comfort in visiting Bucko's favorite beach with all the beautiful dogs playing freely in the sand and swimming in the Pacific.

Muir Beach is such historical, love-filled gem filled with families and their well behaved dogs enjoying nature and each other side-by-side. It would be a shame to deprive Marin residents of the beach that is not only special us and our dogs, but to so many people around the bay area.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,  
Dylan & Rachel Carney

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4427    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 15:06:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please allow for off leash dog walking. Where else in SF can we do this? Remember, dog owners and walkers have a self-interest in keeping dogs under control and the area clean. Why would we want to take our pets, our "family member(s)" to a place that was unsafe and dirty.

Matt Bernstein  
San Francisco, CA 94127

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4428    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley , CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 15:08:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My husband and I strongly oppose the new proposed restrictions to dogs in the GGNRA. Dogs are already banned from so many parts of the GGNRA, but our dog is a big reason we get out into these beautiful open spaces. We already have to leave home when we visit many trails. Please consider the full impact this new "dog management plan" would have. We are responsible dog owners and have lived in Marin for 48 years.

Thank you for your consideration.

---



Andrea and John Ryersen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4429    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes. Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4430    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Lydia Floyd  
20th January, 2014

Dear Sir,

I am an 84 year old military widow and I have lived close to the Presidio since 1969. I no longer drive but I have for years walked my dogs on Crissy Field.

After the Army left, an anti-dog policy developed, despite the fact that the Haas Foundation had stipulated x acres for off leash dogs. This has been totally ignored.

Crissy has become not a neighborhood park for the enjoyment of the people who live here but an arena for events, cyclists descend in the Tour de France mode, marachous as far as the eye can see, making it difficult to cross Marina Blvd. In other words Crissy has become a Mecca, this is all acceptable except when it comes down to dogs!

I belong to the Cgirsy Dog Group we do everything to keep the beach clean. We provide the pooper bags, but unfortunately are all too often people who do not live here have little regard for our neighborhood.

On the other hand we no longer can walk safely in the Presidio due to the coyotes who are multiplying rapidly in great numbers. People living by the Presidio wall live in fear for their pets are afraid to return home late at night.

Coyotes are wild animals don't belong in a city. A few have even been sighted on Scott Street and in this general area.

I no longer feel it is safe to leave my deck door open if I am not at home.

---

I have not noticed any protest about this situation or any comments from the GGNRA as to remedy this growing problem.

Only dogs are a constant subject of complaint. On a regular basis we are forced to fight for every inch of the beach which is shrinking as I write.

I doubt very much that what is happening is what the Haas family intended when they created the Foundation.

Yours Sincerely

Lydia Floyd

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4431    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Novato, CA 94947  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** January 21, 2014

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Fort Mason, Building 201, Attn: SEIS

San Francisco CA 94123

Dear Superintendent:

Living in Novato, I enjoy going to GGNRA land and thoroughly enjoy off-leash dog walking. A lot of support that public lands have received over many years has come from off-leash dog walkers.

The Preferred Alternative is too restrictive.

Fences are not answer. That's not being in the open. It's a totally different experience.

Another poor idea is the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular areas because it decides that there is not enough compliance.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I remember the days when we all automatically considered that rangers are our friends, and public lands are public lands, GGNRA belongs to us, we're all in it together, and we all automatically supported more GGNRA land, and more funding for our public land. Please don't turn the tide! We're all in this together, so let's not create restrictive and overbearing rules and regulations that turn it into an us/them outlook.

We respect your concern for our land. We respect it and are concerned for it too. And, please don't automatically assume that you know better than the people who use our public lands and pay for them with our tax dollars. We are all the owners of the GGNRA lands. Let's keep our lands available for the wonderful resources we share and support.

Sincerely,

Sharon Searles

850 Cypress Avenue

Novato CA 94947

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4432    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 15:16:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

If you are going to discriminate against any group of tax payers/residents/visitors, please be egalitarian about it...disabled people in motorized vehicles can damage natural areas, as well as people using canes who stick them into plants or environments that can be damaged. And what about young children who energetically run after each other and trample on plants, or big brother pushing little sister in the stroller all over the natural environment while the mother looks on and laughs....or talks/texts on her phone? There seem to be quite a few groups of people who should be constrained in their use of tax funded GGNRA areas, so we would appreciate you discriminating equally and not just picking on dog walkers. We happen to be very respectful of the natural environment and our dog does less damage than cayotes digging up gophers, or raccoons or any other natural creatures that traverse the Earth.

Sincerely,  
Nanci and Andrew Scoular

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4433	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Lagunitas, CA 94938 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 15:21:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to GGNRA trails and beaches.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I would like to see more off leash trails and beaches for dogs. I am a dog trainer and know that off leash time in nature is very important for the physical and mental health of most dogs and has a very positive effect on their temperament and behavior. It is also so very important for dogs and their humans to be able to share off leash play time in nature.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4434    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** NA, CA NA  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Superintendent GGNRA Attn: SEIS  
Jan 20 2104

Fort Mason, Bldg 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

Subject: Dog Rules at Crissy

Dear Sir,

I am writing to express my support for the current dog policy at Crissy and the bay coast to Fort Point. It seems people of all kinds, with dogs of many breeds all get along with each other. While this seems to be at odds with the policies imposed at other national parks, maybe San Francisco can lead the way. We no longer visit Yosemite or Mt. Diablo state park because of its restrictive dog rules. Please do not make Crissy another dog unfriendly park.

Sincerely,

Carl Caven

925 788 6970

Earlene Caven

925 788 8468

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4435    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 15:28:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Support the plan, impressed with the number of options explored!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4436    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** January 23, 2014

Superintendent Frank Dean

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

---

Building 201 Fort Mason  
San Francisco, Ca 9 123  
RE: SEIS DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN

Dear Superintendent Dean:

With regard the SEIS Dog Management in GGNRA, I would like to offer the following comments.:

I support your preferred alternative in the interest of striking a proper balance for all GGNRA park users, and one that is very protective of wildlife, natural and cultural resources.

Many lands now under the jurisdiction of GGNRA have been assembled from other management entities over time. Some of the acquired properties allowed dogs on those properties. That was then. We have now moved to the present where, in San Francisco alone, there are reportedly more dogs than children with dogs numbering anywhere from 100-200 thousand. The figure is unknown due to widespread lack of adherence to the City regulation that all dogs must be licensed.

There have been hundreds of reports in recent years of damages caused by out of control dogs to park resources, to people and animals, to wildlife, and to other dogs. While dogs are wonderful pets, in my opinion, they have absolutely no place in any national park including, and especially in, GGNRA, where the mission and goals are to protect, unimpaired, all of the historic, natural and cultural assets for the enjoyment of the generations to come.

Today, we all have had at least one personal experience in a conflict resulting from the proliferation of dogs in our national park. I have personally seen dogs on trails clearly marked "No Dogs"; have been attacked by a dog in a wildlife zone whose owner reveled in his dog's behavior; have seen dogs encouraged to chase wildlife and, unfortunately, witnessed too many instances where an unconscious or uncaring owner or walker, did not pick up the dog's waste or even prevent the off-leash dog from going into clearly marked off-limit areas.

These are the reasons I support your preferred alternative in the interest of striking a proper and protective balance for all GGNRA park users and assets, to adhering to the principles of asset management covered in the National Park Service's Mission, Goals and Regulations, and to maintaining a pleasant visitor experience for all users, not just individuals who have elected to own a dog.

With that support in mind, I would also like to offer the following suggestions;

• By making Rodeo Beach completely off leash, you have changed the nature of the beach from general use to a special use zone. I do not support this and recommend you reduce the amount of off leash space to enable a wide variety of park users to continue to use the beach as they have in the past without having to accommodate dogs first.

• Provide fencing for all off leash areas to ensure boundaries are clear for all park users.

• If the fencing essentially makes the entire area a de facto off leash area such as in the case of Rodeo Beach, then rework the off leash zone to accommodate all users.

• Provide funds to enable full and complete enforcement of all regulations including, as needed, trained volunteers, in all affected parks.

• Provide the public with contact information to report and document off leash abuses in all areas of the park. Consider using an adaptation of the newly refined "SF31 1" iPhone/Android app of the City/County of San Francisco to instantly document and photograph abuses witnessed in the park.

• Regularly review compliance with any new off leash boundaries and adapt boundaries as needed to maintain their protectiveness of nearby assets and diverse park users.

Lastly, I do not support the use of the park for money making private enterprises such as Commercial Dog Walkers.

• Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

• Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Sincerely yours,

Jan Blum

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4437    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Funston and Crissy dog walkers Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Today I went to fort Funston and decided to leave because the parking lot was full and there were many cars cruising looking for a place? This happens on any nice day on the weekends and holidays. Why? because it's a wonderful place to run your dog off leash. For 35 years I enjoyed this place.,made friends, and got exercise. I've never seen a dog bite a person or harm any wildlife. Children get bit by dogs in their own homes because owners don't take their dogs for exercise. Dogs need to run ,fetch, exercise and socialize. The only damage I've seen at Funston is due to your bulldozing the sand around. I never see rangers up there. Old people, young people and children have a great time there. If you push us all together in a small area I believe problems will start. It's happy because it's BIG! The only wildlife up there are birds and gophers. Any other animals wind up dead on Skyline Blvd. Today I went to Stern Grove instead and so will many other people when you restrict Fort Funston and Crissy field.  
Doreen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4438    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037-0263  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Ripcurl Designs Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 15:41:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am totally in favor of and will only support current on-leash dog rules as they are written today. I will not support any more restrictions imposed by the State or County of San Mateo within the currently purchased Rancho Corral de Tierra.

Having to use a leash is bad enough, especially with dogs that have been trained to walk without a leash. Imposing restrictions like the ones being considered (to certain paths or areas) cannot be enforced and should be seen by those of you that have done this before at other parks, as a waste of time, money and effort. We are not here nor support Rancho Corral de Tierra in order to employ more State or County or Government talking heads and bodies.

The taxes I pay here in San Mateo do not call for more restrictions, they actually demand less and require you to stand up for our rights as home owners, property owners, tax payers and law abiding citizens. We did not spend millions of dollars not only for our homes but for the original purchase and protection of this land merely for the State to come in and impose ridiculous rules because of some endangered species. Figure out a way where we can use the park like it was meant to be used by the people that live here and that originally bought into this area because of the Rancho Corral de Tierra "OPEN" area.

If you're looking for ways to improve your newly acquired park (Rancho Corral de Tierra) of which my taxes helped pay for, then perhaps you could start by removing fallen trees laying across paths and placing benches in areas where they can be enjoyed and not crowded onto by the walking path.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4439    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 15:41:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4440    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 15:51:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Dean,

I have walked with my dog in the GGNRA for years. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying the the GGNRA properties. I am 64 years old, the hikes/walks that my dog and I share are an important part of my health regimen.

I feel the GGNRA has truly lost sight of its purpose. It was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. The trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since 1979.

More and more parks and trails are setting up policies to exclude dogs. Not only in SF, but in the east bay as well. Thousands of homes in San Francisco, and the bay area, have dogs. Do not exclude them, and thereby us, from these wonderful environments.

lesli zephyr

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4441    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** None Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 15:51:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think the proposed changes to the GGNRA to limit off leash areas is too restricted. San Francisco stands out proudly as city that is dog friendly and has well behaved dogs. Our wonderful areas are a treasure and so many out of town friends have commented to me on these wonderful areas for dogs to run, feel alive happy and healthy.

As a therapy dog volunteer I have seen what amazing love our dogs give to so mainly people in hospital, care home and to the children reading programs.

For the great love these dogs give to so many people it is only fair that we provide these wonderful off leash ares

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4442    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94706

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:01:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA planners,

I oppose any significant new restrictions on dog access in the GGNRA. Dog access is already severely restricted, and it should not be further restricted. Reasonable dog use is part of human use (the humans like my family whose dogs are part of their outdoor recreation, where currently allowed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4443    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. San Francisco is unique with its commitment to ubiquitous human-canine interactions and is the primary reason why I have chosen San Francisco as my home. The new plan is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dogs for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. There are problems with the current system, however, by removing what makes San Francisco unique harms its law-abiding citizens more that in solves any of the raised concerns. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Respectfully, the GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



Thank you for your dedicated efforts to preserve this truly precious resource. It is my sincere hope that a more reasoned and inclusive approach can be reached.

Sincerely,  
Dan Clark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4444    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:17:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you,

Rhonda Felicity Petrov

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4445    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** PALO ALTO, CA 94303  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** PHOTONICS CONSULTANT Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:19:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having off-leash areas like Fort Funston is great for both dogs and people. Everyone, adults, kids, animals, have a great time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4446    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Antioch, CA 94531  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:22:33

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** dogs are much less aggressive when off leash they need to be able to socialize. we travel a lot and a lot of our travel depends on if we can find areas for our dogs to play off leash while we are visiting. we do not travel to cities that are not dog friendly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4447 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4448 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** dog owner Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:25:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I was born and raised and, except for a few years away at college, have lived all of my 55 years in San Francisco, mostly on the Western edges of the City. I have been angered and deeply, deeply saddened to have most of the coastside areas in San Francisco, i.e., Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Lands End, and Chrissy Field, areas I used to walk in daily, given away to the GGNRA, a group which clearly has no commitment to the communities of people and dogs who use these areas for recreation and exercise, to refresh ourselves and spend time with our friends. Now when I walk my dog in the GGNRA lands, I often find myself crying, literally, to know that I will not have this joy much longer. I also wonder where I will go to exercise my dog off leash, and this is very stressful. Will I have to walk at night so that my dog can at least run and play off leash? I am sad because the friends I have made will inevitably be making new arrangements about how to get their dogs off leash exercise, and the wonderful connections I have made with this community of people will be broken. Maybe you don't know that most dogs don't just exercise themselves. If you put a dog in an enclosed area, they won't actually exercise. The dog will walk around a bit, perhaps tussle with another dog, but most dogs will eventually just lay down. Dogs require their person to exercise with them, i.e., their person to walk so that then the dog will walk. So essentially, to

restrict dogs to leash only access to GGNRA lands is to deny them the freedom they innately need and deserve. And because I will make sure my dog gets what she needs in terms of off leash exercise, my life is going to become more complicated in order to provide her with that. I really see my only option as walking at night where hopefully you will not have the resources to harass me and/or arrest me. Do you see this as sad? I do. One of the great joys of my life is walking my dog with my friends. Remove off leash dog walking in the GGNRA, and this joy is gone. I really see no reason for this. Everyone should be welcome everywhere, including in the GGNRA. Runners, cyclists, skateboarders, people walking, and anyone else should be welcomed in the GGNRA lands. The Bay Area, where a large percentage of the population have dogs, is already one of the most unfriendly places for dogs, and restricting dogs from most of the GGNRA and making it essentially only on leash will seal the deal that the Bay Area is completely unfriendly to dogs.

I beseech you to give the GGNRA lands in San Francisco back to the City of San Francisco, but knowing you won't do that, I beg you to allow off leash dog walking in the GGNRA as it has been all my life. Dogs need a significant area, at least a mile or two, in which to walk, run, and play both for their physical and mental health. And guess what? SO DO I. Things had been working fine for more or less 40 or 50 years. Please allow things to continue as is. Please allow off leash dog walking everywhere in the GGNRA.

I have one more request. I respectfully request a written, personal response from you to this letter that thoughtfully addresses each of my concerns. This is at least the third letter I have written to you on this issue, and I have not had any response except to see your plans remain unchanged regarding off leash dog walking in the GGNRA.

Sincerely,

Julie Kaufman  
585 Bright St.  
San Francisco CA 94132

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4449	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 16:27:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011; comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.				

I support "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley, and the Marin Headlands.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

The SEIS preferred alternatives force people into their cars, in search of places to walk with their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4450    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122-2509  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:34:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... a park without man's best friend is a cold place to be. Dogs are "ice breakers" between humans and provide a reason to get out of the house and get some needed exercise in some of the most beautiful places on this pla net .

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4451    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san jose, CA 95125-1863  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. Dear Sen. Barbara Boxer, Sen. Dianne Feinstein, and Rep. Jackie Speier: I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GFGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because fort Funston is the only place where dogs and their owners can be free Where all the dogs and people are real not phony Please do not take away the owner's or dog's freedom or anyone elses.....

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4452    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:35:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have a very active dog who requires intense exercise at least twice daily. We already feel frustrated by the restrictions on dogs already in place, and the new bans for limiting dog areas proposed would be devastating. San Francisco is a dog city, and we are proud to be part of a place that embraces our four-legged family member. We are also huge nature lovers and love spending time outside in the many spaces which are proposed to be banned to dogs. We want to support protecting the natural beauty around us, but not at the expense of losing even more space for us to bring our dog. If the GGNRA went forward with their proposal to increase the amount of areas banning dogs, the limited areas remaining where dogs would be welcome wouldn't be able to accommodate the large population of dogs in the Bay Area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4453    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403-4803  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4454 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403-3966  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:38:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because.  
Dogs and humans need exercise. Its just a few people who oppose dogs. And just very small minority of dog owners who cause some trouble. Please don't restrict our lives any further than it is already. Cant even find a forrest nearby where I can walk the dog ON-LEASH let alone off leash...

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4455 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94111-1143  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:38:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...I believe there is room for all of us to share the GGNRA. I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive and support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. Give us places to walk and run.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4456 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116-1468  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... So many dogs and dog owners love these recreational areas and rely on them for outdoor exercise and bonding. We live in a large city with limited space for these activities and cannot afford to lose these vital areas

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4457    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044-4036  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...dogs should be able to run free and play with other dogs and chase balls and release all their energy. It's not fair to always keep dogs restricted to leash, they should be able to run free and interact with other dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4458    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-3056  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:40:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is too restrictive. Our City parks are already full and restricting access to GGNRA parks/beaches creates overcrowding.  
Personally, I take my dog every weekend to Ft. Funston. It's good for him because he expends energy and socializes with other dogs and people. It's good for me because I exercise and unwind. Please don't take this pleasure away.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4459    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:40:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I am strongly opposed to Alternative F, the preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

With a miniscule percentage of GGNRA space currently designated for any type of dog access, these new restrictions are completely unreasonable.

The GGNRA is at its heart and as its title indicates, a RECREATION area. It is partly an urban park, and is in no way wilderness, nor a wildlife reserve, nor a bird sanctuary, but primarily a place for humans to enjoy the outdoors. Traditionally, this has included people with dogs in limited areas.

Many GGNRA lands in Marin County were once inhabited; with many buildings that included military installations; families and ranches; herds of livestock; pickup trucks and farm vehicles; and LOTS of working as well as pet dogs, roaming thousands of acres. Our dogs accompanied my friends and me as we rode our horses on hundreds of acres of what is now the Marin Headlands. We shared the range with livestock herds and it was our responsibility to train our dogs not to chase cattle and sheep, which we did. It is that very issue of responsibility that advances the greatest challenge to the proposed new restrictions. If a small percentage of dog owners do not train or manage their dogs properly, they should be cited, but that should not translate into banning all other responsible dog owners and their well-behaved dogs from the vast majority of the GGNRA. Following this path of logic means that:

>We should ban children from the vast majority of the GGNRA, because a few children chase wildlife, run excitedly through and damage sensitive habitat, scream at the top of their lungs and throw rocks at birds, or rip branches from trees to use as play swords, or hiking poles.

>We should ban mountain bikers from the vast majority of the GGNRA because some of them erode trails and damage hillsides and wildlife habitat, aggressively confront hikers and horseback riders on single-track trails where they are not allowed, and build illegal and destructive hidden trails for their personal sport.

>There are smokers tossing cigarette butts, litterbugs tossing trash, pot farmers using pesticides and polluting creeks, and parents leaving detritus behind from family beach picnics. Does it thus follow that we ban all humans from the vast majority of the GGNRA?

No, of course not. So why restrict just one category of park user over any other, when all user categories have bad actors among them? Please exercise common sense and reason as you proceed, keeping in mind the original intent of the formation of this magnificent Recreation Area. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4460	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1607				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 16:41:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan!				

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4461	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94704-2781				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 16:43:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is exclusive and discriminative towards these animals. A drastic 90% decrease in recreation space available greatly affects the well-being of both animals and owners. If this occurs, the spaces in which dog-owners are left take their animals for exercise and fresh air will be more heavily concentrated, which may have negative consequences such as increasing traffic and waste in those areas, increasing the amount of dog-fights in these highly-concentrated off-leash areas, or conversely, deterring owners from taking their dogs out at all.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4462    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:44:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** DON'T Outlaw dogs in the GGNRA. It is a wonderful resource for families and dogs alike. It has been peacefully and harmoniously shared for decades. Keep it dog and family friendly!! PLEASE!!! It isn't broken - there is no need to "fix" it!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4463    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1409  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:45:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan!!!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4464    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122-1110  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:46:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because a large part of the pleasure of visiting recreation areas is seeing an area where people and animals can intermingle in a relatively unrestricted way. There are already plenty of places in which people who dislike animals can go to find recreation, but the number of places for humans and animals to find positive interaction is becoming our greatest scarcity. Dogs should be free in recreation areas to roam under the supervision of their owners and intermingle with each other.

From an environmental impact standpoint, dogs are FAR less damaging to the environment than people. If there is a particularly sensitive habitat that exists in these recreation areas, they should be closed to public use entirely and redesigned as wildlife preserves. A dog in the company of a responsible owner



will stay on walking paths, refrain from disturbing wildlife, and make the overall park experience more enjoyable for everyone who might potentially enjoy the connection with nature that an outdoor recreation area is supposed to foster. Conversely, humans leave behind garbage (particularly cigarette butts,) trample pants, and, at times, create a tremendous intrusion into the lives of wild animals. The ecological impact of humans is far more detrimental than the impact of dogs. Thus, if an area is too sensitive to intrusion, it should not be open to any foreign intrusion.

Please retain the rules and regulations adopted in 1979. I adamantly support not only the continuance of the current off-leash areas, but an expansion of outdoor areas in which dogs are permitted to accompany responsible owners without physical restriction (i.e. leashes, harnesses, etc.)

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4465    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94402-1818

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:46:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I feel as a tax payer, I should have equal access to the open space areas that make living in the San Francisco Bay Area so desirable. I am a third generation native to the San Mateo a County and have a vested interest in preserving our outdoor spaces and keeping them pristine for all to enjoy. Dog owners like myself leave areas better than how we found them. We respect these spaces and cherish them. We are in no way harming species or destroying ecosystems when we respectfully use these recreation areas. In fact, we are the ones who contribute to the local economies when using these spaces. We strengthen the economy with each trip we make to these recreation areas. We and our pets are assets and not liabilities.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4466    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-1839

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:46:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I support The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management because there is already wide-spread abuse by dog walkers. Many dog-walkers abuse the leash-only rules that are already in place making visits to parks unpleasant for people and dangerous to wildlife. Giving them more access will only increase their self-righteousness. We need further restrictions and more enforcement of current laws.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4467    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:47:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for ALL VISITORS. The situation at Ft. Funston illustrates how largely unregulated dog access can ruin the coastal park experience for families with dog feces underfoot, poop smell in the air and aggressive dogs frightening, even knocking over children.

On one visit to watch hang-gliding, my granddaughter was badly traumatized by the sudden approach of a large unleashed dog. The continuing increase in numbers of unleashed dogs at Chrissy Field will eventually mirror the scene at Ft. Funston. Trying to remind dog walking visitors about the leash requirement on Ocean Beach only results in hostile response. "My Dog" doesn't chase birds... is under "voice control" - sure thing. Seems like every dog is an exceptionally virtuous "My Dog".

Furthermore it seems to me that commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public. The DAILY visits of troops of 6 or 8 dogs running together as a pack - often unleashed - multiplies the impact on wildlife and recreational visitors alike.

I very strongly support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I realize the difficulty of instituting firm regulations in the face of fierce opposition by fanatic dog owners and commercial dog walkers, but GGNRA is a National Park tasked with the responsibility for protecting wildlife, enhancing the natural environment and providing thoughtfully managed outdoor recreational opportunities for the citizens.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4468    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044-1321

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because leash walks are not enough exercise for dogs.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4469    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:48:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

Im writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

I hope the concerns of responsible pet owners will be considered before any final changes are made, and that any new policies continue to allow for recreation with our dogs.

Sincerely,  
Jordan Hinkes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4470    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:49:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are so few places already for hiking with dogs in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, parts of the Marin Headlands, and Krissy Field are wonderful places for furry friends to run around and experience the outdoors. Closing these off would deprive owners and dogs alike of this joy. San Francisco is a crowded city, and residents do not have space on their property, and the parks are too small for dogs to get proper exercise. Teenagers partying do far more damage to our open space than dogs do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4471    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133-2606

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...

1) Oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

2) Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel uncomfortable. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

3) Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily

focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

--:--:--

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4472    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:50:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my very strong opposition to some of the proposed dog management alternatives for San Francisco beaches that, if approved, would require dogs to be on leash on certain park walkways and in beach areas where they are currently allowed to be off-leash. We walk our black lab, Fred, almost every day along the water at Ocean Beach between Fulton and the Cliff House, and can't think of a better place for him to run and play in any kind of weather. It's his favorite place on earth and mine too (next to Crissy Field and Fort Funston where we also enjoy playing with him off leash), and we never have any issues. People love to see Fred having fun at the beach, and part of the reason he is such a good and happy dog, is that he gets proper exercise. We walk him on leash in our neighborhood and in the park, but at the beach, he can get even better exercise by running for long stretches, which is so important for large dogs, in order for them to stay healthy as they age. Swimming in the bay at Crissy Field is another safe and healthy way for large dogs to exercise, and it would be a shame to take this away.

The GGNRA was set up to be a recreation area for a densely populated urban area which happens to include a large population dog owners. We should be able to continue to give our dogs the good quality of life they have been fortunate to have in San Francisco, where they don't have to always be confined to a leash or a small fenced-in dog yard/park. Most dog owners as well as many other volunteers have been taking good care of the trails and beaches set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. I am in favor of keeping beaches safe for people and dogs, and would not have a problem if there are penalties to specific dogs and dog owners found to be clearly negligent or misbehaving without prompt correction by putting their dogs on leash or muzzle, or even leaving the area. I believe these cases are very rare, and as I've said we never see or encounter problems with other dogs at the various beaches. Enforcing leash laws on all dogs could actually create dog behavior problems, if they can't get their energy out, rather than solve them.

It is my understanding that the proposed dog management plan does not reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the plan released for public comment in 2011. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. I sincerely believe that the positive experiences of local residents and visitors engaging with dogs in the City is far more common than any negative experience, and I truly hope San Francisco will continue to keep dog-friendly areas like Ocean Beach an off-leash haven for dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4473    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1238

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:52:05

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because

- One of the major attractions of living in San Francisco is that it is a very dog friendly city which allows dogs and their owners a very high quality of life by responsibly enjoying our beautiful environment together. The GGNRA Plan imposes unreasonable restrictions which will have a very negative impact on the quality of life for people AND dogs!

- SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the "Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA" document on the GGNRA website). They say they received over 4,700 comments, but never say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS says: "NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas." (p. 100). But there's no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.

- SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The SF Supervisors and dog walkers asked for a thorough analysis. What we got was cursory at best.

- SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a miniscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252).

-----

sent via [popvox.com](http://www.popvox.com) ; [info@popvox.com](mailto:info@popvox.com) ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4474	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	El Sobrante, CA 94820
-----------------	-----------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	---

<b>Affiliation:</b>	member
---------------------	--------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 16:52:41
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is simply an abuse of power to make the changes that have made in light of a strong public opinion against the measure. You have eliminated a ridiculous amount - 90% actually, of the off leash area available on GGNRA lands. It is impossible to exercise dogs properly on leash.
------------------------	---

-----

sent via [popvox.com](http://www.popvox.com) ; [info@popvox.com](mailto:info@popvox.com) ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4475	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	El Sobrante, CA 94820
-----------------	-----------------------

---

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because it is far too restrictive to dog owners. It's an important quality of life issue for so many of us.

Thank you.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4476    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061-2532  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/15/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because what makes this part of the world special for me is the possibility of running and playing freely with my dog. Please do not take it away from me.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4477    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116-1469  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/16/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...there is no reasonable basis for this plan.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4478    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 16:57:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

I have been a resident of San Francisco since 1972 and was a supporter in the creation of the GGNRA. It disturbs me greatly that the pet policy which was agreed upon has not been supported and that to the contrary there have been fences constructed and limitations already enforced in many of the areas in which I enjoy the recreation and exercise I get with my dog; Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Muir beach, Mori Point, just to name a few.

I walk with my dogs who are under voice control and within my sight in many areas of the GGNRA at least 4 times a week.

These walks are essential for my health and the health of my dogs. They also greatly contribute to the community of all of the residents of our Golden Gate cities. I always encounter people with AND without dogs and have the healthy important experience of socializing with my community. It is in the best interest of all of our residents to adhere to the original pet policy of 1979.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Anette E. Cohen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4479	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Greenbrae, CA 94904 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 16:57:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please reconsider the constraints you are considering to place on dogs off leash in San Francisco and Marin County.				

Matt

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4480	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	el cerrito, CA 94530 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 17:00:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	limited dog access is just plain wrong- --for some bizarre reasoning-it seems that this rule is never applied to fed employees- -ie the superintendent of yosemite dog used to roam free- --there are very few area were a dog can stretch his legs and just run- -ocean beach is one of those areas and should remain a least optional area- --there at least for the last 50 years have been no shore birds nesting on this beach.				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4481    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:01:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off leash areas available to dog lovers here in San Francisco. It is so important for the people of this beautiful City to have areas to share with our beloved family members.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4482    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Bel Marin Animal Hospital Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:03:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi- I wanted to comment about the severely restrictive Alternative F plan for dog access on GGNRA trails. By now you have heard all the reasons why so many responsible dog owners, including myself, favor the Alternative A (No Action Plan).

I am one of those who helps keep the area clean and does not allow my dog to behave badly on the trail. My Family and I have enjoyed walking with our awesome trail dog, Webster, from my front door to the Oakwood Valley/Alta Fire Road Trails on a weekly basis since moving to Marin County 15 years ago.

I'm sure I'm not the first one to suggest this, but before the dogs are thrown completely out, could there be any consideration for a use permit-type arrangement? You will have to police the area to keep people with dogs out, so why not police the area for permit enforcement? At least permits could generate a modest revenue for improvement and maintenance.

I personally feel these are public lands and their purpose should be for urban recreation and not strictly wilderness preservation like an "official" National Park. Plus, the research is lacking to prove that dogs are a major source of harm to the environment. As it is, some of these lands have already been saved from a terrible fate....remember when there was a proposal for a housing subdivision along the Alta fire Road? Walking a few dogs along that road now does not seem like such a bad idea compared to that scenario.

Anyhow, I am not totally thrilled about paying money to go walk my dog in open space, but I guess either way I would end up paying, especially when I have to get in my car to go find some other area where I can let my buddy off leash.

Thank you for your consideration to leave the 1979 plan in place!

Very Sincerely HYours,  
Melissa A. Robinett, DVM

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4483    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:06:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was at Crissy Field today - an unusually warm day for this time of year. With today being the middle of a three-day weekend the beach was as crowded as it ever gets, with a mixture of picnic groups, families, people walking from east to west beach and back, and lots and lots of dogs.

I have read portions of the dog management plan, and I understand that the park service prefers to have a dog policy that is consistent with the policy in all other national parks. I even understand that this might be the easiest thing for the park service to impose and enforce. However, I find myself disagreeing with every argument made in the planning document. In most cases the arguments consist of statements made as if representing fact, but without any clear supporting evidence. To me, the biggest example is the section that argues that the 95 dog bites recorded over a 4 year period proves that a change in policy is needed. On its own, 95 dog bites in 4 years sounds like a lot, but the report presents no data on the occurrence of dog bites in other parks with a different policy, and with a comparable number of visitors and dogs.

Besides, isn't 95 dog bites in 4 years throughout the entire GGNRA an incredibly LOW number? Perhaps a real data-driven report, which was structured to identify the best policy, might uncover the result that the present policy has had the effect of minimizing the incidence of dog bites!

In any case, my experience today, in which hundreds of people interacted with maybe a hundred dogs, peacefully and joyfully, without any unpleasant incidents, and certainly no dog bites, dog fights, dog attacks, teaches me that the present policy is WORKING WELL. Further, the present policy works well without any large-scale enforcement and without damage to any natural resources. I simply don't believe that the proposed policy change will produce any of the proposed benefits, except that the park service will be able to state that all parks have the same policy. As a citizen and resident of San Francisco, and a taxpayer, and a frequent user of many national parks, I plead with you to leave our park as it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4484    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** American Canyon, CA 94503  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:06:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It would be absolutely heart breaking to not see dogs running around happily upon the sand on Muir Beach. Please do not ban dogs from there and other national parks, our best friends need exercise as well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4485    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Albany, CA 94706  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:07:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Tree Gelb Stuber

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4486	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94709
	United States of America
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:10:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I learned about these proposed changes via radio and my heart was sad. It seems that everyone wants everything for themselves and their interest as opposed to taking a middle path and learning to be together and share.

I am a dog lover and have taken great responsibility in training and watching my dog when she is off leash. I have to say she often receives compliments and frankly she is more responsive to what she is asked to do and has better manners than many adults in public places and then many children.

The great outdoors is for us all and we can learn to share and all enjoy the space together. I do not bird watch but I believe they have a right to be outdoors. I do not geo-cache but I believe they have a right to be there. I do not have a boy scout or girl scout but I believe they have a right to be there.

I would rather we learn to get along and embrace the beauty of the outdoors together then to hate, segregate, separate and loose the real meaning and healing of being out in these amazing places we are preserving as parks.

Dog owners tend to do well in leaving no trace behind but we can always improve. Humans could leave less litter and not use the outdoors as a restroom thus leaving a predator scent as well as endangering ground water. Fisherman could pick up fishing line and lures. Loud children could learn to take a moment of quiet to observe what a squirrel or bird is doing. We could all simply learn to get along in the same great outdoor spaces.

The Bay Area has been a leader in embracing and creating off leash open spaces and I hope with all of my heart that we don't take a single step backwards but rather continue to step forward in leading the country in recognizing that these precious parks are for everyone to enjoy in a variety of ways together as one common humanity.

thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4487    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:18:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

This new dog plan for Rancho Coral de Tierra will very negatively affect my dog and I. I have grown up in Montara and I have been using Rancho for walking my dog many years here. I have been responsible and aware of my dog and his impact at all times. To have the pleasure of walking my dog in this beautiful area is a privileged I hold dear. This plan will not only hurt me but the entire Montara dog walking community which makes up the majority of Rancho's daily walkers. This area has recreational needs and dog walking has been one of the main ways that Montarans fulfill those needs. The Montara dog group has over 400 members who have helped take care of the area by maintaining and using trash bins for dogs.

In reading over this document I have found it very unconvincing. There is little to no evidence of dogs destroying or hurting the vegetation or wildlife in Rancho Corral de Tierra. If I am to accept that claim that off-leash dog walking is causing damage then I need scientific proof. If you can reference any hard evidence of the ecological impact then please let me know.

Most of what is proposed seems to be from assumptions about the people and dogs of Montara based on incidents from other GGNRA areas. How can such a plan be proposed based on such speculation. If a thorough report can be done on Rancho Corral de Tierra specifically and it finds that dog walkers are having such a negative impact that a no-dog rule must be enforced then so be it, thus far I have seen no such report.

I suggest that this plan be scrapped and the current policy (of no action) be maintained. This small but beautiful area is very valuable to a great deal of people and this document provides no solid justification for the destruction of the dog walking community.

Sincerely,  
Jeremy MacKinnon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4488    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:21:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Comments on draft GGNRA Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS

I am writing specifically to protest Alternative C. It proposes an off-leash fenced area between LeConte and Tamarind Streets, Montara, CA. (See text at bottom of letter from page 489. It is also mentioned on pp. 79, 489, 548, 699, and other pages throughout the SEIS.)

My reasons for protesting a dog park in a residential area near an elementary school are:

1. Tamarind Street is very narrow street and lacks sidewalks. Currently, cars often have to take turns passing through the narrowest parts, because there is not room enough for two cars to pass. The street is not equipped to support more traffic and more parking.
2. Le Conte Street on which the Farallone Elementary School is located is not a public street, but a privately owned street. (There are some of those in Montara.) The street is in a dreadful state of disrepair.
3. There is no public street lighting on either Le Conte Street or Tamarind Street.
4. It is unwise to put a public dog park immediately adjacent to an elementary school where children could be exposed to possible predators. This proposed park could put our children at risk.
5. For a large concentration of dogs to collect in the middle of our small residential area would lead to a dramatically noisy situation. Barking dogs and owners shouting commands would disturb nearby residents. Neighboring dogs will join in the barking. We residents will experience both a decrease in our quality of life and our property values. We would lose our quiet neighborhood.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Why not put the dog park near the large planned parking lot to be constructed off Highway 1. With the planned central parking area, there would be a place to distribute plastic bags for poop-pickup and a place to dispose of those poop bags.
2. A fenced area close to Highway 1 is more logical than in a tiny residential neighborhood by an elementary school. It would enable easy access for other neighborhoods, such as Moss Beach, and in general easy access for more people.
3. By Highway 1 parking, the barking of dogs will not disturb local residents. Children will not be put at risk from predators. A quiet peaceful neighborhood will be maintained, and our property values will not be lessened.

.....

Below is "ALTERNATIVE C" as set forth in the current SEIS draft:

**GGNRA Dog Management Plan SEIS - Page 489**

Alternative C: Emphasis on Multiple Use - Balanced by County. Under alternative C, dog walking under voice and site control would be allowed in a ROLA (Regulated Off Leash Area) located between Le Conte and Tamarind Street, in a vegetated open area across the street and east of the Farallone View School. On-leash dog walking would be allowed on designated trails in two areas open to dog walking near Montara and El Granada. The vegetation in the ROLA is not comprised of sensitive coastal scrub/chaparral/grassland vegetation, but is mostly annual, non-native grasses in a wet area. This area would become trampled and could become muddy in the winter rainy season, which may cause erosion

during rain events. In general, impacts on coastal scrub/chaparral/grassland vegetation would be limited to the 6-foot corridors immediately adjacent to the trail and within the small-sized ROLA (LOD area). Impacts in the LOD area would be long term, minor, and adverse since the area supports existing vegetation, that would be impacted. Other impacts on coastal scrub/chaparral/grassland vegetation could include trampling and nutrient addition from dog waste and urine; impacts would be measurable and perceptible, but would be localized in a relatively small area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4489    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Matt Martin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4490    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94804  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:26:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. This is a perversion of the public comment process and reflects a worrisome government intrusion into areas that are supposed to be reserved for the benefit of the people and their dogs.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

As a law-abiding citizen who has made extensive use of the GGNRA properties with my two dogs, I strongly urge you to reconsider this ill-conceived plan to prohibit dogs from GGNRA properties.

Sincerely,  
Heather P. Kulp

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4491	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94618 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, and has for many years, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying recreational areas with my dogs the way I have on GGNRA properties for decades.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, to my knowledge there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that would support such drastic restrictions.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area. The original pet policy in 1979 needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Laura Zuckerman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4492	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 17:31:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 16, 2014				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Susan Dolder, and I live in San Francisco. I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's draft dog management plan.

The GGNRA can accommodate both recreation and conservation. It was designed as an urban recreation

area, not a pristine wilderness area like Yosemite. In fact, the courts have repeatedly upheld the existing 1979 pet policy. They have said that it was consistent in both fact and intent with the original mandate for recreation upon which the GGNRA was founded.

The GGNRA draft plan disregards the health and well-being of people, dogs, and the community. It arbitrarily excludes the Bay Area residents who exercise regularly with their canine companions. This plan discriminates against all people with dogs, including tourists, seniors, families, the disabled, minorities, and others. The plan does not provide evidence to justify such drastic changes to 40 years of healthy dog and human recreation. The Park Service should revise the dog management plan to:

â–ª Honor the original 1979 Pet Policy. Respect dog-walking as legitimate recreation.

â–ª Provide for extensive off and on-leash dog walking on all trails and other lands acquired by the GGNRA since 1979, especially in San Mateo County.

â–ª Exclude speculative, exaggerated, biased, or misleading statements and studies.

â–ª Provide reasonable ways to address any significant adverse impacts from recreational activities. Use objective standards applicable to other recreational activities (e.g., equestrians, boaters, fishermen, surfers, bicyclists, beach-goers, joggers, walkers).

â–ª Eliminate "compliance-based management," which will allow additional restrictions to be implemented without any public input.

Sincerely,  
Susan Dolder

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4493	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 17:34:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a Marin County resident who walks daily with her dog on GGNRA properties, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Preferred Alternative F described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in our comments submitted in 2011. As you are aware, the feedback in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan. It appears to me that our feedback did not make a difference, that GGNRA's mind was already made up.

Your preferred alternative/plan is overly restrictive and is not based on a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas as required by law. By not allowing dogs on most GGNRA lands and requiring them to be leashed on the majority of others, you are banning me and thousands of dog owning Bay Area residents from hiking on neighboring lands and enjoying local beaches which we have been visiting with our dogs for many years.

When I first moved to Marin County, I enjoyed hiking the Tennessee Valley Trail to the beach and back. Then I adopted my first dog in 1997 and I learned to my chagrin that dogs were not allowed in that area, thus I have been there only 2 or 3 times since. No responsible dog owners will leave their dog alone at home and go on a hike in an area where their dog is not allowed. Thus, when you ban dogs you ban people too. Is that the intent? GGNRA land is in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different

management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

I exercise my dog on weekdays in Homestead Valley and have been for almost 5 years. He runs, he fetches the ball, he socializes with other dogs we meet on the fire road, and I get my exercise while hiking with him. He is under voice control except near the road. The Executive Summary states that Under the no-action alternative, impacts to wildlife would be long-term, minor to moderate, and adverse. What wildlife? I have never seen a northern spotted owl residing there. If there were any spotted owls, they probably already relocated to Mount Tamalpais State Park which is across the road and further from humans. I have seen several coyotes there over the years. We don't mess with them. The only other wildlife I have observed is moles which are digging up the land. Are they under Federal protection?

Most of the visitors I meet in Homestead Valley are local residents walking their off-leash dogs, a few commercial dog walkers, a handful of runners and some bicyclists. Very few people walk in Homestead Valley without dogs. The Executive Summary states that the impact of your preferred alternative would be long-term, minor, and adverse to visitors who enjoy having dogs at the park & while the impact to visitors who do not enjoy dogs at the park would be beneficial. Impact to park operations would be beneficial for all action alternatives, since the site would change from voice and sight control to on-leash. Excuse me, since only 1% of the GGNRA land is currently available to owners of off-leash dogs, why are the preferences of people who do not enjoy dogs and usually do not visit Homestead Valley given priority over people with dogs in this little sliver of land? People who do not enjoy or are fearful of dogs have hundreds of other park options to visit! Furthermore, based on my observations your rangers are not doing anything in Homestead Valley, so any action alternative would require more effort from park operations than status quo. In the 5 years I have been going there I have never met a ranger on the fire road or on the trails, except in a car driving down the fire road once, presumably touring the area. The wildlife and my dog are more at risk from stepping on broken glass from teenagers drinking in the area than this area being at risk from my off-leash dog. Please do not try to restrict me and dozens of other tax-paying residents from exercising our dogs off-leash in the spectacular Homestead Valley.

I have been visiting Oakwood Valley with my dogs for 16 years. Currently I am usually there on the weekends. Most of the people I meet walk their dogs off-leash. It is a very popular dog walking area. Your proposal contains no scientific proof that off-leash dog walking in Oakwood Valley has a detrimental impact on the livelihood of the spotted owl or the mission blue butterflies. Rather than changing the area to leash-only dog walking, can you post some signs in areas where the mission blue butterflies may be found? Finally, since only 1% of the GGNRA allows dogs, I think visitors who do not enjoy dogs could drive one half a mile further to the Tennessee Valley Trail and hike there. I don't think that's a huge sacrifice.

I love to take dogs to Muir Beach. They get super happy and excited when the ocean air hits their noses and they discover where they are. I realize that giving dogs on-leash access to Muir Beach seemed better than no access at all proposed in the original plan, but it doesn't make sense in reality. Would you take your kids/grandkids to Disneyland and not allow them to go on any rides? Dogs like to run, play, fetch and swim at the beach. The only thing they can do on-leash at the beach is dig in the sand. This is a totally unsatisfactory experience for both the dog and her human. Please, keep the no action off-leash alternative! Post signs near sensitive habitat and ticket irresponsible owners who truly do damage to the sensitive areas at the beach.

Somehow the GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. The trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking and beach going since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with more off-leash areas, not less. Make Tennessee Valley Trail accessible to people with dogs! Keep the public informed of sensitive habitat through good signage. Ticket irresponsible visitors. Don't make dogs the



scapegoats.

Sincerely,  
Pavla Sim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4494    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:42:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F

I support Alternative A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4495    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94804  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:44:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow our dogs access to the off-leash areas already established. It is already bad that our urbanites have to travel long distance just to enjoy making contact with Mother Nature as they were meant to do. The owners who can manage these drives are the fortunate ones. Can you imagine the thousands of dogs who never get to run freely in an opened area from day one because their owners are limited either financially or mobility impaired or are not aware that dogs need to exercise just like their human owners?! Constricting these areas for dogs is also constricting it for their human families! It is bad enough that public schools do not promote physical education for our children! Shutting these designated areas to man's best friends is shutting down free recreational activities to the American taxpayers and their families! Please reconsider your position by allowing these opened areas to remain as they are - open for dogs off-leash!! California needs these spaces to benefit its children's interests in recreational activities because it promotes healthy behavior! Tapping into recreational activity - taps into the right side of one's brain - thus creativity gets triggered - thus peace and harmony surfaces! Think about our Vets with their dogs and their children or families. Please be generous by allowing these designated areas to exist as designed by your predecessors. We need access to outdoor exercise and for those who love and honor our loyal four legged friends that live in our urbanite confinements, we plea with our hearts and souls. There is nothing more beautiful to experience as a family to enjoy having the family dog join us on an outing where freedom with God's elements can be experienced equally for at least in this outing. Everyday I thank God for allowing me the previledge in being able to access Pt. Isabel Park. As a Nurse, I maintain my health daily along with my dog. It is comforting to do this in a safe environment away from the dangers of traffic and without the confinements of a leash. A promotion of stability gets us home satisfactorily.

I feel sorry for the thousands of owners who have never had an opportunity such as allowing their dog(s) to run freely at least for an hour after being confined in his owner's habitat where only a door exists that allows sounds of people's footsteps or a yard converted into a kennel if there is a yard.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4496    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA-

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and the Oakwood valley fire road.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Many thanks for your consideration in keeping the GGNRA as part of what makes the Bay Area such a wonderful place to live.

Julie Cullinane-Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4497    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:49:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Catharine Keyes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4498    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:54:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and Oakwood Vally Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Caitlin Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4499    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 17:55:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and Oakwood Valley Trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public

lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4500    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94618  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a native San Franciscan and a frequent user of the GGNRA, I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Stephanie Sanders-Badt  
Oakland

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4501    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 18:11:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern

I was disappointed to hear that the GGNRA plans to make 90% o the available off leash areas in San Francisco now 'on leash'. I have a small energetic terrier and it is important that she get to run (much faster than I can ever walk her) a couple of times a week.

I currently visit Chrissie Field, East Beach and the pathway that leads to the warming hut several times a month. I see some areas (tidal pond) and part of the beach already fenced off to protect the wildlife from dogs (and people).

99.9% o the time I visit the area with my dog I encounter no problem letting her run off leash on the beach, nor do I often see any problems with other dogs - even the large packs brought in by the dog walkers. I do, on occasion see a misbehaved dog (and for that matter, a misbehaved person, too).

So why the need to change the current situation? Where is my dog (and all the others in SF) supposed to go for a run?

I strongly urge you to reconsider the proposed change to off leash areas for dogs in GGNRA as the current plan works just fine!!!

Regards,  
Judy Kokura

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4502    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 18:14:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not reduce off leash areas. It's hard as it is to find open space to throw a ball for your dog. The off leash areas in most parks are small & get too congested with dogs & their people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4503    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 18:24:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am not a dog owner. I walk from our home to the Golden Gate Bridge along Crissy Field approximately 200 times a year.  
One of the highlights of my day is to walk on the path along the beach and watch the dogs playing. Most of the dog owners are very responsible and pick up after their dogs. I'm more dismayed at the horse poop that is left by the park police horses that never gets cleaned up. I'm amazed at how well-behaved the dogs are. i so enjoy their romping and chasing and running. If the city/government has an issue with certain dogs off-leash then I would like the city/government to deal with those dogs specifically. The city/gov. should not punish all dogs because of the behaviors of a select few.

PLEASE allow dogs to remain free and to run and play.

In a city/state that is so adamant about free-range animals.....what about dogs? Let them have good lives and run and romp and not be limited by a leash law.

We want our food to be free-range, but the government wants our pets to be leashed? This makes NO SENSE!

Many of these dogs live in small residences as a result of city living. They need exercise, like their owners!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4504    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 18:28:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, George P. Polchow

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4505    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in Fort Funston and Stern Grove, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. I know many of my friends feel the same way and we are extremely unhappy about GGNRA and its new plan.

The new plan was not put together to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.  
Please DROP the proposed plan!

---

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4506    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean  
GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

February 16, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Kathryn Coffey and I have been a resident of San Francisco for 20 years. I walk on a daily basis in areas such as Crissy Field, the Presidio trails and weekly at Fort Funston. I walk with my dog in this area precisely because it is located in an urban environment and is unique in offering a safe open space where I can socialize with friends and provide on and off leash exercise for my dog. Walking my dog improves both my dog's and my physical and mental health. My dog is an SF SPCA certified Animal Assisted Therapy dog. Exercise is an important part of her daily routine, both walking with me and occasionally with her dog walker. Access to the GGNRA for this highly social activity is an important aspect of the quality of life in San Francisco. I have noticed over the past 20 years that the dog owners who walk at Crissy Field, specifically since the renovation 15 or so years ago, are responsible, careful, respectful and usually leave the park cleaner than how they found it...picking up trash left by picnickers and other visitors. Walking on the beach with my dog is how my family enjoys our free time and is often the highlight of the visits for friends when they visit from out of town.

I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative the proposed Dog Management Plan that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dog(s) in the near and longer term future. The conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Further, and importantly, I strongly oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel segregated and discriminated against.

Because dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years for come per GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It is managed for financial sustainability and contains both residential and commercial activities as an extension of the urban area that surrounds it. As such, it should to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential and provide maximum enjoyment by visitors to and residents of the Bay Area that recreate regularly on this land.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the

SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS permits further restrictions in the future and on newly acquired lands, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS strongly suggesting that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Specifically addressing Crissy Field, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure. Further examining Crissy Field, the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. I cannot tell you the number of children I have seen running on the dunes in protected areas where the snowy plover live, families picnicking and playing football right in front of "protected wilderness area" signs, wind surfers displacing people walking on the beach (with and without dogs), trash being thrown around and not in the cans, etc.... Your data has a very narrow lens and, on its own, simply does not statically support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for \$2,000,000 for more rangers. Use the money for path restorations and infrastructure upgrades. Where does your data capture the hundreds of thousands of hours of smiles and joy, from dog and non-dog owners alike, that is created by walking with our dogs on the beach and watching them swim.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of historically granted and important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come. The SEIS seems to select dog walking as a single threat to the GGNRA. What about the negative impact of very large groups that use the spaces (and take over large areas and roadway access) for events, what about the terrible light pollution emitted from the sports facilities at the west end of Crissy Field ? The myopic approach and grossly disproportional focus on visitors with dogs to environmental impact at Crissy Field and other GGNRA locations is flawed and deeply troubling.

Dog guardians, parents with children, older citizens, disabled citizens and large groups for special events should all have equal access to all GGNRA areas that are not historically designated as wildlife protected areas of the parks. Dogs and people are co-existing now and visits by both groups have grown in the recent years as improvements have been made to the GGNRA lands. Restrictions on dog owners make us a separate class of GGNRA visitors with restricted access. The current preferred alternatives outlined in the SEIS are flawed, based on incomplete information and discriminate against a large population of visitors to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Sincerely,

Kathryn E. Coffey  
San Francisco



---

**Correspondence ID:** 4507    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94921  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 18:31:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Born and raised in San Francisco three generations!!

Owned, trained and groomed dogs for 35 years.

Humans do far more damage, cause more trouble and devastate our parks mor than any four leg creature!!

This is proposition is so outrageous!!

Free our parks!!

Rules not banishment!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4508    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** uperintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4509    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94404  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 18:36:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear council member,  
This plan is unfair to dog lovers and their companions. There is so little space for us now, with only tiny

---

little fenced in areas that only create chaos for animals who need space. The guardians of these animals clean up after them, care for them like our children, pay taxes, make good salaries and invest in our dog's and the state - we need the places we have now to spend time that creates healthy dogs, by keeping them exercised and happy. I need to swim my Lab for his hip dysplasia and arthritis and I have no options but the ocean. It's for his health. Please reconsider this ban - I am a tax payer and I want to live here for my career at a large Biotech. I had much better options for a well rounded life in Seattle, but chose my company to have a strong career. I have a dog who helps me through my medical issues and having no space to share with him where he can run and be happy, socializing with people and animals, is not a fair and equitable situation for the many tax paying dog lovers in our cities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4510    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kate Tierney

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4511    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 18:39:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I feel strongly that GGNRA and NPS should not take action and should implement alternative A. We need off-leash and voice control areas. Alternative F does not allow for enough off-leash or voice control. Off-leash and under voice control is a must have feature and a reason I and a number of people I know live in San Francisco. I would seriously consider moving to the East Bay/Oakland, should it become more restrictive to walk my dog off-leash and under voice control.

The cost to implement the plan both to the GGNRA and to the people who will get tickets is not positive

---

for anyone in the community. Those without dogs have thousands of options in the Bay Area, and dog owners continue to be forced out across the state. There will without a doubt be thousands of people confronting park staff and it's not something we should move towards. They should be focused on more important things.

Off-leash dogs and responsible owners should not be punished, do not have enough space currently, and should instead be embraced in areas already off-leash. I see more conflicts in areas with leash restrictions than in those without because non-dog owners become even more intense and pissed off when they see people with dogs. My dog is more responsible off-leash than he is when on a leash and he requires exercise which I am not able to provide him with on leash. It's challenging to walk him on leash and it's more stressful. When off-leash, he's able to go at his own speed and he ignores all other animals and park visitors.

I don't really care about commercial dog walking one way or the other, but any time I see large groups they're usually fine.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4512	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Foster City, CA 94404 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 18:41:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a taxpayer, and responsible dog owner for over 60 years, I think I and my dog should have reasonable and equal rights to use public land and beaches as do any other tax payer. I don't have kids, but gladly support public schools and playgrounds. All I ask is a reasonable accommodation on PUBLIC property to allow my dog to walk/run off leash. These restrictions are unnecessary and unwarranted. The hysteria about dogs is nothing but political hype and misleading info by selfish narrow minded special interest groups. Which proves that the squeaky wheel gets the grease. Thank you Norm Kirby				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4513	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 18:47:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs are an important and integral part of our social lives. Dogs need a place to run free. The great majority of dog obey voice commands and their people are mindful of the need to respect cleanliness and wildlife. Allowing areas for dogs and people to enjoy each other and nature with the restriction of a leash is valuable to our quality of life. We want well-managed parks, but not at the cost of too much sterility and loss of freedom to enjoy these parks with our children and dog companions.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4514	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 18:47:52				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for taking initiative on this issue. I support the NPS preferred plan as a good compromise. However, in Crissy Field beaches I'd like to see more restrictions and would only allow dogs on leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4515 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 18:49:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to trails within the GGNRA and he is very well behaved.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4516 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 19:05:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There is previous little area for dogs off leash - please preserve Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4517 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 19:14:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We need off-leash areas for our pets to run, play, exercise and socialize. Do not take this basic right away from our pets. This is NOT FAIR!!! IT'S CRUEL and SELFISH!!!!

Nita Ybarra

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4518 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. These comments are from tax paying people who also deserve access and rights to the land. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. This area is self-policed and a model for such an area considering the countless number of families who enjoy and delight in the great outdoors with their dogs.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. It has completely lost its way and does not serve the tax paying public for which it is supposed to serve. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
This new plan must be rejected.

Sincerely,  
Elisabeth Herald

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4519    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** na Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 19:18:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

It is painful to even contemplate the effect of the proposed restrictions on dogs in off-leash areas, now under consideration by the GGNRA.

Dogs should be allowed the joy of romping freely in the areas where they are currently allowed- - an area that is minimal enough, comprising as it does a tiny percent of all GGNRA lands.

In an ideal world, more space for this worthy purpose would be available- -but surely, surely, not less!  
Elisabeth Keller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4520    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 19:19:30

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I never thought I would own dogs. But now I do. I have three small rescue dogs all of whom would have been euthanized if not rescued from the shelter. We fostered them, stabilized and socialized them and they became part of our lives.

They are small and we live in a very urban area near the ballpark. They cannot run on the large gravel in the two nearby dog runs. Also, one is very noisy and frightening (at the base of the Bay Bridge) and the other has a lot of big dogs.

Our great joy (and theirs) is going to Fort Funston on the weekend. What a better way to enjoy the open undeveloped areas in the city that walking with our dogs, enjoying the scenery along with other dog owners in the Bay area.

I've always been amazed at how well all of the dogs behave when off leash. I've never seen an incident in the several years I have been going there (other than one dog who got down on the cliffs)

Our dogs are so animated and happy there. They feel safe. They can run around free and stay close to us when we tell them to. We do not let them stray off the path on the way down to the beach.

When they might occasionally bark at another dog when on leash on the sidewalk in our neighborhood, they exhibit no such behaviour when free and running around with other dogs.

And when they hit the beach - it is amazing how they run around and chase each other and meet other dogs. They could not do this safely anywhere else. And it is a joy that should be preserved to all who have access to this.

98% of the people we see at Fort Funston are there with their dogs. These lands are for recreation and it is being used exactly as intended. It is being used well and for joy.

If there have been problems I've not been aware of you should solve them. If that means having a staff member around to monitor any issues (I've never ever seen anyone) then why not fund that by charging for the parking. Or why not let the dog community self organize volunteer "docents"

There could be so many creative ways to address any issues. But banning this joyous resource from well behaved off leash dogs is socially criminal and not what the Bay Area is all about.

I invite you to come for a walk with us one Sunday and see how wonderful it is when a huge number of people from the community can enjoy all the city has to offer its residents (including citizen dogs)

Thank you for considering this letter. Please take this plea seriously. It is important to people like me, who count on their hard earned tax dollars supporting recreational areas like this. We work so we can play. We don't want to pay to be banned.

With kind regards, respect and support for all aspects of the GGNRA - except this proposal.  
Linda Marshall

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4521	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94618				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 19:21:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the new severe restrictions being placed on off-leash dogs in the GGNRA. These areas are recreation areas for our urban community. All members of the community should be welcome. The places currently open to dog walking have been successfully used for many years and represent only a small part of the GGNRA. It is unreasonable and unfair to make these changes. I know that the NPS has heard numerous comments opposing these changes. I find it disturbing that our needs as a community are being ignored. This prejudice against dogs in this highly populated and heavily used area doesn't make sense. Please reconsider and allow us to continue as it is. We are not asking for more open space (though I think it would be reasonable to), we are simply asking for continued access. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4522    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sonoma, CA 95476  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4523    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 19:27:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I beg of the GGNRA to keep Fort Funston leash free, I believe with all my heart that if it were not, it would be another bed of homeless people, like so many other SF parks, left undesirable for anyone to go to.

I also beg to keep more leashed areas in Pacifica, not restrict any further. The land have to be shared by all residents and species.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4524    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,16,2014 19:30:37**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Out National Parks are a true treasure. They preserve some of the most beautiful parts of our country to be enjoyed by this and future generations. But they are living things not museums. They are to be used responsibly for recreation and enjoyment not preserved to be looked at. They are for individuals and families and those families include dogs. Many of us have wonderful memories of walking our dogs on this region's beautiful beaches, this proposed restriction will prevent those memories being formed in the future. Does the GGNRA really want to be responsible for taking away such a pure and simple pleasure that encourages families to get outdoors and be part of California's natural beauty?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4525 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,16,2014 19:34:03**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Barri Swett

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4526 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,16,2014 19:42:13**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

As someone who regularly enjoys walking my dog on Crissy Field/Beach, I am writing to express my displeasure with the GGNRA's proposed dog management plan.

The new plan is in direct conflict with the spirit of the use of the land - which is to use it as a recreational



area. The GGNRA was built and designed for dog-walking from the beginning, to allow city residents the ability to walk their dogs in a recreational area. In fact, congressional reports specifically named dog walking as one of the uses for the space when the GGNRA was created. The GGNRA's current plan, however, would seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the supplemental EIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties.â€This management plan allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Additionally, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a blatant reversal without reason. I feel like the plan is set up to fail because it will force more dogs in a smaller concentrated area, which will actually negatively impact visitors than the current system.

Thank you,

Alex Livingston

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4527	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Portola Valley, CA 94028 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Anastasia S. Eckstein

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4528	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Concord, CA 94521 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 19:58:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't put further restrictions on the few off-leash areas we have in the Bay area to bring dogs!				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4529    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mountain View, CA 94040  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 20:03:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Draft Dog Management Committee;

I think you should spend a bit of time considering the law of unintended consequences in regard to this new plan.

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

Second, dog owners in the Bay Area are at the breaking point with restrictions. There are simply not enough areas to hike with dogs. I am a very law abiding citizen. But I will not allow my dog to suffer because of unjust rules. Many, many dog owners feel the same. So we will walk our dogs illegally.

It is unethical to have a city where dogs can be owned, but they are not given ample place to play, socialize, and exercise.

Again, MORE space available for dogs will solve your problems. You are shooting yourselves in the foot with this plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4530    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hayward, CA 94541  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Hsiao Chien Lim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4531    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 20:19:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan.

Our public parks and lands should be for ALL families - including those with furry family members like mine. It is already a challenge to find spaces where my entire family, including my dog, can hike or just enjoy some time sitting outside together without a leash (and actually at all). The GGNRA's draft plan will make the current sub-par situation even worse. The GGNRA should look at the East Bay Regional Parks for an example of how families with dogs can be welcomed in parks instead of shunned.

I believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRA's original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan fails to do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4532    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 20:25:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Good day,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the GGNRA Dog Management Plan.

I am a tax payer, voter, small business owner, nature enthusiast, and a dog advocate.

Discriminating against dog owners by banning dogs from recreational parks such as Fort Funston and Crissy Field under the guise of "compromise" is unjust and bad for the surrounding urban community. GGNRA areas were designed to be accessed for recreational activity and are distinct from protected and isolated habitats such as Yellowstone and Yosemite. Recreational areas adjacent to urban environments need their own form of protection for public recreational use, as opposed to special interests or fringe environmental causes. Less than 1% of GGNRA is lawful dog friendly space. This tiny portion of space allocated for dog families needs not only to be protected and maintained, but it needs to be expanded. San Francisco has a growing population of dog residences. Some estimates say that close to 1/3 of San Franciscans own pets. People and dogs are also products of nature and we require natural space to exercise and socialize. The proposed Dog Management Plan is draconian as it severely curtails and limits the now already small space that dog owners can enjoy. Some maps show up to 90% of existing dog friendly space lost in the GGNRA.

Reducing 75-90% of the currently less than 1% of dog friendly space in the GGNRA is nothing short of an all out government assault against lawful dog owning citizens. We can not afford to "compromise" any more space. The shared recreational use at places like Fort Funston has been very successful since the 1979 handover of territories to the GGNRA. If it ain't broke, than don't fix it.

John Chirico  
Dog owner and nature enthusiast

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4533    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 20:28:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having safe off-leash areas for our four-legged companions is crucial to this city. Such areas draw people to SF, and allow recreational activities that happen to be enjoyed by people and their pets. Please understand how life-changing it would be to so many SF residents that it would significantly lower the quality of life for many.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4534    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94125  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 20:29:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not believe the GGNRA analysis is accurate. We should continue to allow dogs access to Fort Zfunston, Chrissy Field and the Presidio. Dogs are an important part of the civic experience,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4535    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 20:31:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not change the amount of open and off leash space. It would decrease or almost eliminate something that enriches my life and my dogs' lives so much. We utilize these open spaces for socialization and exercise every week. This would kill something so amazing about this area. Please, please, please don't do it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4536    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Donna Bonifield from Daly City my dog and I walk Crissy Fields, Fort Funston every day of the week, rain, fog or shine. I pay taxes so I can enjoy spaces such as Crissy Fields, Fort Funston to walk with my dog off-leash.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

---

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4537	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Greenbrae, CA 94904 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 20:34:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep off leash areas for dogs in the GGNRA! Their owners pay taxes and the dogs need a place to run and socialize.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4538	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco Ca, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 20:34:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My service dog & I really need for our therapy Space to be available for us to continue our treatment				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4539	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Portola Valley, CA 94028 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 20:36:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear National Park Service,				

---

I urge you to reconsider your current plan in regards to constraining dog use in the GGNRA. Please do not sacrifice the joys and needs of mans best friend. The land currently provided dogs in the GGNRA not only provides much needed space, play and comfort to many dogs; it gives a wonderful place for their owners to come and relax with their pets, exercise and experience many beautiful areas they might otherwise never see. I hope you can find an alternative to the current plan that does not sacrifice the happiness of so many.

---

Sincerely,

Nathan Hanley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4540    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 20:36:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to urge the GGNRA to ensure that imperiled wildlife, including threatened species such as the Snowy Plover and other creatures which live within the GGNRA properties have the opportunity to thrive within the GGNRA boundaries, which means there MUST be areas which are strictly off-limits to dogs.

The GGNRA has a large mix of lands, but it is important in that context that citizens understand that their right to own a dog does not trump the rights of wildlife, or the rights of their fellow citizen to admire the serenity and rare beauty without dog disturbances.

As a lifelong dog lover, I understand that people will want areas to bring their dogs, and even areas where they

may be off leash, but it is absolutely vital that the species which absolutely rely on GGNRA lands have FIRST PRIORITY, and their needs and respect for those needs must always supersede the particular interests of dog owners. Unfortunately, there are many irresponsible dog owners or clueless and short-sighted individuals who think, "Oh, but my dog doesn't chase birds." That is not the point. The point is that the presence of dogs in some areas is absolutely not compatible with allowing the GGNRA wildlife to survive and thrive. If dogs are allowed to be off-leash in some particular portions of the GGNRA, I suggest that those areas

be well marked as the ONLY areas for dogs within the larger GGNRA and, further, that fines for violations of the dog rule in wildlife sensitive portions of the GGNRA be raised significantly. Dogs pose a serious menace to threatened species such as Snowy Plovers just by their presence. In creating a fear-generated disturbance to nesting plovers, for example, a single irresponsible dog owner and canine can undue decades of work to recover the population of the plovers and to set aside areas for them to breed and thrive, at taxpayer expense running in the millions of dollars. The fines for violations of the GGNRA dog rules need to be steep enough to dissuade even the arrogant and irresponsible from even contemplating violating a protected area.

The GGNRA lands are amazing places for RESPONSIBLE citizens and visitors to enjoy, but they must have a very carefully conceived and STRICTLY ENFORCED ban on dogs in wildlife sensitive areas.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Cindy Margulis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4541    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
John Farris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4542    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My name is Ronald. I live in Mill Valley. I have lived here for almost 50 years. I use Muir Beach, and Tennessee Valley and Crissy Field and Ocean Beach with great frequency.

I oppose the Preferred Alternatives because they are too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

The SEIS still lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

The SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific

studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not to do them.

The SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

The SEIS says there has to be a no-dog area at all sites where off-leash dog walking is allowed. For example, the SEIS says Muir Beach is too small to have both an off-leash and a no-dog area, so therefore there cannot be an off-leash area at Muir Beach (p. 113). There's no similar idea that sites that are no-dog also have to include off-leash areas. This shows the inherent unfairness of the SEIS.

The SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA document on the GGNRA website). They say they received over 4,700 comments, but never say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS says: NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas. (p. 100). But there's no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.

The SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011, and by the Marin County Board of Supervisors in 2014. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a minuscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) in the GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.

The SEIS still does not consider management tools that could mitigate alleged impacts from dogs in the No-Action Alternative. For example, dog training classes, dog-horse workshops, and poop cleanup days could all mitigate concerns about dog safety and pathogens in feces that are used to argue that the No-Action Alternative will not work and therefore the GGNRA must restrict off-leash access.

The SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way,



that In many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities. (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to & expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972)

The SEIS will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. The only site-specific consensus agreement to come out of Negotiated Rulemaking was to allow off-leash dog walking on a trail in Oakwood Valley in Marin. This was included in the DEIS. However, it was removed from the SEIS (Oakwood Valley is now proposed to be on-leash only) because the GGNRA decided that there would be no off-leash dog walking on any trail. All the money and work that went into Negotiated Rulemaking was wasted.

The SEIS still will not allow any off-leash dog walking on New Lands acquired by the GGNRA in the future, even if dog walking occurs has traditionally occurred there.

The SEIS cites several surveys of visitor use and visitor satisfaction, including two done in 2011 in response to DEIS comments, that were so poorly done that their results are essentially meaningless. A 2008 visitor use survey at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field used people who intercepted people at these sites and asked about their park usage. However, the interceptors were observed by several people to actively avoid talking to people walking with dogs, hopelessly skewing their results. A 2011 visitor use survey at Fort Funston and Muir Beach, done specifically in response to DEIS comments, only counted people as walking dogs if they had a leash in their hand. People walking with a friend and the friends dog were not counted as a dog walker (because they did not have a dog of their own with them), even though they were only walking there to walk with the friends dog. A 2011 Visitor Satisfaction Survey was so confusing respondents didnt know if they were being asked about their satisfaction with current conditions at GGNRA sites or with the severe restrictions proposed in the DEIS.

The SEIS still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who dont want to be around dogs. This criticism was made of the DEIS too and apparently ignored.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4543	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Seattle, WA 98102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 20:50:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

My family visits the area every year and we enjoy taking our ENTIRE family, dog included, to the dog accessible beaches and trails.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4544	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 20:52:31				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have lived in San Francisco for 35 years and have had companion dogs for most of that time. I have always enjoyed walking my dogs in areas where they can be allowed off leash. I am a responsible dog owner. In the summer of 2012, my wife and I acquired a new puppy, and with the help of SF Puppy Prep, we have trained him to be an excellent companion. He is socialized and well behaved with other dogs as well as people. He is a small (15 pound) cross between a Poodle and an Australian Shepherd. He has been trained to come when called.

For over a year, we have taken our dog to Crissy Field beach on most weekend days. We especially enjoy being able to let him off leash. He is so happy to run and interact with other dogs at the beach, that it brings joy to our hearts and helps to relieve the stresses of living and working in a city. We regard this as one of our favorite parts of living in San Francisco.

In over 100 visits to Crissy Field beach with our dog, I have never observed any problems with off leash dogs. The people who bring their dogs to Crissy Field seem to be a very responsible group of dog owners, and everyone cleans up after their dogs.

I support the status quo. It seems to me that the 1979 pet policy is working very well, and the new draft policy and EIR are not premised on evidence that a change is needed or warranted. To the contrary. If the draft proposed policy were enacted there would be significant adverse impacts. These have not been adequately studied. You would not only reduce the recreational enjoyment for large numbers of people who use the GGRA, you would unduly stress certain areas that remain approved for dogs, as well as SF city parks.

I urge you to consider the recreational purposes for which the GGNRA was set aside, to take a balanced fact-based approach, and to defer any change pending further empirical evidence and study.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey J. Cole  
I urge you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4545	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 21:01:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** The joy that I get from being able to get outside and walk and play with my dog off leash is indescribable. My dog is the reason for me to get exercise, to meet other people and to love the fact that I live in San Francisco. Please do not take that away from me, my dog, and all the other dog owners in our beautiful city.

With that said, I am not thrilled with dog walkers who have four or more dogs running loose. I think they should be regulated and not more than three dogs should be under the supervision of one person.

I love my dog, I love watching him run free, and I love how other people enjoy watching my Golden loving life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4546    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 21:08:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative set forth in the GGNRA's revised draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and will significantly impair the culturally valued, time-honored tradition of off-leash dog hiking in small segments of the GGNRA.

On a personal note, I am 63 years old and fighting a fierce battle with stage IV cancer. There is no doubt in my mind that the reason I have done as well as I have in the last year is in very large measure because of the frequent hikes I have been able to take at Fort Funston with my well behaved off-leash dog and the ability to interact with the extraordinary community there.

It is disheartening in the extreme to see such a healthy, community-building activity - an activity that in fact has been enjoyed by humans and their canine companions worldwide for well over 10,000 years - treated as an intrusion, a potential impact to be marginalized if not eventually stamped out altogether within GGNRA. All without a single peer-reviewed site-specific study to support such a drastic change.

Conservation of recreation is a crucial GGNRA value that should not be impaired, and off-leash recreation should be treated with the respect it deserves as a time-honored and cherished cultural tradition.

What legacy are we leaving for future generations if a child receives a new puppy as a birthday present in the year 2050, then realizes there are no hiking trails available, only small fenced pens. Will that child have to learn about the joys of off-leash trail hiking from ancient history books?

Incident reports from 2013 show a small number of dog-related incidents within the hundreds of thousands of visits to the GGNRA, much smaller than the number of reported incidents involving people; again, data that does not support the need for such a drastic change nor the request for a staggering \$2 million for more rangers.

The 1979 Pet Policy was created as a result of extensive public hearings and input from all stakeholders and allows off-leash recreation on a very small fraction of GGNRA lands, with mechanisms in place for dealing with people/dogs who cause problems. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Recreation and resource protection have been balanced for decades within the GGNRA. Let's leave a legacy for future generations that not only supports protection of natural resources but also protects and respects culturally valued recreation in this densely populated urban area, as clearly envisioned by those who established the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. To impair that cultural value significantly without scientific basis would be inconceivable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4547    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Fremont, CA 94538  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Petra Leible

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4548	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fremont, CA 94538 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Michael Goeller

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4549	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 21:17:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I wholeheartedly support the NPS's effort to enact and enforce a stronger dog management policy in San Francisco. The current situation is unsafe for our families, unsustainable for our natural resources and completely out of line with other cities' dog management policies.				

---

As a mother of three living in the city, I am appalled at the misuse of public spaces by dog owners. There are so many dogs off-leash in the public parks that it is nearly impossible to walk anywhere without an off-leash dog running up to me and my children. Unfortunately, the attitude of many of these dog owners is that their dog is entitled to use public space just as people are, but I have witnessed non-service dogs biting children, dogs peeing on personal belongings, running through fenced children's playgrounds and on public transportation. I even see off-leash, non-service dogs in grocery stores.

Last month, a very large labrador approached my two sons who were strapped into their stroller while we were walking down a very busy section of Fillmore Street. It shoved its nose in my son's face. My son pushed him away. This dog was off-leash and the owner casually said "he's friendly." No matter how friendly, dog owners cannot always predict their own dog's reaction, nor can they predict the reaction of a startled toddler who has just been accosted by an uninvited large dog.

Prior to that, my 2 year old son has been knocked over by large dogs running off-leash in Julius Khan Park and again INSIDE the gated playground in Alta Plaza Park.

Dog owners in this city need clear guidelines and signage to tell them where their dogs are welcome and where they are NOT welcome. These areas and laws should be enforced.

I am concerned by the amount of media and grassroots attention that the opposition to this effort has gathered. I believe the supporters of this effort are not going to be as loud as the opposition so I sincerely hope that the NPS take into consideration the years of formalized complaints filed by families of children who have been bitten, elderly who cannot safely walk down the street, beach-goers who cannot find a clean spot to lay their blanket, and cannot sit without fear that a dog is going to charge at their children.

I commend your effort to right something that is horribly wrong with this wonderful city and make it a safe place for all of us.

This is written by a mother AND DOG OWNER who wants the best for my family and city.

Regards,  
Rachel Holbrook

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4550    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a native Californian and homeowner living in Bernal Heights and take my dogs to Fort Funston almost every day of the year. Part of the appeal to living in California and San Francisco is the access to parks and the beach. Being able to take my dogs out and get regular exercise benefits both my physical and mental health. It is greatly discouraging to have felt that all talks and negotiations were completely disregarded when this new draft was put forward with very few changes in place.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Enclosed parks are generally stressful for dogs and humans and do not allow enough space to properly exercise my dog or self.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

There is no valid reason being presented to restrict our access to these lands. I would happily pay a yearly or day use fee in order to make sure the land and space was being cared for and supported. There has been no evidence presented that says that dogwalkers are affecting the land or wildlife in a negative way. Please do not make unnecessary restrictions to land that we treasure and frequent.

**Correspondence ID:** 4551    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 21:29:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I work for an environmental organization and have a long history in the environmental community, going back beyond the early 1990s when I was chair of the San Francisco Bay Chapter of the Sierra Club (however I do not represent or speak for the Club today; my views are solely my own).

I want to thank the Park Service for many years of dedicated stewardship. I have personally participated in trail maintenance in the GGNRA and have seen much good work at all levels by rangers, staff and administrators. I have been supportive of Park Service rules for a very long time, especially on user group issues.

I have lived very near the Marin Headlands since the 1980s and have never owned a dog or taken one into the GGNRA. But on the issue of Alternative F, I respectfully ask my friends at the GGNRA to consider relaxing some of their proposed dog restrictions a bit.

Like the other National Recreation Areas, the GGNRA is an urban park, not pristine wilderness. Some usage rules that make perfect sense in true wilderness or extremely endangered areas appear harsh and impractical in places that are very close to major population areas.

In Marin especially, many residents live near the GGNRA and have dogs without a lot of other places to take them. Obviously, if we were to turn the entire GGNRA into a dog park for a million canines a day, that would be a problem. But finding a few places where they can run won't kill massive numbers of birds or cause the extinction of severely endangered species of fauna and flora.

Dogs are a beloved and healthy part of many families. Surely we can work together to find a good compromise about where they may be allowed under voice command and how to keep those areas clean. I would urge you to try again to work with the public to find that better solution.

Thank you for listening and for your continued good stewardship of our parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4552    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Jose , CA 95112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

---

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Sheena Marie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4553    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 21:43:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4554    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 21:49:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My name is Stephen Austin from Pacifica, CA. As the owner of two small dogs who regularly walks my pets on and off leash (under voice control), I oppose the overly restrictive Preferred Alternative and think that the 1979 Pet Policy and off-leash access is preferable. The SEIS plan focusses on things that "might" "can" or "could" happen, but does not give any evidence that these things have ever happened at specific sites. It does not give any data that supports worries that there are major safety issues that necessitate off-leash restrictions. The vast majority of serious incidents in the GGNRA are serious crimes, including murder, that do not involve dogs at all. The Monitoring-Based Management Strategy focusses on compliance with leash restrictions and not on any actual harmful activities. When Congress created the GGNRA in 1972, it intended that it "expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." The SEIS, however, seems to be focussed on people who don't like dogs, ignoring those of us who value the recreation and exercise provided by dog walking.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 4555    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 21:49:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4556    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 21:49:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to show my strong opposition to the GGNRA's alternative dog management plan that will greatly reduce the off leash opportunities for all dogs. As a resident of San Francisco, I see the benefits that dogs have on the community's diversity and health. I was at Crissy Field today with my dog enjoying the early morning with other families their dogs as well as families without dogs and individuals without dogs and it was a great experience.

Sincerely,  
Ling Chang

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4557    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sonoma, CA 95476  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 21:50:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Frank Dean,

I would like to voice my opposition to your dog management plan. I live in Sonoma and I am handicapped. My well behaved labrador retriever and I regularly drive down to Crissy Field because he loves that beach. It is the only place where I can park myself in my wheel chair and throw the ball for my dog so he gets some exercise and I can sit back and watch him play with the other dogs. After many years of doing this, I haven't seen any conflicts between dogs and people or dogs with dogs. In fact, on the contrary, everyone seems to co-exist perfectly despite it being a very bustling place. I oppose your Preferred Alternative F for that area because it is too restrictive. It seems reasonable to me that people need a large area of beach to spread out and if you reduce that area, you are asking for trouble. I insist that you leave our recreation areas alone. I support the no action or Preferred Alternative A for all the areas. It seems to me that the GGNRA has lost its way in terms of purpose. I urge you to return to your roots and manage the GGNRA as a recreation area not a national park for tourists. Dogs are an important part of people's lives and we need to maintain areas where people can recreate with them.  
Thank you.

---

Nick Choulos

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4558    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94108  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 21:51:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The GGNRA needs to keep the same amount of off-leash areas as before. Quit messing with our area! Don't change the rules. Damn it!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4559    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 21:56:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for your fine stewardship of the GGNRA.

I often walk along the beach at the GGNRA/Fort Funston as well as along the path adjacent to the batteries. I have never observed anything except both people from all walks of life enjoying the day as well as many happy dogs.

The system seems to be working; as for as regulations regarding the dog management plan and off-leash regulations, please keep the status quo.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4560    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 21:58:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4561    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Larina Weber

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4562    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I need to hit the points, so to begin with:

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Now that that is done, let me get personal. The above is in keeping with my views on this issue, but it is only the tip of one very large iceberg. The lands you administer are lands that have been used in many ways for a very long time by the people who live here. People like me. One of those traditional uses is dog walking. It is one you are right to be concerned about, but not in the way in which you are. You need to be working to insure that it continues...it and the other uses we have for these lands.

My greatest personal interest is in the area known as Fort Funston, since I go there daily with my dogs, as a professional dog walker. At least that has been my profession for the last 4 years. Before that I was there every weekend, sometimes Saturday and Sunday with my own dog for about 5 years. At Funston, we share the land with Horses, surfers, fisherman, hang gliders, families with children, older folks, young people, you name it. And we do so with very little conflict or incident. It is a truly amazing thing, given the diversity, that there aren't more incidents/conflicts, but there aren't. The GGNRA needs to admit that, and to embrace the wonderful thing they are a part of, or they need to get off of our land. The city has said that it isn't feasible to take it back, but if you can't do for the people of this community, you need to get out, and let us make it feasible. If you insist on being our enemies, we don't want you in our town. So just get out. If you would like to help keep this available to the world, and especially to the residents of the Bay Area as an URBAN RECREATION AREA, then you have to listen to the people who live here, and especially to the ones who recreate there.

This is a major coastal city. We are not inland, and so we will have access to our coastline. We need that access. As a matter of fact, I don't know the law, but I do know that that access is our legal right going way back. This is not A national park. Even if it is administered by the National Park Service. This is an URBAN RECREATION AREA, and also our back yard.

This city is beautiful, but have you ever seen our yards. If you are lucky enough to have one, you are not going to be doing a great deal of communing with nature in it, as it is the size of a postage stamp. We depend on our parks (both the city parks, and the beaches and coastal areas) to make life liveable, and even enjoyable, and so do our dogs. They have to get out and exercise, and so do we. In watching them we rejuvenate our spirits, so we can go and do it again tomorrow. If you will not let us do it there, we will have to do it in the city parks, which will be overrun. With dog walkers locked out (that is what you plan does, the areas we have been left will be intolerable due to overcrowding, and so we will have to go elsewhere), very few people will be out there using the land except on the days when it is hospitable, warm and beautiful. You will have the hang gliders, a few surfers, an occasional fisherman. My guess is that you will start working on getting them off your land then, because I really don't think you want to have anything to do with people. I think you actually want everyone off what you now consider to be yours. It isn't. The GGNRA was formed to protect against development as I understand it, development of our lands by people who could buy it and turn us out. You are supposed to help us retain it not turn us out like the people we hoped you would save us from.

We are being ignored in this process, and we will not be silent about it. We can't make you listen, and you have made it quite plain you don't want to hear what we have to say. After previous rounds of comments on previous plans, no changes have been made that amount to anything. Certainly none that address the overwhelmingly negative response to you plans to lock us out of our coastlands.

You truly have no regard for the communities you are in. The impact of your plan on my industry will be huge. Many people will no longer have work. Businesses will fold, debts will go unpaid. People who contribute to society now will find themselves unable to do so anymore. I really think you need to go away, or totally revamp the way you do what you do. If something is urban, it necessarily involves people. If you don't care about people, you can't be expected to take care of an urban recreation area. Thanks for not reading or paying attention to yet another one of my rants.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4563    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:01:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not put such stringent limits on our off leash areas! As a mother and a dog owner who frequents crissy field daily, I see so many examples of people, children, dogs, wildlife and bikers enjoying the area simultaneously and in harmony. Changing the way people can use an area that is so vital to our existence in sf, as dog owners and citizens, will undoubtedly have far reaching and unpleasant repercussions. Off leash areas will become more crowded and there will be more incidents of dogs clashing in such a small area. What about families who bring their off leash dogs to crissy field? Will they now be relegated to the one off leash area with all the other dogs and walkers/owners? Was there any thought about what this would actually look like on a warm spring day, when hundreds of people walk their dogs to enjoy the weather? What about the incidents of children and dogs being forced to be in a small area (in this instance)? This proposed plan will, essentially, create an environment of tense discord and will not be promoting the thing that we as San Franciscans value most: diversity, responsibility for our environment and living harmoniously. There must be a better way that does not isolate or alienate a huge percentage of the population and take away rights of people who have built their lives with the expectation of having equal and free use of such an important and beautiful place. I honestly hope the proposed plan does not go through as it stands now, and that there is serious thought about a more just and equally beneficial solution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4564    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:01:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep a reasonable amount of off leash areas available to the taxpayers and citizens of California. All the proof you need for the demand for this recreational activity is to see Funston Beach parking backed up every weekend. These are dog people, not people looking for shore birds or sea shells. Allowing our dogs to run and socialize with other dogs makes them happier and safer for the community as a whole. Off leash recreation, yes recreation, is just as valid and important as horses or kids on the beach.

Thank you.

Joe Vohs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4565    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:04:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in the comments filed in 2011. I support the "No Action Alternative" for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands and hope that the 1979 Pet Policy is retained. The

---

Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to give people living in densely populated urban areas opportunities for outdoor recreation. This includes our pets who also benefit from the recreation in this area. Please don't take away these opportunities to enjoy the beauty of California.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4566    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94805  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:05:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support ample park areas that allow off leash access for dogs and their owners. There are few dog friendly locations in the city and golden gate park should be the exemplar!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4567    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:09:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in the comments filed in 2011. I support the "No Action Alternative" for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands and hope that the 1979 Pet Policy is retained.

I live in the Presidio of San Francisco and live for my time off hiking throughout the aforementioned areas above with my family member, dog, and friend, Wilson the Labradoodle. My wife, myself, and Wilson are constantly enamored by the audacious beauty of Northern California. Our four legged friend deserves to be as moved as we are by such grandeur north of the golden gate.

I absolutely could not disagree more with the potential banning of man's best friend from these areas. As civilization continues to emigrate to higher dense living situations across our major cities in the US, these areas only become more important for us all to stretch our legs.

Keep California Free...For all of us. Humans and Man's Best Friend.

Patrick Harrington, Ph.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4568    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:16:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I go to play in our neighborhood rec center with my children. There is a sign on the fence that dogs are not allowed inside but there has been consistently at least 4 dogs running free. When I let the owners know that dogs are not allowed there, they tell me that they always go there without a problem!! They treat it as a dog run for their dogs. Also whenever we go play soccer in other fields where dogs are also

not allowed (e.g. Rossi park) there are dogs and their poop everywhere. It is unsanitary and unsafe. Dogs should not be allowed on fields that were designed and reserved for youth recreation. I think there should be clear signs about fines and what number to call to report violators. I think there should be dog parks where owners can bring their dogs.

Thank you working on making our parks and public places safer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4569    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:16:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have lived in the Bay Area for more than 45 years, paying State and Federal income tax as well as property taxes for much of that time. I have lived with wonderful rescued German Shepherds for much of that time; they have been socialized and active dogs who loved meeting other dogs and running and playing off-leash. Doing so kept them, and me, healthy and happy.

There used to be many areas where this was allowed, but most have disappeared. More than half of the people I know have dogs and pay taxes, but have very few places they can go to exercise with their off-leash pets. Why isn't this more important to those who govern the National Parks? There should be multiple parks and beaches where dogs and their people can socialize with their peers.

Please expand, not contract, the areas permitted for off-leash activities for dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4570    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

In the past I have felt constrained by dog-leash policies on Limentour and other beaches around the Bay Area. Frankly they stink. Dogs and their responsible owners need and deserve the freedoms that open space and beaches afford.

I have innumerable memories of exploring with my Scottish Terrier Art, the Presidio, the Headlands, Mt Tam and so many other pristine places. My dog Art served not only as a companion but at times as a much needed guide. To diminish anyone's ability and safety with similar experiences seems a shortsighted measure that serves an ideological agenda and not living people and pets,

Today my Family went for a walk down to Marshall's Beach. other than paw prints there was no evidence of dogs. However I did pick-up 3 plastic cups littering the trail, carelessly left by humans. No feces but some nasty plastic.  
Dogs are NOT the culprit. People are.

While I may understand the intent, the result falls far short of the results.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

R Stutch  
917 690 3892

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4571    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:29:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support alternative D

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4572    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:31:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Frank Dean,

I am just another bay area resident that is very concerned about the GGNRA's overly restrictive dog policy. Please be reasonable. There is enough open space for all to share. Healthy and well-adjusted humans and dogs is a win win factor for any society. It is just smart urban planning for a community to accommodate families like us who have dogs who need the exercise (running, swimming, walking, and or hiking) and socialization to be good citizen dogs in the community. In order to get the proper exercise that some dogs need, they need to be off leash. To run and play with other dogs, to run and fetch a ball, to swimming are just some activities that can NOT be done on a leash with the owner at the other end of this leash. So again please be reasonable in your decision making, for dogs are integral members of today families and their needs are few, but their gifts are immeasurable.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Nicole Skerry  
114 Del Monte Road  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4573    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Petaluma, CA 94952  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:32:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Theresa Johnson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4574    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:32:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 16, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). I live in the city of San Mateo and do visit the GGNRA regularly. I consider myself sympathetic to domestic animals' needs and since a child continue to adopt shelter animals to be my companion pets.

I am compelled to comment on the SEIS because of yet another poor visitor experience due to unruly dogs during my recent visit to Fort Funston, Lands End, Surtro Heights Park, Crissy Field and Ft Mason for a geology class. Like other visits to GGNRA, this one was no different in terms of witnessing dogs eliminating themselves all over the park. I was surprised to observe many owners leaving their dog's solid waste behind in its raw form or packaged inside a doggie bag. I witnessed a person walking thru the Crissy Field fenced wildlife area with their leashed dog, despite the signage stating this type of activity is not permitted. I watched unleashed and leashed dogs lunging and jumping at strangers, who did not request, nor welcome, this type of behavior. I have witnessed this type of owner/dog behavior on many prior visits to GGNRA.

I believe the GGNRA is a unique within the NPS park system, unique because of it many competing interests that need to be managed; very high use by people and dogs, high need for effective and ongoing public education of GGNRA rules/regs, management of sensitive species and natural resource and oversight of cultural/ historical artifacts and buildings to name a few.

After reviewing the SEIS, I do not support Alternatives A, B, C and E. Because I visit GGNRA without my pets, I do support Alternative D but realize the political environment will not.

I do support Alternative F and the monitoring based management strategy outlined in the SEIS. I strongly encourage NPS to move forward with its implementation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4575    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** N/A Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:34:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I have roughly read the 2 main plans for dog planning.

I hope that you will decide to go with Plan A and leave the dog ares as they currently exist.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4576    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** SFDOG Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:39:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is preposterous. The City of San Francisco never intended this to happen when they deeded the land to the Park Sevice.

Deed it back and save yourself some money and get out of our hair.

Sincerely,  
Barry Nichols

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4577    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:40:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA's proposed dog management plan is too restrictive. If this plan is implemented, there will not be enough places for us to exercise our dogs.

The GGNRA is a Recreation Area, not a wilderness. Most of the land in the GGNRA is not near a trail, anyway, and these lands would not benefit from additional restrictions.

Please enforce the existing restrictions on dogs, not add more restrictions. Any additional lands added to the GGNRA should also allow dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4578    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:41:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** we love our parks, and we love our families and pets as well. with so many restrictions in the city, we find it harder and harder to enjoy the lifestyle we use to love living in the city. there are so little areas where dogs can run free and enjoy being what they are. most of us living in the city do NOT have a yard where dogs can run and be free off leash. Now our off leash parks are being proposed to be taken away from them. how do we expect our dog friends to exercise and enjoy our parks while having to be leashed at all times?! how can dogs play fetch with their beloved ball with a leash on them?

Keep our off leash parks, don't take them away from our four legged friends and their companions!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4579    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94124  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:44:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jenny

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4580    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kansas City, KS 66104  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Dawn Maderak

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4581    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:54:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Living in the city is challenging for pet owners to find appropriate space to exercise our canine companions. To take away the limited space that is already allocated for our pets is not appropriate...it's like taking some of the parks allocated for the children.

Please do not allow this to go through...it can be stopped.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4582    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:54:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Let dogs off leash

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4583    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 22:57:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've read this analysis and it is seriously flawed. It fails to use good statistics and relies instead on anecdotal evidence and flawed statistical analyses.

This report should be rejected and you should take a better approach to viewing how dogs impact the city. Rather than just picking the negative, you should look at all evidence.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4584    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean  
GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

February 16, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Michael Carboy and I live in San Francisco. I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative the proposed Dog Management Plan that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dog in the near and longer term future.

I have lived here for over 20 years. My wife and I enjoy Crissy Field, Baker Beach and Fort Funston with our retriever. We visit these locations weekly, usually during the very early hours or at the end of the day just before sunset. Our dog loves to swim and play with the other dogs. We enjoy socializing with the other dog guardians and with non-dog walkers who are also enjoying the beach. Very often people with children like to have their children play with our retriever as she fetches balls from the water that the children toss. These places offer a safe place where we can enjoy some open space in an urban environment. Access to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (which is not a National Park, but a Recreation area) for this highly social activity is an important aspect of the quality of life in San Francisco. It is also important to me that my wife and children have a safe place to go when I am traveling. The presence of other dog owners and professional dog walkers adds a critical element of safety to these areas. People walking their dogs are alert to things that do not look right and are always quick to help others at the park. Further, when my elder parents visit they enjoy walking with us and our dog, on and off leash. Access to these areas is critical for a safe walk.

The conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

In addition to finding the GGNRA preferred alternatives to be grossly ill considered and discriminatory, I strongly oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens, make the dogs feel trapped and visitors using them will feel segregated and

discriminated against. Perhaps we should put all the families with children in fences ? This way they cannot play Frisbee on the dunes, picnic in the wildlife protection areas and toss their trash around the beach. I know our children would be very unhappy with this arrangement.

Because dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created Golden Gate National RECREATION Area in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years to come per GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It is managed for financial sustainability and contains both residential and commercial activities as an extension of the urban area that surrounds it. As such, it should be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential and provide maximum enjoyment by visitors to and residents of the Bay Area that recreate regularly on this land.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS permits further restrictions in the future and on newly acquired lands, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. Additionally, in reviewing the SEIS it appears that a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS. Such clear disregard for a large number of comments strongly suggests that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Specifically addressing Crissy Field, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure. I cannot tell you the number of children I have seen running on the dunes in protected areas where the snowy plover live, families picnicking and playing football right in front of "protected wilderness area" signs, wind surfers displacing people walking on the beach (with and without dogs), trash being thrown around and not in the cans, etc.... Your analysis has a very narrow lens and appears to be highly biased.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of historically granted and important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come. The SEIS seems to select dog walking as a single threat to the GGNRA. What about the negative impact of very large groups that use the spaces (and take over large areas and roadway access) for events, what about the terrible light pollution emitted from the sports facilities at the west end of Crissy Field ? The myopic approach and grossly disproportional focus on visitors with dogs to environmental impact at Crissy Field and other GGNRA locations is flawed and deeply troubling.

Dog guardians, parents with children, older citizens, disabled citizens and large groups for special events should all have equal access to all GGNRA areas that are not historically designated as wildlife protected areas of the parks. Dogs and people are co-existing now and visits by both groups have grown in the recent years as improvements have been made to the GGNRA lands. Restrictions on dog owners make us a separate class of GGNRA visitors with restricted access.

The current preferred alternatives outlined in the SEIS are flawed, based on incomplete information and discriminate against a large population of visitors to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Sincerely,

Michael Carboy  
San Francisco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4585	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 23:04:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I like dogs and I know most owners are responsible, but I'm so tired of unleashed dogs running up to my three-year-old child, knocking her over or scaring her. People should take priority over dogs. Thank you for making the parks safer for all of us by implementing these reasonable restrictions dog owners.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4586	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94402 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 23:10:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a tax payer, an animal lover, a responsible dog owner and a supporter of public schools. I feel that I and my dog deserve the benefits that others receive and should not be excluded from being able to continue to enjoy off leash areas that have been a part of this area for many,many years. I urge you to be fair in making the right decision to continue allowing off leash areas that have been in place for a long, long time to the benefit of many.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4587	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 23:27:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I take my labrador retriever to either Crissy Field or Fort Funston every weekend. It's my favorite time of the week for me, and my dog, Gary. He LOVES running around chasing his ball and meeting other furry friends.				

---

I'm shocked as these proposed new restrictions. I've tried really hard to understand why they are needed, and it just doesn't make sense. Then I found that the proposal is based on either no data, or old data.

Please don't let this happen. It will have a massive impact on many San Franciscans, and just isn't needed.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4588	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 23:29:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to protest the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. One of the great joys contributing to quality of life in Marin is access to its trail system with our dogs. It is hard to understand what motivates a plan to eliminate off leash dog walking on trails and on Muir Beach. For many of us, our dogs are our most important companion and encourage us to maintain a healthy lifestyle through walking.

This is to register my strong objection to any plan that changes the current off leash dog walking allowance.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4589    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 23:33:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm the parent of two young boys (7 and 2). I understand that some parents find off-leash dogs disruptive and scary. But I love seeing dogs run on the beach and would absolutely hate if that changed. There are many, many, many parks and places for kids that dogs are not allowed at all. Don't take the few beaches dogs are now allowed away from them and their owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4590    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,16,2014 23:34:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

When Crissy Field was created, one of the stated purposes was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hooker



---

**Correspondence ID:** 4591    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 23:34:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is a delicate subject. I have a dog and enjoy going to our parks with and without my dog. As a dog owner, I fully support the proposed alternative F. This alternative provides ample areas for dogs to exercise off leash while enabling the rest of the park to be enjoyed by all citizens. I often see off leash dogs eliminating themselves on the path or on the grass where children (and adults) are playing - yet the dog owner is not there to pick up after his/her dog. We all should be enjoying the sights and views in these parks instead of keeping our eyes glued to the ground in order to avoid stepping in dog waste. Our children should be able to play in our parks without fear of landing a pile of dog poop. These parks are for all citizens, not just dog owners. There is plenty of space for everyone in Alternative F. When my dog was younger and still had some aggression towards other dogs, I would walk my dog in areas designated as "leash required" expecting that we would be able to avoid conflicts. However, every day I would encounter dogs off leash. When I mention the leash requirement to the owner and ask him/her to leash their dog for its own protection, 9 times out of 10 they would not and indicate that I was inconveniencing them! Our park employees have much better things to do than enforce leash laws. Having designated, fenced off leash areas frees them up for other tasks and protect the environment, our pets and our children while allowing everyone to enjoy our parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4592    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 23:37:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm a dog owner and I like to let my dog run off leash, but I also want to protect the environment and I believe endangered wildlife and habitats need to be protected from off-leash domestic dogs that scare birds and dig. I also have two young children and we like to hike in the National Parks. If we want to protect our parks and nature for future generations, we have to make some sacrifices and keep our pets at home. I support the Park Service's plan to limit access to dogs in the parks in and surrounding San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4593    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA Ca 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 23:41:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** People should leave dogs alone, Parents should act more responsible with their kids around dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4594    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Deal, NJ 07723  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,16,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean  
GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

February 15, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Barbara Coffey and I live in New Jersey. I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative the proposed Dog Management Plan that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with dogs in the near and longer term future. I visit San Francisco several times a year and going to the beach with my sister's golden retriever is my favorite thing to do when I visit. We take long walks on the beach at Ft. Funston, Baker Beach and Crissy Field. Her dog loves to swim and the children on the beach get very excited when they can throw the ball into the water and our dog retrieves it. It is truly a very special thing that you have in San Francisco, please do not ruin it. I love watching the dogs play and run and swim. It is pure joy in the middle of a city and a welcome escape from the business of every day life. No other city has this special place for all people - with and without dogs - to visit.

My sister called to my attention the proposals in the SEIS. It does not take much to realize that the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are deeply flawed. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

In addition to finding the GGNRA preferred alternatives to be grossly ill considered and discriminatory, I strongly oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens, make the dogs feel trapped and visitors using them will feel segregated and discriminated against. I do not visit San Francisco to go stand in a fenced in area.

Because dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created Golden Gate National RECREATION Area in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years for come per GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It is managed for financial sustainability and contains both residential and commercial activities as an extension of the urban area that surrounds it. As such, it should to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential and provide maximum enjoyment by visitors to and residents of the Bay Area that recreate regularly on this land.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS permits further restrictions in the future and on newly acquired lands, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash). When I visit we like to go to several beaches. It would be an enormous disappointment to not be able to visit some of these beautiful places while other visitors without dogs are welcome.

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure. When I visit I frequently see families running on the dunes in protected areas where the snowy plover live, picnicking and playing in areas protected as wilderness areas. You would be well served to increase enforcement among the non-dog walking population.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of historically granted and important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come. The SEIS seems to select dog walking as a single threat to the GGNRA. I note the negative impact of businesses in the Presidio and the traffic and noise that they bring, the large charitable events that are held at Crissy Field, and special events such as the Americas Cup. There seems to be no mention of this in your report or any efforts to curtail these activities. The singly focus on visitors with dogs to environmental impact at Crissy Field and other GGNRA locations is flawed and deeply troubling.

Dog guardians, parents with children, older citizens, visitors with and without a dog, disabled citizens and large groups for special events should all have equal access to all GGNRA areas that are not historically designated as wildlife protected areas of the parks. Dogs and people are co-existing now and visits by both groups seem to have grown in the recent years as improvements have been made to the GGNRA lands. Restrictions on dog owners would make me a separate class of GGNRA visitor with restricted access.

Even the small bit of research I have been able to conduct as background for this letter makes it clear that the alternatives outlined in the SEIS are flawed, based on incomplete information and discriminate against a large population of visitors to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I urge you to consider alternatives that provide equal access to all families and visitors. I would be crushed if I could not enjoy a walk on Crissy Field, Baker Beach or Ft. Funston with my sister's dog running along side us and playing in the water and with other dogs.

Sincerely,

Barbara Coffey  
85 Norwood Ave  
Deal, NJ

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4595	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,16,2014 23:49:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This is the second time I am submitting comments on GGNRA plans to limit access for dogs in GGNRA lands. The first time, mine, and many other comments were disregarded. So here				

---

were are again. I support plan A or F.

I walk my dog every week in Crissy Field and Marin Headlands, including Miwok Trails, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, Tennessee Valley Trails, and in areas in San Mateo county. The provides an opportunity for exercise, enjoyment of trails, socializing with friends as we walk (with friends who own dogs or don't) and keeps me sane, gives me the ability to hike and enjoy our lands which brought me here, and without I would leave. I need this recreation with my dog. San Francisco is full of people like me, who need to recreate with their dogs. Dogs need to recreate as do we. The proposed limitations will make my life, my dog's life, and my friends' lives, who walk with me, impoverished. I can't imagine living in this area if the draconian measures take hold.

I am a scientist, and do not see the validity of statements about dog impact on wildlife and plants. This issue needs to be addressed in order to impose measures such as proposed. I believe it is a legal requirement for Federal Government to make policy changes, where it invokes scientific statements, to present peer reviewed studies. That has not been presented. ie. how are dogs impacting areas with proposed changes in access.

The lands in question are in urban environments, and there was a deal to allow Federal Government to maintain them in the spirit of recreational areas for people and dogs. The proposed changes defy that spirit, and present a disconnect in the way people living in San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo enjoy the lands, with their dogs or without, and the new draconian measures.

If these policies take effect, the small existing parks that allow dogs will be inundated. There are more dogs in San Francisco than children. Dogs are adored by this population. How does plan take into account shifting demographics, importance of dogs for human health, and the importance of exercise and time spent with dogs as important paradigm in human health?

It's essential we keep current trails and beaches open to dogs. It is such a small percentage of GGNRA already, it would be sad loss to us, and then to San Francisco to those of us who are good citizens and specialized in biotech, high tech, all sorts of industries this area wants to attract, to make this a place we can no longer live with our dogs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4596	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:04:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Feb. 16, 2014				

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94923-0022

RE: SEIS Dog Management Plan

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing to oppose your restrictive dog management plan. As a taxpayer, I am quite shocked that after millions of dollars, and years of compiling information for this tome, there isn't one shred of evidence that dogs are having a negative impact on our recreational lands. I wrote a comment back in 2011 for the DEIS and feel my suggestions for better education, improved signage and enforcement of existing rules were completely dismissed. The fact that comments ran 3-1 against your Preferred Alternative F and you went ahead and rolled out basically the same plan with just a few cosmetic changes is infuriating and telling that you are determined to kick dogs off no matter what.

I have been visiting GGNRA lands, including Oakwood Valley, Miwok, Homestead Trails and Muir Beach, for decades. I now see more wildlife, including bobcats, coyotes, rabbits and deer than I have ever seen before. There have even been reports of mountain lions. It goes to the fact that people, dogs and all kinds of wildlife can and do co-exist. The SEIS admits there are no scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs. For example, on vegetation or soils, (page 375), so it cites anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. This document, which unfairly sets out to eliminate or displace a major user group, is supposed to be based on science, not anecdotes. Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring. If you have soil or water reports that conclusively link problems directly to dogs, I suggest you provide them.

The SEIS data still doesn't support claims that there are major safety problems associated with dogs that require off-leash restrictions. In fact, according to GGNRA data collected between 2001 and 2006, incidence reports that involved dogs (7%)aled in comparison with the majority of problems, which involved people (93%).Park personnel and resources required by visitors for instances of injuries, fatalities, rescues and missing persons far outnumbered the same situations for dogs. In other words, millions of dogs visit the GGNRA every year and the problems associated with them are miniscule at best. The other safety argument is that women, in particular, feel safer when with a dog. I would not feel comfortable hiking on any trail alone without my canine companion for protection. By banning dogs on many of our trails here in Marin, you are virtually cutting off access to women, many of whom would stop using the trails if they couldn't bring their dog.

I am opposing the Preferred Alternative F for all Marin sites because it is too restrictive. I would urge you to consider the no action alternative or Alternative A. After reviewing the DEIS, it appears that you didn't incorporate any of the suggestions the public thoughtfully provided. In fact, there seems to be no accommodation or compromise on your end at all. These restrictions are as draconian as it gets. I believe the driving force behind these harsh uncompromising rules are several groups including but not limited to, the Golden Gate Conservancy, The Audobon Society and The Sierra Club. What a shame that these groups have taken over what is supposed to be the people's parklands for recreation. I do believe in balance in usage but this dog management plan is simply unreasonable. Dogs are already banned from 99-percent of lands managed by the GGNRA. By taking away 90-percent of that 1-percent, we will be left with nothing. In fact, here in Marin you've managed to take away all of the looping trails and require dogs on-leash on just five dead-end trails. That is not only harshly restrictive but down right irresponsible. The SEIS also sites that the only off-leash area for all of Marin's 60,000 dogs would be a small stretch of Rodeo Beach. That beach is only accessible via car. Right now, many people can walk to their favorite off-leash trail including Oakwood, Miwok, Homestead and others. These federal lands are intertwined with our neighborhoods. Forcing people into their cars to exercise themselves and their dogs is not only horrible for the environment but also hard on the pocketbook. I also think it's quite fiendish since the GGNRA has been in the process of downsizing the parking lot at Rodeo Beach and will begin encouraging people to take shuttles therefore making it increasingly impossible for Rodeo to become a full fledged ROLA in the future.

Responsible off leash dog walking should be able to continue in as many areas as possible. The 1979 Pet

Policy was a visionary document that was well planned and thought out when it came to deciding which areas would be able to accommodate people and their pets. The idea was to spread it out and make sure all units or areas had a little bit of everything. Trails that dont allow dogs, trails that allow dogs on leash and other trails that allow dogs under voice command. I urge you to reinstate the 1979 Pet Policy and enforce the existing rules.

In Marin, the GGNRA Dog Management Plan is simply devastating to our culture and lifestyle. We rely on our trails and beaches to maintain a connection to nature. And we do this in tandem with our dogs. NEPA law required agencies to consider impacts on surrounding communities. This has not been done and I find that not only illegal but unconscionable.

Please remember that the GGNRA was established to provide much needed recreation for our urban area. You must go back to your enabling legislation.

GGNRA was established by Congress in 1972 (PL 92-589). The language of the enabling legislation states the parks purpose as follows: 'In order to preserve for public use and enjoyment certain areas of Marin and San Francisco counties, California, possessing outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is hereby established.

The GGNRA lands are designed urban parklands with buildings, signage, structures and trails built by humans. It is not a natural zone or back country wilderness area such as Yosemite or Yellowstone. This land is not for visitors but for the residents of the Bay Area. As much as you want it to be, it is NOT a national park and needs to be managed differently. And the needs of the people and their dogs must be considered.

To reiterate. I support the no action alternatives in all 22 areas listed in the SEIS.

Thank you.

Cassandra Fimrite

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4597	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 92124 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:05:32
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a dog lover, dog, owner, and dog advocate, yet I feel that the dogs off leash at Fort Funston really interfere with the teaching program that is on-going between the SFUSD and the National Parks service. As a teacher, I was there on an overnight trip with my students. The proximity of the off leash area really interfered with our learning experience. We had some children who are extremely phobic. Many of the dog owners did not have command verbal of their pets. I believe there should be space for off-leash opportunities, but it should be limited to an area where educational goals are not being jeopardized.
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4598	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:26:01**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the beach in the summer and hike all the trails year 'round.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Please, please don't punish the dogs! They love it so.

Kris Mulkey

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4599	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 16, 2014				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a person who walks and runs often with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is much too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog and many like-minded friends for all of our good health as we have on GGNRA properties for many years.

Since there are more dogs than children in San Francisco, it seems a drastic step to discriminate against dog owners. Environmental degradation due to dogs is insignificant and can certainly be mitigated in minimal locations as necessary. I oppose fences as both an eyesore, and, a ridiculous initial as well as on-going expense. Unusual regulations will only require unusual and expensive enforcement. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you for listening to a significant user group who want very much to continue to support and appreciate the GGNRA lands.

Sincerely,

Tom Long

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4600    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Berkeley , CA 94707  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:32:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I enjoy walking on Baker Beach and Ft. Funston. Please preserve or increase off leash dog walking areas rather than cut back on them. I am a senior and I get my exercise walking my dog. It is important for seniors (and everyone) to have public spaces in which to exercise and build community relationships. Living in a dog-friendly region such as the Bay Area adds greatly to my quality of life and losing access to areas that I have always enjoyed fills my heart with grief. Take action to preserve our quality of life in the Bay Area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4601    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:43:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the NPS dog management plan. I find it dangerous to have loose dogs in parks where small kids are vulnerable, and pet owners are irresponsible and have poor judgment. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4602    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102-2777  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:49:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi and thank you for your time,  
I am all for any and all dog bands! Every single time I've gone camping up in Marin Headlands people are walking there dogs where they shouldn't be. Scaring wild life, leaving feces and diseases for wild life to be infected with. Twice a dog walker let here dogs just start running around my campsite nosing in my tent and food.

We need to do everything we can to lessen the canines impact in fragile areas.

Jeff

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4603    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** lagunitas, CA 94938  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Olema ridge, which is part of GGNRA as well as several beaches. I've always felt comfortable taking my dog there as I have felt welcome. I always thought of GGNRA as being like the forest service, where people could recreate more freely than on the National Park Service lands.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Laura Szawarzenski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4604    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 01:21:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** San Francisco is a haven for otherwise unwanted dogs who would be euthanized. Many of these are working dog breeds that need significant amounts of activity to be physically and emotionally healthy. These dogs are also of above average intelligence and are easily trained to obey voice commands and hand signals. Off leash exercise for these dogs is essential to their well being.

San Francisco is and has long been a pet friendly place (as is the rest of the Bay Area). Pets contribute to the family unit in a positive way and are often the primary companion to elderly owners. Walking a dog in the beautiful outdoors is a healthy activity for pets and their owners. It is part of the daily routine for many dog owners, who gather so their dogs can play together and meet both social and physical needs.

All new pet owners in San Francisco are urged to take their dogs to training classes in which the owner is trained in ways to effectively control their pet. They also learn how to socialize their dog to a variety of people, age groups, clothing variations, other animals and so on in order to teach the dog appropriate

---

socialization skills to integrate with the public.

Restricting the many dogs and their owners from most of the open space areas to which they have had access for decades is simply wrong. If the parks are suddenly closed off to the huge number of people who enjoy them daily, who is really served? Who will really support parks that close their gates to their most frequent visitors? And what about the collateral damage of this change in policy for these areas? Does it matter to anyone that the few open spaces left will be overcrowded and likely damaged by the excess number of visitors who have no other options? Is the attitude simply "Not my problem"? Is there anything about this that confers a true respect for nature (of which all of us in the animal kingdom are a part)?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4605    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 01:38:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

David Dolinar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4606    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir / Madam.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

My wife and I regularly take our dog to the many trails leading of from Marin Drive (especially Miwok Trail) - and in fact chose to buy our house here, due to close vicinity to a dog-friendly nature.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. So we really cannot see any compelling reasons to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. do not believe you have conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

In short we are very concerned about this sudden change in policy, which will have an impact on where we will choose to have our house & living in the future.

In hope that you and your organization will do the right thing.

Best Regards,

Michael Jonsson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4607	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 02:31:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	(Part 1 of 2 - - sent as backup to hard copy mailed)				

SEIS Comments

Dear Superintendent Dean:

Most of my comments pertain to the stated goal of NPS in developing a dog management policy: to "&minimize conflicts related to dog use by providing a variety of safe, high-quality visitor use experiences, including areas where dogs are allowed" (SEIS, p. 2). I do not believe that the SEIS has provided evidence that NPS can allow mixed use of an area where off-leash dogs are allowed while providing "a variety of safe, high-quality visitor use experiences." I generally support the concept of compromise regarding protecting certain areas of the Park from off-leash activity, while allowing off-leash activity in other areas. However, I do not support the Park Services preferred alternative as presented in the SEIS, because it does not describe the true level of impacts of off-leash activity, and certainly does not provide a management framework that adequately addresses the impacts, stated and not-stated, caused by the presence of off-leash dogs in the GGNRA.

VOICE CONTROL

Voice control should not be used as a concept in the EIS. NPS has not presented any evidence to indicate that voice control is a meaningful concept. The law enforcement incident reports indicate that dog owners routinely bring dogs to GGNRA, over which they cannot exercise voice control. Incident reports show that sometimes they cannot even recall their dog after a serious incident occurs. Superintendent Frank Dean admitted at a public forum on dog management on January 30, 2014 that voice control "does not work" as a policy for managing off-leash activity. GGNRA biologist William Merkle in an email of January 11, 2010 to Sarah Kosher, EA Engineering, Science, & Technology, appears to indicate that voice control is not effective in reducing the tendency of off-leash dogs to chase shorebirds.

The law enforcement incident reports are full of instances of owners of off-leash dogs not being able to recall their dogs or completely losing sight of their dogs leading to hazardous incidents. A few of the incident reports indicate that owners knowingly allow high risk dogs off leash in GGNRA, including dogs with troubled histories that are being rehabilitated for adoption or known aggressive dogs. Since GGNRA does not monitor or issue permits for "voice control," there is no way to control the risk to visitors caused by such dog owners who have the poor judgment to allow such high risk dogs to roam off-leash. There are only three meaningful classifications of Park space for dog management: 1) areas where dogs are prohibited; 2) off-leash areas; and 3) areas where all dogs must be on a leash. GGNRA further must recognize that off-leash areas are essentially single-use areas when crowded and are not safe or appropriate for all user groups.

## VISITOR SAFETY

"Visitors with children who play along the waters edge or in the sand and are approached by dogs, either aggressively or not, may feel that their child's safety may be at an elevated risk for dog bites or other injuries." (SEIS, p. 22)

Visitors with children feel that their child's safety is threatened because in fact their child's safety is threatened. The issue with the safety of children is not just a perception of visitors, it is an established fact. This fact is almost completely ignored in the SEIS. It should be noted that although there is a considerable literature on the especial risks of dogs attacking children, there is little literature on other groups that may be similarly vulnerable, including the elderly, physically or emotionally disabled, and those engaging in sports or other physical activity that conflicts with off-leash dog activity. Although the SEIS does mention that children and the elderly have a increased likelihood of being the victims of attacks by dogs, the SEIS does not fully address the safety issue in an explicit manner and apply safety risk management to policy alternatives of dog management.

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

Dog walkers cannot be relied upon to control the behavior of their dogs to reduce the safety risk of off-leash activity. One study found that dog owners had limited knowledge of dog behavior and were unaware of factors that increased the risk of dog bites to children (Reisner & Shofer 2008). Many dog

owners surveyed in the study who indicated that they were comfortable taking their dogs to public areas were making unsafe assumptions about interactions between dogs and unfamiliar children. Reisner and Sofer reported that 41% of respondents surveyed thought that it would be OK to allow their dog off leash in an area where they saw children running.

The GGNRA visitor cannot control the risk to her/his safety where off leash dogs are permitted. Certain types of dogs, such as pit bulls, may be associated with a higher risk of serious bite injury (Bini et al. 2011) and older, active children are more often bitten by pit bulls (Reisner 2013). In one review of dog bite data, most older children bitten in an outdoor setting were unfamiliar with the attacking dog and were not interacting with the dog (Reisner et al. 2011). As stated above under "Voice Control," some dog walkers bring high risk dogs to GGNRA and allow them to run off leash.

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

When an attack on a child does occur, there is a significant chance of a fatality. One study estimated that a risk of 2 fatalities per 1,000 reported dog bites exists nationwide (Wright 1985). Although most studies show that fatalities typically occur in residential settings, there is still a real possibility of a fatality in GGNRA because of the concentration of visitors with children and lack of control over the type of off-leash dogs present. GGNRA must fully and explicitly address this risk in the EIS.

#### "NEEDS OF URBAN RESIDENTS"

" Additionally, the adjacent city, county, and state public lands have fewer areas available for dogs and/or more restrictions on these areas, so potential use by urban dog owners is therefore pushed onto NPS lands." (SEIS, p. 22)

Under "Needs of Urban Residents," the SEIS refers to the needs of urban Park visitors as if dog owners were the only urban visitor group. Although there does not appear to be a specific estimate of the proportion of visitors to GGNRA that are dog walkers, one of the surveys cited in the SEIS (Tierney et al. 2009) indicates that among the survey participants, only 13% of those interviewed listed walking a "dog/pet" as the "primary reason" for visiting GGNRA. Other survey results suggest proportions of dog-driven visits at around 10%. What about the needs of the other 90% of urban residents?

In San Francisco, leash laws are almost never enforced in any of the City parks, and many parks, such as Pine Lake Park, are de facto dog parks. For San Francisco residents wishing to pursue an outdoor activity outside the presence of off-leash dogs, there are extremely limited possibilities for enjoying the outdoor environment. The EIS should discuss the limited options for outdoor space not just for dog walkers but for all visitor groups, especially visitor groups especially vulnerable to safety risk from off leash dogs, including: children; the elderly; the physically disabled; equestrians; hand gliders; joggers; etc.; and those who wish to have an outdoor experience without being harassed or disturbed by off leash dogs, such as hikers and naturalists.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION OBTAINED FOR THE SEIS

During the past seven years the park staff has amassed as much information as could be found on dog management-related topics. (SEIS, p, 28 ff)

Although the park staff amassed information, critical information or analyses were overlooked. My review of FOIA requests for dog management documents by the Center for Biological Diversity in 2004 and Wild Equity in 2011 suggested that NPS staff actually did a poor job in collecting and reviewing relevant information in some areas. The literature reviews for disturbance issues related to shorebirds was initially poor, suggesting that GGNRA staff and EIS authors did not have a good understanding of the basic biology of shorebirds. NPS must realize that allow such a serious impact as off-leash dogs into sensitive areas where visitors and resources are put at risk is not a management policy that has been generally allowed. There has been little need to study such a situation, and few specifically relevant studies have been done that address the degree of off-leash activity occurring in GGNRA. Relevant literature searches by non-specialists will often return little information. In order to prepare an adequate EIS, the study authors must have adequate understanding and knowledge of the basic biology and other relevant sciences pertaining to the resources, sociological knowledge of visitors, and knowledge of canine behavior. It will be difficult for Park staff and contractors who are most likely generalists to obtain the required knowledge without consulting with specialists

The following critical areas of knowledge for dog management seemed to be virtually non-existent in GGNRA records previously reviewed:

- " Risk assessment of off-leash dog activity for visitor safety and experience.

- " Research of the issues involved in dogs impacting the quality of visitor experience: why are people bothered by off leash dogs and what can be done to mitigate or eliminate the problem?

- " Development of professional management techniques for reducing the impact of off-leash dogs on natural resources, visitor safety, and the quality of visitor experience. GGNRA relied on such tools as "voice control" and "visitor education" to improve compliance with dog management regulations. Such tools have proven to be ineffective over the years. GGNRA apparently had no information to suggest such tools would be effective yet relied on them in management documents. GGNRA seemed to make to no effort to understand why leash law compliance was poor and seemed to take no steps to improve compliance.

- " Analysis of dog-related incident data to understand how and why dog-related incidents occur and to incorporate such knowledge into Park management.

## COMPARISON OF DOG MANAGEMENT POLICIES & REGULATIONS / RISK ASSESSMENT

(SEIS, p. 31 ff)

The SEIS mentions the dog policies of National Parks, California State Parks, and other parks or open spaces of counties, municipalities, or other local entities. This section would be much more useful: 1) if there was some discussion about in what proportion of parks and other open space areas entities ban off-

leash dog walking and what type of risk assessment led to those policies, and 2) if in those entities where off-leash activity is allowed, what warnings and rules for visitors entering off-leash areas are operative. Such a survey would provide a much better context to proposed dog management alternatives in relation to how the issue has been handled by other entities than by simply mentioning policies of those different entities.

My initial survey suggested that most parks that allow off-leash dogs have enclosed "dog parks." Most parks that allow off-leash dog play activity provide specific warnings to visitors about the risks involved in entering an off-leash dog zone. There is frequently mention that the park or other entity cannot guarantee the safety of visitors. Since GGNRA is proposing to allow off-leash dogs on some GGNRA beaches and in mixed use areas, the EIS needs to explain how and why NPS thinks it can overcome the problems of off-leash dog activity cited by the other entities while attaining its stated goal of minimizing "conflicts related to dog use by providing a variety of safe, high-quality visitor use experiences."

An example of some of the regulations and warnings to visitors provided by other entities include the following.

The City of Evanston Illinois provides a "Dog Beach Information Packet." The 2011 edition of the document lists the following points among others under a section, "Risk and Responsibility of dog Owners Using the Evanston Dog Beach":

" A dog's behavior or actions, no matter how well trained, if startled or frightened, can be unpredictable and potentially life-threatening.

" Even a well trained dog may attack a patron, another dog, park wildlife or a curious child without provocation or notice.

" Other risks include a dog's natural reactions, such as jumping, pulling , resisting and biting, and the negligence or irresponsibility of a dog's owner/handler.

" It must be recognized that it is impossible for the City of Evanston to guarantee absolute safety.

" Dog owners must understand they participate in Dog Beach activities at their own risk and the risk of their dogs.

The Clark County Nevada Parks & Recreation "Dog Park Rules" include the following warnings concerning visitor use of dog parks (<http://www.clarkcountynv.gov/Depts/parks/Pages/dog-parks.aspx>) :

" All dogs have the potential to bite

" One adult to supervise several children or an infant and the family dog is not sufficient to ensure everyone's safety and control.

" Not all dogs are child-friendly! Never allow your child to approach or pet a strange dog without the owner's presence and approval.

" The Dog Park is Not a Place for Your Child!

" Never let your child have toys or food in the Dog Park. A friendly dog might knock down your child to get at a bright ball or cookie.

" Canine and human visitors enter at their own risk.

" Owners are legally responsible for their dogs and any injury or loss caused by their dogs.

" Clark County will not be responsible for injuries to visiting dogs, their owners or others using the park.

The City of Centralia, WA makes the following statements about visitor use of a dog park  
<http://www.cityofcentralia.com/Page.asp?NavID=449> :

" Entry to the Dog Park is at the risk of dog owners, handlers and guests. Small children must not be permitted to run loose within the off-leash area.

" To prevent fights, no food or toys allowed inside the off-leash area.

" Owners are legally responsible for their dogs and any injury or damage caused by their dogs.

" Maximum 2 dogs per adult allowed in the off-leash area at any time.

The Manatee County Florida "Dog Park Rules" include the following statement  
(<http://www.myanatee.org/home/government/departments/parks-and-recreation/parks/dog-parks/dog-park-rules.html>):

" Canine and human visitors enter at their own risk. Manatee County cannot be responsible for injuries to visiting dogs, their owners, or others using the park.

I noted that a dog behavior expert, Richard H. Polsky Ph.D (dogexpert.com), provides the following among a list of warnings to dog owners for reducing the risk of injury to others caused by their dog  
(<http://test.webzler.com/richard/dog-bite-prevention-safety-for-children-and-others/>):

Comply with local leash laws. Letting your dog run loose in an urban environment or residential area could be dangerous, and imposes substantial risk to the safety of others. For example:

" Your dog might approach a person and frighten that person, causing that person to fall;

" Your dog, albeit non-aggressive, might approach and try to interact with a dog-aggressive-dog (possibly being walked on leash), an altercation starts, and somebody gets injured;

" Your dog might run into the street in pursuit of a squirrel or cat and get hit by a car or possibly cause a traffic accident;

" Your dog could injure a person if it accidentally collided with a person while in pursuit of some object like a cat (or another dog), or while playing with another dog.

(I note that the GGNRA law enforcement incident reports contains specific examples of all of these types of incidents described by Dr. Polsky.)

The SEIS has failed to explicitly discuss the issue of risk to visitors. Although it is mentioned that there is literature on the risk of injury to some types of visitors, there is no attempt made to assess the fact that surveys suggest that a high proportion of visitors don't want to be around off-leash dogs and will probably avoid areas of the park where off-leash activity occurs.



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

Here are examples of how risk analysis could be useful.

I examined 29 incidents from the 2009 and 2010 incidents reports involving visitors being attacked by dogs. In 16 of 29 (55%) incidents reviewed, the owner of the attacking dog either absconded from the victim or law enforcement or provided contact information that was bogus. This result suggests that a high proportion of visitors walking off-leash dogs are scofflaws in terms of taking responsibility for the actions of their dogs and having consideration for the other visitors affected. Visitors must realize that if attacked by a dog, it is likely that the perpetrating owner will not be identified. Visitors may have to undergo rabies shots and may not have any possibility of recovering costs associated with a serious injury. Such scofflaw behavior needs to be taken into account by GGNRA in formulating dog management regulations. It suggests that GGNRA should require that all dogs wear collars with proof of vaccination and that off-leash activity should be strictly compartmentalized within the Park, so that visitors wishing to minimize the risk can go elsewhere.

I also examined 37 incidents from the 2009 and 2010 incident reports involving visitors or pets that were either bitten or harassed by off-leash dogs. The incidents were classified according to how many dogs the owner of the attacking dog had off-leash at the time of the incident. In seven cases, there did not appear to be information on how many off-leash dogs the owner had. In the other 30 incidents, 17 of 30 incidents (57%) involved owners who had three or more off-leash dogs at the time of the incident. (It should be noted that such a result is conservative in terms of my analysis, since from the incident report it could not always be verified that an owner with one dog did not have other dogs besides the attacking dog.) The EIS does not present data on the distribution of the average number of dogs for dog walking visitors, but the result of the NAU survey (NAU 2002b) indicated that 77% of survey participants owned only one dog. Therefore, it is likely that a highly disproportionate number of serious incidents are associated with visitors with three or more dogs. Even the proposed limit of three off-leash dogs may not limit the risk associated with visitors having more than one dog off-leash. Such a result suggests that GGNRA should take a careful look at the risks of allowing multiple dogs off-leash, and suggests that any area of the Park where this occurs may not be appropriate for vulnerable visitor groups, such as children.

GGNRA must fully address the risk issue. The best way to control the risk for visitors would be to enclose areas where off-leash dogs are allowed and/or to segregate off-leash activity into specific well-defined areas, outside of which visitors can be reasonably certain they will not encounter off-leash dogs. Based on the management policies of most or all other park or open space entities, GGNRA is going against the grain of management practices across the country by proposing to allow multiple use of space, where off-leash dogs are allowed. It is incumbent upon GGNRA to explain how they can control such risk that most or all other entities have chosen to avoid.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4608	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 02:33:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** (Part 2 of 2 - - submitted as backup to hard copy mailed)

## COMMUNITY BENEFITS OF OFF LEASH DOG WALKING

"Visitors with dogs, including elderly and handicapped visitors may experience beneficial effects of walking their dogs. Dog walking provides mental health benefits by providing a social community for many people."

"Studies have shown that dog owners exercise more than people who do not own dogs. A study in Australia looked at how dog ownership influenced physical activity (Cutt et al. 2008)."

(SEIS, p. 35)

These statements suggest that the SEIS is claiming that allowing more off-leash dog walking in GGNRA will somehow have health benefits for the community. These statements are presented in a suggestive manner that probably leads to false conclusions by the reader. The main policy issue of the SEIS and the underlying management decisions is how much off-leash dog walking to allow in the Park. There is no indication that on-leash as opposed to off-leash dog walking has any less of the health and recreation benefits to humans. The study referred to (Cutt et al. 2008) compares dog owners vs. non-dog owners in a housing tract in Perth, Australia. The study shows slight differences in the total weekly amount of self-reported physical activity of dog owners vs. non-dog owners in this housing tract. However, it is unclear what health benefits, if any, are associated with such differences. There was no statistical difference in "vigorous leisure-time physical activity" between the groups - possibly the most significant physical activity measured that would be associated with actual health benefits. The study may have just measured the fact that people who own dogs have to walk their dogs, so they walk more than people without dogs on average.

Any claim about the health or community benefits of off-leash dog walking should be given the context of the costs to others in the community who may be negatively impacted by off-leash dog activity in GGNRA. What about all the other types of activities in GGNRA that foster physical activity and social community: jogging, biking, fishing, horseback riding, picnicking, etc? Law enforcement data suggests that those engaging in physical activity in GGNRA, such as playing, jogging or biking, have an increased risk of being bitten by or attacked by off-leash dogs, and the presence of off-leash dogs probably reduces the access to GGNRA for people who want to engage in these activities. If Cutt et al. 2008 is cited, there should also be references to articles on the potential benefits of an increase in physical activity realized by providing safe and accessible places for other types of physical activities besides walking dogs, such as running, biking, nature observation, etc., and a discussion of the potential negative impact on these activities by off-leash dogs.

## SHOREBIRDS / BEACH WATCH DATA

(EIS, pp. 119/259/261)

Data from Beach Watch surveys (Beach Watch 2006; 2009) is used in the SEIS. Although the data from this survey may be appropriate to use to mention the presence and general abundance of certain species of shorebirds, there are severe limitations to this data. This data is based on "encounter rates" as were the Snowy Plover surveys done by GGNRA, so the data on shorebirds cannot be considered as an accurate survey of shorebird populations. The surveys were done every two weeks and may not have been conducted during peak migration periods and may have completely missed the presence of some bird species during migration and the peak number of individuals of various species during migration. Although some aspects of the data may be useful, I do not think it should be used to draw conclusions about the relative species numbers or the habitat importance between different sites, such as on p. 260 of the EIS:

Muir Beach and Rodeo Beach sites had documented low shorebird abundance and diversity compared to other GGNRA coastal beaches that had high shorebird abundance and diversity such as Ocean Beach (Central and South) and Fort Funston (or Thornton Beach North) (Beach Watch 2006, 11)

Such a statement may or may not be true. Any use of the data must address the limitations of the survey methods and the fact that some species may have abandoned sites, especially smaller sites, due to off-leash dog activity over many years. The EIS needs to avoid such simplistic interpretations of the data.

## VISITOR EXPERIENCE / SURVEYS

(SEIS, p. 372 ff)

Although GGNRA has utilized various surveys to attempt to collect information on Park visitors and visitor experience related to dog management issues, the surveys have limited usefulness in understanding the impact of off-leash dogs on various visitor groups. The NAU (2002) survey was helpful in revealing that a majority of the surrounding community was in favor of enforcing restrictions on off-leash dogs. As I stated in my comments on the initial EIS draft, the NAU survey did not flesh out why people want restrictions on off-leash dogs and how off-leash dogs affect or would affect their safety and visitor experience. The NAU survey followed up with respondents supportive of off-leash dog walking, who were asked a "series of questions probing specific preferences" to gain a deeper understanding of the nature of the dog walkers use of resources, but there was no similar attempt made to gain insight into why, for example, 35% respondents "strongly opposed" off-leash dog walking.

The subsequent surveys provided no real further insight into the visitor experience related to dog management. The other studies, including Tierney et al. 2009, relied on intercepting visitors at sites heavily used by off-leash dog walkers, where visitors not wanting contact with dogs had been excluded for many years, leading to extraordinarily biased samples of visitors. (For example, I live within a few miles of Fort Funston but have not been there in over seven or eight years because of the off-leash dog activity.) Nakagawa et al. (no date)'s survey compared attitudes across ethnic, age, and income groups but not across various Park user groups. Respondents in this and other surveys were not asked questions specific enough to allow for "probing specific preferences" related to potential conflict with off-leash dogs. In the Tierney et al. (2009) study, respondents were evaluating their visitor experiencing concerning dogs along with factors outside of Park control, such as the weather or park and community infrastructure - essentially incommensurable factors.

Many casual or infrequent visitors to GGNRA do not know the extent of the problems caused by off-leash dog activity and would not be aware of those problems unless informed during the survey. On an average visit, a casual visitor may not see or recognize the significance of dogs chasing birds and may be lucky

enough not to have any conflict with off-leash dogs. It should be noted that Tierney et al. (2009 - Table 71) found that a visitor who had made 101 or more visits to GGNRA in the 12 months prior to the survey had a seven-fold increase in likelihood of mentioning restrictions on dogs as a factor that would improve the experience of visiting the Park compared with visitors who had made one or none previous visits. The NAU survey asked respondents for their opinions on enforcing restrictions on off-leash regulations before and after reading them a mission statement of the National Park Service. The same type of before and after polling could be done by providing respondents with a description of the nature and extent of problems caused by off-leash dogs, such as hazardous conditions and safety risks to vulnerable populations. The 35% category of respondents strongly in favor of enforcing restrictions on off-leash dogs would surely have increased.

The surveys have failed to elucidate the real problems faced by different user/visitor groups in the Park. I am stunned that the SEIS does not refer to the work of Vaske & Donnelly (2007), which provides some insight into why visitors to a park/open space have conflicts with off-leash dogs and to what degree their visitor experience was affected. To be effective in addressing the visitor experience issues at GGNRA related to dog management, a survey would have to involve stratified sampling and detailed probing of the impacts of off-leash dogs on various user groups and vulnerable populations. However, I believe that NPS can make use of existing information if a conservative approach is taken towards addressing the visitor experience issues that are known or can be inferred related to off-leash dog activity in GGNRA.

Given the available information, including anecdotal information in NPS files, the inescapable conclusion is that off-leash dog activity in many cases leads to single-use user group dominance of a space by off-leash dog walkers. The SEIS has failed to "connect the dots" about the consequences of off-leash dog activity on Park visitors.

## VISITOR SAFETY/INCIDENT REPORTS

From the years 2008 through 2011, a total of 2,775 dog-related incidents were recorded in GGNRA for leash-law violations, dog bites or attacks, hazardous conditions or pet rescues, having dogs in closed areas, and failure to pick up pet excrement (tables 11-28). (SEIS, p. 337 ff)

The SEIS presents data on dog-related incidents but does not provide a discussion of the limitations of the data and the context needed to understand and interpret data. The raw data is presented in a way that might lead one to draw conclusions about the total number of dog-related violations per year in GGNRA or to compare the number of dog walking violations and hazards between specific areas of the Park. Without information on the "effort" on the part of law enforcement involved in patrolling each area and the normal behavior of off-leash dog walkers, the data is just a random collection of numbers that show nothing beyond the existence of certain types of violations by dog owners in the Park. In fact, the data represents such a small sliver of the actual violations occurring that without further data it is impossible to even estimate the number and type of violations actually occurring.

For Ocean Beach it does seem possible to make some estimate of the total number of annual leash law violations, since information on the rate of leash law compliance and the number of dogs observed on Ocean Beach (Hatch 1996), suggests that the number of citations for off-leash dog walking in an entire year could be exceeded by the number of off-leash violations occurring in a single day on the beach. Based on Figure 11 in Hatch (1996), it appears that the median number of dogs observed on Ocean Beach in the seasonal closure area during a two-hour weekday survey is approximately 35. Assuming a 40% rate of leash law compliance, in the high range of this rate based on field surveys at various times by GGNRA, there would be approximately 21 violations encountered by an observer walking the entire Beach over

two hours. Over eight hours there would be a median number of approximately 88 violations "encountered." The actual number of violations would be much higher, as an observer would not encounter all such violations on the Beach while walking a transect. 150 violations would be a conservative estimate for the median number of violations per day based on this data. Although additional assumptions would need to be made to reach an annual estimate, that estimate would probably be around 40,000 per year. The EIS should make a similar estimate and discuss it in relation to the actual incident report data. The numbers of leash law violations reported for Ocean Beach between 2008 and 2011 was between 131 and 345 - - truly a minute window into the number of violations actually occurring there.

There is also no discussion about the lack of systematic enforcement of dog-related regulations in GGNRA and how the lack of systematic enforcement biases the dog-related incident data. My review of documents obtained through a FOIA request by CBD in 2004 and Wild Equity in 2001 suggested that GGNRA never had a systematic professional management plan for enforcing dog-related regulations and protecting public safety, natural resources, and the quality of visitor experience. The GGNRA response to complaints about off-leash dog behavior in those documents and personally to me from former Supervisor O'Neill elicited this type of response: Call law enforcement when you see a violation! Yet, as I discussed in my comments to the first EIS draft, informing GGNRA dispatch about a dog-related incident rarely, if ever, results in mitigation of the incident or citation for a violation.

The annual number of off-leash violations issued at Baker Beach varied by a factor of 10 between 2008 and 2011 and was greatest in 2009. Why? Does the data reflect something that happened in 2009 or is this great variance symptomatic of the fact that the data does not reflect the reality of off-leash dog violations? In essence, the incident data we have appears to be some artifact of random and/or inconsistent enforcement activities that may vary from site to site, from year to year, or from individual ranger to individual ranger. The data do not allow any conclusions about the relative behavior of dog walkers compared between sites or to the actual behavior at a site or the trend over time.

On 1/17/2009 a Park Ranger patrolling Ocean Beach encountered 55 dog walkers with off-leash dogs in violation of the seasonal beach closure. Only two violations were issued. The conclusion, besides the fact that the overall risk of a leash law violator actually receiving a citation is low, is the fact that because there were few if any other days on which 50 warnings and/or citations were issued, apparently Ocean Beach was not being patrolled.

Another missing context for the data is a discussion of what proportion of the violations are associated with off-leash dogs vs. on-leash dogs. This result would provide some idea of to what degree different types of violations could be eliminated by limiting off-leash activity.

I reviewed FOIA data obtained by the Center for Biological Diversity in 2004, including law enforcement data from GGNRA and from National Parks nationwide. My impression was that the number of serious dog-related incidents in GGNRA documented was in the same ball park if not greater than all incidents from the rest of the U.S. National Parks combined. The EIS should refer to dog incident data from other Parks in performing a risk assessment of off-leash dog activity and discuss this in the EIS to provide some context for the dog incident data from GGNRA presented in the SEIS.

## NONCOMPLIANCE MONITORING

SEIS, p. 64 ff

One of the most troubling developments in the SEIS is the proposed monitoring-based management strategy, under which Park Service staff will monitor noncompliance and impacts to natural resources and

propose mitigation measures at a later date, instead of using automatic triggers that were originally proposed. This development is clearly the result of lobbying and political pressure and does not have any factual relevance. The previous target for 75% compliance was itself far too low to have any meaningful impact on protecting visitor experience or natural resources. Such a compliance level would not change the type and degree of risks to visitors exposed to off-leash activity, as described above under "Visitor Safety." Vaske & Donnelly (2007) found that even a single negative encounter with an off-leash dog by a park visitor can qualitatively change the quality of experience. Goss-Custard et al. (2006) have used models to estimate in their study area, the a species of shorebird is disturbed more than between 1.0 and 1.5 times per hour in good feeding conditions or 0.2 to 0.5 times per hour in poor feeding conditions a reduction in fitness would result. As I discussed in my previous comments on the initial draft EIS, just one or two aggressive dogs can cause serious disturbance over long stretches of Ocean Beach, which may be visited by dozens of dogs per hour.

NPS is simply hiding from reality regarding the enforcement issue. It is clear from law enforcement incident reports that dozens if not hundreds of dog walkers, who are aware of leash laws, purposefully violate the laws and are contemptuous towards NPS and any attempt to restrict off-leash activity. An estimate for the number of annual leash law violations at Ocean Beach of 40,000 should immediately indicate to NPS that a high level of enforcement is needed in that area. In discussing management alternatives at various other sites, NPS admits that the level of leash law compliance at many other sites is low. Yet the impact of noncompliance on visitor experience and safety and on resources at those sites is not explored. It should not be necessary to re-evaluate compliance rates to establish enforcement targets, as proposed in the SEIS, which re-evaluation process would allow serious impacts to occur for several more years. It is obvious that as appropriate in the case of contempt for regulations that direct enforcement of rules is necessary (McCool & Christensen, 1996).

It is unsettling that NPS has not performed a full risk-assessment and resource analysis of the impact of off-leash dog activity in GGNRA in the SEIS. It is difficult for me to find NPS credible in the claim that they will monitor compliance and provide a realistic and effective solution to any problems encountered, given the lack of transparency in the SEIS concerning what criteria the NPS will use to evaluate acceptable levels of compliance.

## IMPACTS ON NEARBY DOG WALKING AREAS OUTSIDE OF GGNRA

(SEIS, p 360 ff)

The section on the potential impacts of dog management policy alternatives on off-leash dog use of "nearby dog walking areas outside of GGNRA" is removed from the reality of off-leash dog activity in the Bay Area, specifically San Francisco. It is also another example of the EIS being written in places with blinders and not considering that there are many user groups of GGNRA besides dog walkers.

This section is written with apparently zero knowledge of the actual situation of off-leash dog use of San Francisco City Parks. Although official policy limits off-leash dog use to certain designated areas within specific parks, in actual fact there is almost no enforcement of this policy. For example, Pine Lake/Stern Grove is essentially a dog park. All of the negative consequences discussed in the SEIS in the event of dog management in GGNRA more restrictive to off-leash dog walking are already occurring in Pine Lake/Stern Grove, for example. The authors of the EIS need to be informed that most off-leash dog walkers in San Francisco ignore restrictions on off-leash dog walking in City parks.

In addition, this section also needs to cover the impact of various alternatives on other user groups, comprising approximately 90% of GGNRA visitors, who might need to seek alternative areas outside of

GGNRA based on dog management alternatives that fail to protect their safety or visitor experience from off-leash dog activity.

## DISTURBANCE TO WILDLIFE

(SEIS, p. 376 ff)

Although the section on disturbance to wildlife has been improved since the initial EIS draft, something is missing. Although some relevant literature is discussed regarding disturbance, there is little discussion on the actual disturbance that is occurring at GGNRA that can be observed on a daily basis. A reader of the SEIS who had not observed disturbance by off-leash dogs at GGNRA might not realize the seriousness of the disturbance actually occurring. GGNRA scientific staff have decades of experience observing this disturbance, yet the only actual instances of disturbance mentioned are from law enforcement incident reports, which are random and non-systematic observations that only occur because of a violation documented by law enforcement staff, not scientific professionals. Observations from scientific staff would be much more useful. The SEIS needs to relax its focus on only using peer-reviewed sources. The Department of Interior guidelines for the use of science are concerned with the "integrity" of the use of science. Over reliance on peer-reviewed sources that may not be relevant lacks integrity compared with judicious use of peer reviewed and other sources. There is a sufficient body of literature to describe and determine the probable level of impacts of off-leash dogs in much more detail than currently in the SEIS.

The impact of off-leash dogs on shorebirds in the beach environment at GGNRA is not subtle (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r75OTjvJdX8>). As I described in detail in my comments to the initial draft EIS, off-leash dogs frequently chase flocks of shorebirds for great distances along the tide line. This impact is so severe and obvious that there is little relevant scientific literature on bird populations chronically affected by off-leash dogs to a similar degree, because off-leash dogs are usually banned in beach environments that have significant shorebird populations. It is not difficult for someone with knowledge of shorebird biology to discuss the degree of the disturbance and the potential impact on shorebirds of the disturbance observed at Ocean Beach. However, this is not done in the SEIS, probably leaving most readers questioning why it is important to prohibit off-leash activity where sensitive bird populations occur.

## ROLA ENCLOSURES

NPS stated that enclosures are undesirable because an enclosure would hinder or prevent wildlife movement. (SEIS pg. 95). This statement is not credible. There is a vast literature of how artificial wildlife corridors have been successful in mitigating the impact of natural or artificial enclosures or barriers to wildlife movement.

Sincerely,

Charles Pfister

## REFERENCES

(Note: For references not mentioned below, see the SEIS bibliography)

City of Evanston, Illinois. 2011. Evanston Dog Beach Information Packet.

Bini, John K., et al. 2011. Mortality, mauling, and maiming by vicious dogs. *Annals of surgery* 253:791-797.

Chu, A.Y., Ripple, M.G., Allan, C.H., et al. 2006. Fatal dog maulings associated with infant swings. *J Forensic Sci.* 51:403-406

De Keuster, T, Lamoureux J, Kahn A. 2006. Epidemiology of dog bites: a Belgian experience of canine behavior and public health concerns. *Vet J*; 172: 482-487.

Goss-Custard, J.D., Triplet, P., and A.D. West. 2006. Critical thresholds of disturbance by people and raptors in foraging wading birds. *Biological Conservation* 127:88-97.

Kahn, A., Bauche P., Lamoureux J., et al. Child victims of dog bites treated in emergency departments: a prospective survey. *Eur J Pediatr.* 162:254-258.

Love, Molly, and Karen L. Overall. 2001. How anticipating relationships between dogs and children can help prevent disasters. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 219: 446-453.

McCool, Stephen F., and Neal A. Christensen. 1996. Alleviating congestion in parks and recreation areas through direct management of visitor behavior." *Crowding and congestion in the National Park System: Guidelines for management and research.* University of Minnesota Agriculture Experiment Station Publication (1996): 86-1996.

Reisner, I.R. 2003. Differential diagnosis and management of human-directed aggression in dogs. *Vet Clin North Am Small Animal Practice.* 33:303-320.

Reisner, I.R., Shofter F.S., Nance M.L. 2007. Behavioral assessment of child-directed canine aggression. *Injury Prevention* 2007; 13:348-31.

Reisner, I.R. and Shofer, F.S. 2008. Effects of gender and parental status on knowledge and attitudes of dog owners regarding dog aggression toward children. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 233:1412-1419.

Reisner, Ilana R., et al. 2011. Behavioural characteristics associated with dog bites to children presenting to an urban trauma centre." *Injury prevention* 17: 348-353.

Reisner, Ilana. 2013. The Epidemiology & public health issue of dog bites: who, where & why. Western Veterinary Conference. Summary accessed at:  
[http://www.wvc.org/images/session\\_notes\\_2013/2013\\_SA7.pdf](http://www.wvc.org/images/session_notes_2013/2013_SA7.pdf)

Rohrich, R.J. and Regan B.J. 1999. Man's best friend revisited: who's watching the children? *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 103:2067-2068.

Vaske, Jerry, & Donnelly, Maureen. 2007. Visitor Tolerances and Standards for Off Leash Dogs at Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks. (HDNRU Report No. 75). Report for Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks. Fort Collins: Colorado State University, Human Dimensions in Natural Resources Unit.

Wright, John C. 1985. Severe Attacks by Dogs: Characteristics of the dogs, the victims, and the attack



settings. Public Health Reports, Vol. 100, No. 1 (Jan - Feb), pp. 55-61.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4609    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sunnyvale, CA 94087  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 03:11:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear SIr,

Doggy is not an evil, and doggy is much friendly than humen.  
It's pretty hard to understand why we can't give them more space to close with us.

Regards,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4610    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 03:51:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep the parks safe and clean for our children - I support the concept of dog management in this regards wholeheartedly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4611    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito , CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 03:53:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm concern that I'm unable to unleash my dogs at Crissy Fields. I enjoy walking my dogs at Crissy Fields as they are able to run at the beach and interact with other dogs. In my experience, I have not seen dogs fight with each other. I see happy dogs that run to their heart's content until they are tired. I see people enjoying each other as they share things about their animals. I have a history of depression. Dogs provide unconditional love when I see dogs running free, I feel peace, contentment, and joy. The interaction between humans and their animals projects happiness. We have busy lives and highly stressed careers. The beach provide fresh air, exercise, and interaction with God's creatures. I see responsible owners who pick up on their dog's mess. I look forward to checking out other parks and recreations in the Bay Area that will allow my animals enjoy running, and interaction with other animals. I pay almost 40% o my income to taxes. Please allow me to enjoy these areas with my animals because I am a taxpayer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4612    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Albany, CA 94706  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Pei-Chung Ting

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4613    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** None Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA with family and friends, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive in its current draft, as it would prohibit our regular exercise and enjoyment of the outdoors.

In its present form, the plan fails to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections communicated by the community after the first plan was released. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Yours sincerely,

Phillip Benedetti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4614    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Jose, CA 95121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4615    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Sincerely,

Tim Myers  
Resident of Montara,Ca.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4616    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 08:13:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express concern about the proposed changes to dog leash rules in San Francisco. The current dog policies are effective and make city life for dogs (and people) healthy, fun and special. Please do not change these policies in any way to further restrict beach and trail access for our dogs.

Many thanks! Josh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4617    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Jose, CA 95112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 08:17:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Dog Plan because it is too restrictive for off lease dog space.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4618    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 08:23:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Gosh San Francisco is known as a good Dogtown. I know people that don't Even have dogs go to Chrissy Field and the other national Park areas to just watch the dogs joyfully run around. How could we even consider removing this From our fine city by the bay. This is an essential part of quality-of-life in San Francisco. Thank you, Lindsay

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4619    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94704  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 08:34:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is outrageous that this project would take away the some of the extremely limited areas dog owners have to allow their dogs to go off leash. A dog that is regularly allowed to run off leash is a better behaved animal as any dog owner can attest.

Please reconsider this plan.

Thank you,

Leslie Balog

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4620    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support the few remaining off leash parks in and around San Francisco. Our family dog is an important part of our lives and we all benefit by being able to walk her off leash in the parks. It makes us all healthier, mentally and physically. I agree that some pet owners do not control their dogs and that they cause problems, but there are laws to cover that. Enforce them! Don't penalize the rest of us and cause more problems by not allowing all the other dogs and their owners, the exercise they need. Off leash is extremely important to our way of life on a daily basis. Please do not diminish our quality of life in San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4621    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 08:39:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support the few remaining off leash parks in and around San Francisco. Our family dog is an important part of our lives and we all benefit by being able to walk her off leash in the parks. It makes us all healthier, mentally and physically. I agree that some pet owners do not control their dogs and that they cause problems, but there are laws to cover that. Enforce them! Don't penalize the rest of us and cause more problems by not allowing all the other dogs and their owners, the exercise they need. Off leash is extremely important to our way of life on a daily basis. Please do not diminish our quality of life in San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4622    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 08:55:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear NPS:

The wilder places of San Francisco need protection. Yes, we live in a City and we all need to share space. But we live in a unique City. It is a desert City lying next to the Pacific Ocean. And we are lucky to have these wild places, not only for the beautiful contrast that they create with the built environment, but also the solitude and serenity they provide.

These wild places need to be protected and cherished. The coastal birds need to be protected and cherished. If dogs are granted all the area to run that their owners want it will be unfair. If dogs can run everywhere why not people running all over the land? You would have chaos and destruction. My point is that we need rules and regulations to maintain our wilder places within our City.

I think you have provided a balanced plan. It is not a sin to have a dog on a leash in our wilder parts of the City. The off leash dog owners, who prefer to call themselves "guardians" have the right to call themselves whatever they want, but they do not have the right to do whatever they want.

This Draft Dog Management Plan allows all of us, all visitors to these wilder places of San Francisco to be the Guardians, the stewards of our land.

Thank you for your hard work in preparing this plan.

Sincerely,  
Georgia Schuttish

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4623    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Retired Native San Franciscans Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 08:56:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was born at Saint Francis Hospital in March of 1945. San Francisco is not only my home, but a city I love more than any other city in the world. As Herb Caen would have written in his "continuous love letter to San Francisco", this city is made up of people with different skin colors, different religions, different educations, different pocket books (bank accounts), different talents, abilities, motivations, desires and dreams. What makes San Francisco the city that it is, is its universal diversity and its ability to find harmony, and progress, within that diversity.

I have watched not only the growth and redevelopment of the city's downtown areas, such as what is now called the South of Market area, from rundown warehouses to ball parks and highrises, and what used to be a freeway enclosed Ferry Building area to a magnificent open space with restaurants, hotels, trolley cars, offices and living spaces, but I have also been a part of the natural beauty surrounding San Francisco, such as Crissy Field, Lands End, Baker Beach, Fort Funston, Fort Mason, China Basin, Aquatic Park, Golden Gate Park, and many more places of natural beauty around this city.

This little jewel on the tip of the San Francisco peninsula land mass should be openly enjoyed by all peoples, their families, friends and family members, specifically their dogs. Dogs have been a part of San Francisco households for generations. Some came here with the ships and crews that sought financial opportunities. Some rode along with the missionaries who sought religious growth. Many dogs were here with The Ramaytush People, a subdivisions of the Ohlone Native Americans who inhabited the San Francisco Peninsula between San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean in the area which is now San Francisco and San Mateo Counties.

Dogs have always been a natural part of this area, and they still are. With respect for the land, people should be allowed to walk, run and enjoy their dogs openly on all the surrounding lands of San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin Counties. Restricting the people from sharing this area with their dogs is wrong and is dictatorial. I strongly oppose the Dog Management Plan proposed by The National Park Service.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4624	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Sincerely,

Zack Kamen  
914-548-4289

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4625	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Leandro, CA 94577 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA as well as other off-leash areas in the Bay Area, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is extremely restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

There are many areas that already are banned for dogs. Don't make it any worse than it is now. Most people who walk their dogs off leash are very responsible pet owners and it is unfair to penalize this group of citizens.

Sincerely,  
Maryellen Reed

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4626    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:02:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who walks 3-4 times a week with my dog, Dante, at Ocean Beach I think your plan for the GGNRA is wrong. It prevents both my dog, my girlfriend and myself from getting much needed exercise, the way we have since we got our dog. Before we got him we barely got out. I met more neighbors in the first size months I had the dog than the previous 6 years without him. Please don't limit access for me and my dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4627    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:10:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4628    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:14:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Supervisors:

Thank you for your public service.

---



The Sanders family of Marin County is opposed to the proposed GGNRA Dog Management Plan. We are in favor of keeping the existing areas open to dogs and the current on/off lease rules as they are.

This is a very important issue to us. We urge you to reject the proposed changes to the GGNRA Dog Management Plan.

Your constituents,

Doug, Michelle, and Anna Sanders

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4629	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent Dean,				

I strongly oppose the proposed changes to off-leash policy at the GGNRA. Please formalize the off-leash policy that is the current defacto policy.

My dog and I enjoy the freedom afforded by the open-space of the GGNRA ar Ft. Funston.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. I also oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The GGNRA should not change the leash status simply because not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Thank you,

Russell Ginsberg

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4630	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94158 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 09:22:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep off leash areas open to owners of responsible dogs. They are members of our families and require area to exercise outdoors!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4631	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 09:22:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support off leash dog parks.				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4632    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive and appears to be biased. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes in my opinion. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy INCLUDING off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like dog parks and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. There must be another solution that can be worked out.

Sincerely,

Karen Fletcher

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4633    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:28:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Laura Oppenheimer (parent to Tyler, a terrier mix my husband and I rescued 3 years ago).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4634    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and a variety of trails in the GGNRA.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. There is a huge area already of protected land and eliminating dogs or restricting them to only on-leash is unnecessary and excessive while causing a disproportionate impact on dogs and their owners.

The GGNRA is a "recreational" area not a "preserve" and is meant to be enjoyed, not just protected.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4635    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:37:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't take this away. It is so important for the mental health of both dogs and their companions. To take away this opportunity for people and their companions will have detrimental health effects that are bad for both the dogs and their humans. I often suggest that women get dogs to walk with for their health for safety and companionship to get them outside and moving. Being in nature with one's well behaved and friendly dog is also restorative in a time when so much of life is too busy, hectic and jarring.

Please don't let this change go through. What is driving it anyway?

Thank you for your consideration,

Dr Penelope Fetsch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4636    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:38:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There must be a way to keep the dog friendly areas available. Please do not reduce the open areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4637    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:41:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Enjoying the out of doors that so richly surrounds us here in Marin is an important part of our family. Weekend walks with our dogs is a habit and a way for our family to gather and spend time talking and being rejuvenated by the natural world. So few trails are already available for this important experience, I urge you to keep the current trails open to pets and even consider adding some more. The parks are for all kinds of use, biking and hiking and enjoying with our pets. Lets keep it that way.  
Cathy Greene

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4638    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:42:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management plan. This and the Preferred Alternative are far too restrictive. I support the formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy Plus off-leash plus off-leash access in San Mateo County. I was throughout trails in San Mateo and see first-hand that human garbage (wrappers, broken glass) is far more prevalent than dog waste.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4639    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:43:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I do not support increasing unleashed dogs in the GGNRA. Despite owners' protests to the contrary, dogs' conduct cannot be predicted with accuracy. Keeping a dog under control by voice commands is unrealistic, uncertain and often unsuccessful. Dogs run into and jump onto others, such as hikers, without warning. People fall and get needlessly hurt. Moreover, people are frightened and intimidated. It is unconscionable to permit this. The enjoyment of dogs or dog owners should not trump the safety rights of other people.

The community of dog owners should not impose their wills on the rest of us. There is no need for a dog

---

to be allowed to run off leash at the GGNRA; that is what dog parks are for. People there voluntarily accept the risk. Not at the GGNRA. Thus I oppose increasing the areas unleashed dogs are permitted. They should not be permitted ANYWHERE in the GGNRA. When I hike, I should not have to be on continual look out for unleashed dogs. Watching out for speeding cyclists is difficult enough!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4640    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:45:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ana

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4641    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:47:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the changes in the management plan for dogs. The only off leash location in Marin will be Rodeo Beach. Unfortunately Rodeo Beach is only accessible by auto therefore all the dogs and their owners who do not have cars are unable to go to Rodeo Beach. The highly restrictive proposed plan removes many existing trails and beaches for dogs. Many people moved to San Francisco and Marin specifically because these counties are doggie friendly. Dogs need places to run and play to be healthy and well adjusted. The new proposed plan is a set up for a cascade of expected and unexpected problems.

San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo are popular places to live, in part, because there are accessible areas for dogs and their owners.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

Wendy Kahn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4642    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:49:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent

For over forty years I have enjoyed the beaches of San Francisco and for the first time face the prospect of a reduction in my use and enjoyment of those venues for no logical or historically supported basis.

When Rep Burton first proposed ceding Our beaches to GGNRA it was always identified that the use and enjoyment of those beaches would not be reduced or restricted.

Not only are the proposals exactly contradictory of that stated intent but they clearly failed to take into account all of the comments, are no different from what was proposed before the comment period, were not the product of a truly transparent or fully participatory comment period, apply an identified bias, and fail to understand the use of the lands for an urban community that cares passionately about it's parks.

Use of specious arguments about regulations concerning dogs on Leash in national parks is an intentionally misleading representation about the regulatory process, the historic use of leash laws and the need to tailor regs to actual use and enjoyment.

THESE LANDS ARE FIRST AND FOREMOST INTENDED FOR THE USE AND ENJOYMENT BY THE RESIDENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE Bay AREA.

If GGNRA fails to understand and appreciate that as it's first priority then it has failed it's mission and you have failed yours.

Very Truly yours

Sheila Gropper Nelson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4643    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:50:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We would like to weigh in on this subject from the perspective of a family with severe allergies to dogs. We have lived in San Francisco for many years and can share the numerous encounters we have had with irresponsible dog owners who assume we want their unleashed animals jumping on us or our personal property in public places before we have to alert the owners of our allergies. Most often the response from dog owners is surprisingly not an apology but rather an indication that they are entitled to do what they wish even to the detriment of other persons.

The proposed plan has become necessary, because unfettered access to the park at large to irresponsible pet owners impinges on the rights of those doing nothing to harm anyone. We have a right to enjoy public lands without fear that our young child with allergies to dogs will not have an unleashed animal jumping on him or even biting him.

It is notable that with the advent of ADA, persons in the protected class are allowed to use dogs for assistance, but those with severe allergies to dogs are not entitled to any protection whatsoever.

We ask that you do whatever is necessary, including implementing the proposed plan, to allow those with dog allergies wishing to have access to public lands to be able to do so safely and without confrontations with persons believing they are entitled to do anything without regard for others simply because they love their dog. If they wish to have expanded off-leash access, then perhaps they can band together and use private resources that do not impact the public at large.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4644	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. As a property owner and business owner in San Francisco I stand opposed to the new plan. It is not what the citizens of San Francisco want! There are over 100,000 dog in our fair City and they need a place to exercise.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. Do not turn a blind eye to the DEIS comments. This whole process seems to be amounting to lip service for the pro dog faction and our needs have not been addressed in any way! In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

I beg you to listen to the public in this matter and now bow to the pressures of the anti-dog lobby. The GGNRA is an urban park! It cannot be managed like Yellowstone Park or other National Parks. It is not a wilderness, but green space that should be used in whatever manner the citizens choose. And we choose

to walk our dogs!

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

John Delaplane

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4645    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:54:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an avid bird-watcher, I support a Dog Management Plan that keeps dogs on leash in and near any sensitive bird habitat- -and that can & will be enforced. Too often I see dog owners letting their dogs run into so-called protected areas, chasing birds. In my experience, placing off-leash areas next to protected or on-leash areas generally doesn't work because it's too tempting for the people or the dogs. Dogs don't need protection; their owners take care of them. Wild birds live incredibly challenging lives, and they do need protection. Thank you for your consideration. -Matt Perry

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4646    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Although I am not a dog owner myself, I do enjoy walks at the GGNRA with others' dogs. I am strongly opposed to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent much needed recreation for dogs and their owners. I am particularly concerned that elderly and disabled people will not have an area to exercise their dogs off-leash if the new plan is implemented.

The great majority of people who walk dogs at GGNRA sites are caring, thoughtful people who pick up after their dogs and train their dogs. There is nothing better than watching a happy dog romp on the beach.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



Sincerely,

Hillary H. Huth

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4647    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** N/a Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:55:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I ask that you please not pass this plan - I enjoyed walking my dog on the water - it was her favorite thing to do right up until the time she passed away last year from cancer. It would be so very sad to take this joy away from people and their little friends.

Thank for your attention.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4648    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Sincerely,

Edwin Marwitz  
3020 Pine Street  
San Francisco, CA 94115

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4649    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Self-employed Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 09:56:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This would be a horrible development, banning innocent creatures from enjoying the best that nature has to offer. I vehemently oppose this ban!  
Sincerely,  
Lawrence B. Wood

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4650    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the

impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Sincerely,

Noel Adams  
3020 Pine Street  
San Francisco, CA 94115

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4651	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 09:57:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern,				

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

- o We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.
- o Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.
- o Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.
- o Visitors to the park should be limited to a maximum of two dogs per person.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

As a dog-lover myself, I have been witness to far too many instances where dogs that are off-leash chase after birds, forcing them to expend precious energy that they need to survive. Unlike our canine friends, our wildlife need us to speak on their behalf in order to protect the habitat that we all share. More balance is needed, and the proposed plan would provide such a balance.

Thank you for your attention.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4652	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 09:57:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Coming from a parent with a 4 year old that is Terrified of dogs and a family that spends weekends hiking in our great parks, I can tell you that off leash dogs are a problem for my child. He no longer likes to go on hikes with us since there are dogs that "chase" him when he runs from them. Public parks are public and should be enjoyable for all. I'm not advocating that dogs be locked up inside, but I do think that on trails that are frequented by all kinds of people, a dog should be leashed. If I'm at a park or beach and there are designated dog zones, I'll be sure to stay away from those, as long as there are also places that people without dogs can enjoy the beach/park as well. Public space needs to be accessible to all people, regardless if they like animals or not.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4653    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:00:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm glad you are reducing the off lease areas for dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4654    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:10:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello and I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. I am 10 years old and I love taking my dog to the beach, watching her run up hills. It makes her so happy to be able to run free without a leash. She is so so so happy when we go for hikes. I don't want to take away from that because of some silly rule. You have no idea what these dogs feel like when they are able to run in the grass, parks, ocean, etc... I think that you should acknowledge that. Thank you. Sincerely, Caitlin Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4655    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,

there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Sincerely,

Tobin Schilke

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4656	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Redwood City, CA 94062 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 10:12:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	One of the things I love about SF is that our dogs can be dogs and run on the beaches and have a blast in open areas. I have loved running on Ocean Beach and Chrissy Field with our dog. Please do not take this privilege away.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4657	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94618 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 10:13:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe it is paramount to preserve the GGNRA environment and species that depend on it. We are losing so much habitat and natives species are under so much stress. Dogs are not endangered. Moreover we can't rely on the owners to be voluntarily responsible for managing their pets. Every week I see evidence of "responsible" dog owners who leave their pet's feces on trails, or allow their offleash pets to go tearing through the brush. Believe me, I am not a dog hater. I've had dog pets and enjoy my friend's dogs. I just believe they are not a part of a natural environment. They are at an unfair advantage up against a fragile environment and other creatures who haven't adapted to their presence.				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4658    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Wurtzel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4659    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:15:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the plan to prohibit off leash dogs in Marin County. Marin being dog-friendly is part of what makes it so special. Please don't take away off-leash areas in the Bay Area. It would be a big mistake.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4660    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Albany, CA 94706  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a birdwatcher, I'm opposed to having dogs run anywhere in the GGNRA off leash. Often, when I am trying to bird watch, dogs will run up to me, circle, bark, jump up or nuzzle me between the legs. Dog owners do not have their dogs under voice control and often are apologetic or just use the excuse that it's only a puppy. This is very distracting and often frightening to me not to mention scaring all the birds away.

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

---

Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.  
Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4661	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94312 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan fails to address concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, I understand that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA was set up to be a recreation area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Marty Walker

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4662	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Stinson Beach, CA 94970 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 10:20:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support plan "A", with no further restrictions on dog and dog owner recreation. There are already too many restricted areas where dogs cannot go at all even on leash, and very few off-leash areas. I would support a fee or registration tag that the dog could wear or the owner could carry to				

---

help support the bag and clean-up program. Dogs that cause problems or owners that do not clean up after their dogs then could be kept track of and/or cited.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4663    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:21:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Good morning,

I have been a very grateful user of the NPS spaces for over 4 decades. How fortunate we are to have access to such beautiful, inspiring places!

Many of my ventures in the NPS Marin spots have been with a succession of 3 dogs. We have frequented Muir Beach and the beach at Fort Cronkite, enjoying the opportunity for beloved dogs and their tax paying humans to be out together with other like-minded creatures, always carrying doogy bags and cleaning up after ourselves while maintaining careful control of our playful canines so they do not interrupt the experience of other beach goers. It is abhorrent to think that those spots might be restricted to on-leash dogs.

Please protect some spaces for off-leash dogs to play and enjoy one another, posting info for all comers to let them know they are sharing with off-leash dogs, and that disrespectful dog owners who fail to clean-up and/or maintain control of their dogs should be reported.

Thank you for your attention.

Jennifer Lillard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4664    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:24:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Laurel, Miwok, Rhubarb Trail as well as Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.



Sincerely,  
Matt Sterling

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4665    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** El Sobrante, CA 94803  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:27:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Muir Beach is working fine! Please, please continue to allow dogs to enjoy it off leash. For more than 40 years we have been bringing our family dogs to Muir, most recently on Valentine's Day. The beach was filled with happy people and animals with no disharmony to be seen. As I am sure you know, for many of us, enjoying a good time outdoors means having our canine companion along. Our dog, Dorje, hikes the East Bay hills almost daily (where she has been trained not to chase coyotes), has gone camping in the High Sierra many times, and as a special treat sometimes gets taken to the beach. It is her favorite place and playing there takes years off her age. You have done some fine work with the habitat restoration and infrastructure improvements at Muir. The dog regulations state that the animal must be under control at all times, must not disturb wildlife, must be on leash except on the beach, must be under voice control, and that the owner must pick up dog waste. These rules are reasonable and are working well. The people are happy, the dogs are happy and, as evidenced by recent sightings, the wildlife is happy. Apparently river otters have been seen repeatedly. When I first moved to the Bay Area, there were a number of places where people and off leash dogs could enjoy the ocean. Now there are almost none. For many of us, this is a significant loss. Everything is a question of balance. Certainly some individuals will disobey the regulations. This happens in every circumstance where people are present. But these individuals are the exception. To enstate rules based on the exception is too draconian in this instance. I believe that responsible people, happy off leash dogs, and wild animals can continue to enjoy Muir Beach together. Please give this a chance to work. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4666    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:30:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Marian Bryan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4667	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 10:31:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Betty Bryan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4668	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. It could raise money for the parks by fining these people.

Sincerely,

Cristina G

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4669    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:39:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** What has Marin become? I can no longer take my dog on a hike. I can no longer let him run and play. You have destroyed the image of a kid playing ball with her dog because you can't play fetch on a leash. Responsible dog owners whose dogs are under voice control and who clean up after their dogs should be able to bring their companions on hikes, and to at least some of the beaches.

Increase fines for out of control dogs. Catch people who do not clean up. Punish the irresponsible people... those who have dogs as well as those who do not. But do not punish responsible Marin residents who live here for the nature and outdoor opportunities we have here. Who pay local taxes, start local businesses and hike on local trails... with their dogs.

Some people bring their dogs for fun, other for safety. Many women do not feel safe on trail alone, even in Marin. Dogs allow them to enjoy places they would not otherwise be able to see, and solitude they would not otherwise be able to have. Dogs are vital part of our society. This is codified in the many laws around proper treatment of companion animals, or regulations surrounding service dogs. Why do you now exclude companions from our activities? It questionable whether you will be able to maintain such restrictions. Everyone will soon have a service animal that cannot be excluded from the trails. That companion is a safety animal.

Enforcement of these regulations will cost money, and raise the ire of locals who will protest. Stop Marin from becoming a restrictive and elitist place. It seems that the only thing left for residents of this county will be a requirement that wine and cheese are required on all trails. Keep Marin, Marin. Rural, friendly, with an amazing combination of outdoor and cultural opportunities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4670    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:39:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Appropriate shared use of park land has become very controversial in San Francisco, and I'm not quite sure why. It seems that some advocates want to turn what have been successful urban public parks into wild lands, which is neither appropriate nor fair to users who behave correctly. The dog policy for GGNRA is one symptom of this controversy, as responsible dog owners are going to be prohibited from nearly all of their prior use of the GGNRA due to complaints about wildlife harassment. I am a frequent user of both Crissy Field and Fort Funston with my family. Just like I would never allow my daughter to touch or bother wildlife there, I never allow my dog near any wildlife and only allow her to be offleash where there is no wildlife present and other park users will not be bothered. I hope that the NPS will seriously consider allowing offleash use to continue, in conjunction with more education and

---

enforcement of existing rules. Otherwise, responsible dog owners will be the ones to suffer, as the irresponsible owners will continue to allow their dogs offleash in inappropriate ways.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4671    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Palo Alto, CA 94303  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:40:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner in the bay area and I occasionally use the GGRA to exercise my dog. It seems to me that most of the dog owners that use these areas are responsible people who just want their dogs to be healthy and have a place to run in a city where that is not possible in most places. My dog as well as most of the dogs I see there are under voice control. Removing these wonderful off leash beach places will make more dog owners break the law so that their dogs can have some healthy exercise. Please leave these off leash beaches as they are. There are so many dogs in the area that need a place to go. Has there ever been a survey to see how many people and dogs use these areas? There are an awful lot of dog owners in the San Francisco Bay area.

Thank you,

Roberta Rovner

Bay area dog owner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4672    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:43:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I support tightening up the leash laws. Many dog owners in this city are inconsiderate and unsafe. They laugh when their dogs jump on young children and leave their dogs' bowel movements all over. If we left dirty diapers on the street, you bet there would be repercussions.

My request is simple: the amount of off leash areas be limited so that there are safe areas for the rest of the city. And the remaining areas plus disposal of waste be enforced strictly, with fines substantial enough to pay for the personnel to do so.

If you want San Francisco to become more child friendly, this would be a huge step forward.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4673    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:44:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley Fire Road, and Trail, Muir, Rodeo beach, and the Marin

Headland trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4674    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94108

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:45:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an owner of a young dog that needs exercise, I wish to state that restricting activity to be on-leash only is a terrible idea. It is simply the case that all mammals need exercise - if we were to restrict adults to remain at their desks all day, or prevent children from playing, we would very quickly see negative effects. It is the same with dogs - we need to have these areas in which they can exercise, for their health and for their mental well being. To deny them of this is little more than to deliberately increase suffering of a group (dogs) that want little more than to be able to play.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4675    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in Glen Park.

I visit Fort Funston on a daily basis. I also visit Glen Park Canyon, Baker Beach and Ocean beach with my dog.

Unfortunately Glen Park Canyon is an on-leash area, so I go to off-leash areas (named above) to walk my dog.

The benefits I derive from off-leash is the following:

1. Allows me to get full exercise by either running or climbing, with my dog getting adequate exercise to. With a dog on leash, these exercises are seriously diminished.
2. seeing my dog and other dogs being able to play and be one with nature is incredibly joyful.
3. Being able to have my dog off-leash brings about a sense of freedom, and harmony with nature, which is one of the reasons that I moved to the Bay Area.

â€¢I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â€¢I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

â€¢I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

â€¢The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

â€¢The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

â€¢The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

â€¢The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

â€¢The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

â€¢The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

â€¢The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

**Correspondence ID:** 4676    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:47:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please save space for our dogs to run free. Free from harassment, leashes and cruelty.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4677    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I have walked with every one of my dogs since the 1970s in the various dog-friendly spots of the GGNRA. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.  
The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.  
The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4678    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95113  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Joe Jing

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4679    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:50:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I walk my dog in Chrissy Fields and Sweeney Ridge and oppose the measure

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Alexandra Willson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4680    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm writing to express my strong concern and opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I walk my dog regularly in various areas of the GGNRA and the adoption of this severely restrictive plan would significantly reduce my use of these all NPS facilities. As a result, I would also be much less likely to support NPS initiatives as I would no longer be a user, and be very likely to ask my elected officials to divert money from NPS to other budget priorities that do impact me more directly.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The report even states in general that there were only minor to

---



moderate consequences to natural resources for the majority of these changes with moderate to major changes to those of us who walk our dogs in this area. It is specifically mentioned in the report that citizens of the Bay Area have few other options of allowing their dogs to exercise off leash, and removing this highly-utilized resource would result in severe detriment to dogs and humans alike.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with large off-leash areas in San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin Counties and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I believe that this change is also contradictory to the NPS mission as it will drastically reduce the enjoyment of these areas for both dog owners as well as non-dog owners alike.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4681	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Sincerely, Mark Ryle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4682    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 10:54:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a disabled person. I feel it's discrimination to make these changes that you propose. I won't be able to walk in places like Fort Funston if I can't use the paths. Please allow us to continue use of these areas, I as a dog owner have the legal right to these areas, just like everyone else. Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4683    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:00:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Regarding the plans for Fort Mason, I would like to lend my support for alternative D. Alternative D offers a compromise that allows for the use of Fort Mason by different stakeholders. The Great Meadow is often too busy to allow for dogs to roam freely. While the rules require owners to pick up after their dogs, I have seen far too many cases of dogs defecating on the lawn (which I am sure the owner would attribute to the fact that they weren't watching their dog and the dog went to the bathroom without their knowledge). I shouldn't have to constantly look down when I walk thru an area.

If dog owners want an area to allow the dogs off leash, they can use the Laguna Green area for that type of activity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4684    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:07:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support restrictions on dogs in the park. I strongly support enforcement of all dog restriction policies. Currently, our parks are dominated by dogs. Any walk in a San Francisco park involves numerous, non-stop, dog-related frustrations, including dogs jumping on you, dog waste underfoot, and plants destroyed by dogs.

The most important reason for dog restrictions in our parks is the need for wildlife to flourish. Endangered birds, native plants, and all sorts of beneficial wildlife require a modicum of freedom from the pressures exerted by dogs. When we require dogs to be on leash in designated areas and absent from others, we will find a greater number of living things enjoying our parks.

Please restrict dogs' movements to the extent necessary to ensure that people, plants, snowy plovers, and others can all enjoy our parks. And please enforce those restrictions.

thank you.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4685    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:08:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs make San Francisco feel like home, and SF dog parents I find more civic minded than human parents. Please don't take away the spaces we exercise, socialize, pick up litter, and make this city whole.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4686    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 2/16/14

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

---

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4687    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:12:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco and live in Noe Valley. I regularly (between 4 and 6 times per week) walk my dog at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Baker beach and enjoy the recreation that it provides me, my family and my dog. I support the 'No action' alternative for these areas. Please enforce the existing rules of the 1979 Pet Policy. It appears that the SEIS is a fatally flawed document with no peer-reviewed, site specific monitoring or data and that there is no legitimate or legal basis for the proposed changes.

Regards,

Dave

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4688    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Greenbrae, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:13:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe dogs should be allowed off leash and under voice control on certain areas of the beaches and on some of the trails.

Dogs are a part of nature themselves. They are not only pets, but wonderful, happy creatures who love to run free in the wind and surf. I have noticed that not only their owners, but others on the beaches enjoy watching them play.

Of course, they should be kept away from wildlife. In cases where dogs do bother people or wildlife, I am in favor of evicting them, giving their owners citations, and permanently banning those particular dogs. I am also in favor of banning dangerous dogs, such as pit bulls and rottweilers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4689    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:13:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean

I'm writing to strongly opposed the GGNRA's draft dog management plan. I am a dog owner in San Francisco and the GGNRA parks have been fundamental to me being able to raise a happy healthy pet.

There's nothing that brings me as much joy as seeing my dog get excited as he smells Chrissy Field's beach air.

But beyond this, the fact is, \*dogs foster neighborhood community in these spaces\*. From the stiffest businessman to the most eccentric animal fanatic, we meet and talk and become friends and better neighbors in these off leash areas. These off-leash areas are the spontaneous town halls of San Francisco's pet owning community.

In addition, data shows dogs are not causing problems at the parks. Last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for \$2,000,000 for more rangers.

Please don't take these spaces away from us. It's unfounded by the data, and will greatly impact the quality of life for people and their dogs in San Francisco.

Sincerely  
Siobhan Quinn  
1335 Filbert Street, #304  
San Francisco, CA  
415-624-6337  
94109

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4690	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:13:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Whitney Murphy  
& Perrita (a dog that loves the beach!)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4691    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:13:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've been walking my dog at Fort Funston and Crissy Field for the past seven years. I am an environmentalist and a dog owner and I'm certain we can protect the environment AND allow off-leash dogs in the GGNRA. The vast majority of the GGNRA is already closed off to dogs. It's important to remember that the GGNRA is not a pristine wilderness area - it's a recreation area in an urban environment - so it needs to allow for recreation that is balanced with the protection of indigenous species and plants..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4692    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:13:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Zack Goetschi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4693    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:14:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have nearly fallen and been injured several times while running on the dirt path that goes from Crissy Field to Fort Point. The path gets very busy on nice days and on weekends, and off leash dogs dart and make dangerous sudden, unpredictable moves causing runners to risk injury to stop

short or avoid a collision. I have also witnessed several dog fights. For the safety of all, it is my hope that does would be required to be on-leash on the path, and perhaps keep the large field off-leash.

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

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4694	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:14:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please make all National Park areas safe for all by requiring dogs to be ON LEASH at all times.				

I am a dog owner but am made to feel unsafe by other dogs that are off leash. My dog was attacked by three off leash Great Danes. The financial cost of seven surgeries required for her survival was \$10,000.

My anxiety remains. Off leash dogs are unsafe. They should all be leashed except for fenced dog run areas.

Thank you.

Sharon Starr

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4695	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:15:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To All concerned, As a dog owner and taxpayer i am so disappointed that i have to write a letter to plea that you not infringe on the need for our noble best friend be limited to where we can walk our dogs and to have the freedom to do so without a leash. Where is the logic in this. We demand that this be public space. Not controlled by the park system. The beaches and Fort Funston is where we experience freedom. As people living in an urban environment we need to be able to let our dogs experience nature. Banning us from walking our dogs is not only an injustice it is an infringement on our civil rights. We work in offices, commute in cars and now you want to take away our freedom to walk our dogs on the beach and in the parks. Those parks are ours. Not yours to deny us of. You should be ashamed. Anyone who does this should lose there job. I myself will not take this lying down and will fight this. Stop your madness now! Giorgio Anthony				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4696	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:16:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Emily Christiansen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4697    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:16:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Carolyn Chamberlayne

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4698    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely, Tobi Garelick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4699    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Albany, CA 94706  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:18:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Representative: I am in favor of fewer restrictions of off-leash dog walking rules. Off-leash activities allow dogs to interact or avoid other dogs or perceived threats. This is particularly the case with high energy or working breeds. I include myself among responsible dog owners who are alert to their pet and other people's needs. Let us all try to get along and have fun in nature.  
Sincerely, Peter Day

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4700    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:18:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Caroline and Billy Cloak

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4701	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Albany, CA 94706 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:20:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please allow us to take our pets/family members to the local Parks. We are very responsible and always clean up after ourselves. We need space to take our whole family to enjoy the outdoors.				

Thank you, Sandra Lee Beckley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4702	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:20:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Cooper Bethea

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4703	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-3817

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a longtime walker and birder in the Bay Area, I strongly support the GGNRA's Draft Management Plan, which I regard as a fair and sorely needed approach to the growing problem of off-leash dogs in our park areas. I frequently encounter unrestrained dogs chasing birds in our parks and on our shorelines, and will welcome any and all official efforts to limit and control this problem and its profoundly negative impacts on wildlife, plants, and humans alike.

I subscribe fully to the Golden Gate Audubon Society's position, as follows:

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously. The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

Thank you for your thoughtful work.

Sincerely,

Christine Hall  
San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4704    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

---

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Allison Oropallo

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Allison Oropallo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4705	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:23:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not further limit off-leash dog walking i the GGNRA, especially Fort Funston.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4706	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:25:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please Save off leash dog walking in the City of SF Parks!!!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4707	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:26:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I believe that people need to be put first before dog owners. While I am fine that people have pets, parks are not created for the pets, they are created for the people of this country that pay taxes.

In San Francisco, there are more dogs than children. Whenever I take my son or go with my friends (who also do not have any dogs) to a park in the city, there always seem to be dogs running around off leash, leaving their mess in areas where people would like to sit. They ruin the area for the taxpayers without animals.

I would prefer to see dogs that stay on leash at all times unless there is a dog run. They should be kept away from areas that ordinary citizens enjoy and away from children because you never know if a dog could turn on child or person and bite or maul them. There have been cases where children have been attacked by dogs and as a parent you can never know if a dog will be ok around a child. Our children are more important in this regard.

The GG Parks are beautiful spaces and should be prioritized to people. It's fine to be accommodating to dogs, but they should be kept in different areas.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4708	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	oakland, CA 94601 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:28:41
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	i have had dogs for my whole life. they are the closest thing to children i will ever have. they are well behaved and always under voice control. i have spent alot of time with them in the beautiful nature around the bay area and i have never had any problems with any other dog owners or non dog owners in my 10 years of being here. this bill wil unfairly punish an entier section of society that does not deserve it. humans are the most destructive force on earth and you would make it so that they are the only ones that have freedom and access to a nature that they stole and scraped roads through? what fun is the nature gonna be filled with flocks of matching speedo bikers trying to run you over and loud watteling famlies that allow their ignorant children to chase the wild life? actually thats what i would like to see happen. all the humans that are at a certian lack of knowlage about how to respect nature must be on leash at all times.. thank you for reading. i hope that the one thing that makes me and my kids truly happy is not taken away beacuse of ignorant humans.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4709	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Hayward, CA 94541 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:32:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	My dog would be devastated if he could play with his friends freely at one of his favorite parks
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4710	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Castro Valley, CA 94552  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Bay Area German Shepherd Rescue Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:33:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4711    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:33:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't restrict lease free zones. Dogs and people have co-existed for 50k years and they bring amazing mental and recently discover health benefits to their owners and children. Help San Francisco be the progressive place that it is an offer options for on lease and off lease.

Adam Smith- Dog owner, father and proud San Franciscan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4712    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Boston, MA 02476  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:33:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My 4 year old son was jumped in by loose dogs three time in Ft Funston during a trip to SF. One owner said maybe my son should go else where.

Dogs can get good exercise on a leash without terrorizing kids.

I have a dog.

Thanks for considering the Silent Majority opinion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4713    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:34:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I write to support stricter limits on dogs in the GGNRA.

As you know, the GGNRA has more endangered species than any other unit of the National Park System. The goal of the Park Service must be to provide access to people, education, and protection of the natural resources under your (our) management. When dogs are incompatible with protection of our natural resources, they must be excluded.

Before people were here, beaches were very attractive to birds and other wildlife because they were vast areas with few predators, and so allowed ground-nesting birds like the Snowy Plover safe places to raise their young. Now with 6 million people in the Bay Area, and who knows how many dogs and other commensals, we have taken over that habitat and left these species nearly no place to reproduce. Similarly, we have destroyed well over 90% of the original wetlands in the Bay. We must manage these remnant habitats to allow the species that depend on them to survive and thrive as best they can. Many of these species may go extinct without these habitats, and even those that are not threatened deserve a safe place in this, the most productive estuary in California.

Please designate as much space as possible to the responsible use by people alone. Remove dogs from sensitive areas. Reduce the number of dogs (there is no reason for us, the tax payer, to provide spaces for commercial enterprises like dog-walking services), and enforce these laws. Limit the places for pets to those places that pose no threat to our native plants and animals, and especially to the threatened and sensitive species that call GGNRA their home.

Thank you

Alan Harper  
GGAS Board Member  
Oakland Resident  
National Park Fanatic

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4714    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:36:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am against any changes to the plan that would increase the number of dogs in the parks and recreation areas. There are already numerous places and dog parks for dog owners in Pacifica.

There has been an increase in the number of people bringing their dogs into San Pedro Valley Park, both

---

leashed and unleashed. There are signs prohibiting this, but they are ignored. As a result, there is dog excrement left behind on the trails, frightened deer, and foliage torn up. Each time I gently inform the dog owners of the restriction against dogs in the park and why, they claim ignorance.

Please save these areas for people, plants, and animals that call these parks and areas their home.

Thank you,  
Jennifer Alpaugh

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4715	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:37:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog owner, avid GGNRA visitor and former Field Biologist for the Fish and Wildlife Service, I understand the complexities of balancing the needs of all stakeholders described in the Draft Dog Management Plan/SEIS.				

The sheer joy my dog expresses while running off leash at his favorite park, Fort Funston, is unparalleled and certainly a difficult experience to recreate anywhere else, especially given the staggering lack of available ROLAs in the Bay Area. After waiting patiently all day for me to return from work, it is the only opportunity for him to socialize, get exercise and simply be a dog. It is also a great opportunity for me to enjoy the beautiful landscapes and soundscapes the GGNRA has to offer. The loss of this daily enrichment would be devastating and have a severe impact on quality of life not only for myself and my dog, but certainly for the hundreds of visitors who flock to the parks each day.

This is a classic case of the tragedy of the commons, as evidenced by the individuals who simply abuse the parks and take every bit for granted. Unfortunately, it is the small few who ruin the experience for others and contribute to the degradation of natural resources and impacts to sensitive species.

I am in favor of a balanced approach as described in alternatives E and F. However, I believe the NPS stands to allow for more community involvement with the release of this plan. Specifically, setting up voluntary activities for visitors to participate in the restoration and continued maintenance of the parks. For example, beach clean up days, native plant restoration, trail improvements, etc. For the many dog owners who love their pets and love their parks, there should be more opportunities for engagement and education.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4716	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:40:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I love the GGNRA as a place of natural beauty and a sanctuary of solitude from our busy urban lives. I urge you to adopt the most restrictive policy regarding the presence of on leash and off leash dogs. We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco parts of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.				

---



Dogs barking, dogs jumping, dogs digging, dogs urinating and defecating do not constitute an acceptable form of recreation the our National Parks.

It is not the mission of the GGNRA to assist or promote dog ownership. Therefore, park officials need to enforce the dog rules vigorously. Despite all the promises made by the dog coalition, it only takes a few irresponsible owners to destroy the work of many. Therefore, I urge you to implement the proposed plan with the addition of fencing for all off leash areas.

Please save us from the DOGPAC.

It is often local politicians who fail to license and enforce local dog regulations that create the howling by dog owners for more space. The NPS should not be pressured by gutless politicians or held hostage by a group of self serving dog owners.

I implore the NPS to implement a plan that is sustainable and results in future generations hailing your brave and enlightened stance against expanded access to dogs. Our children, grand children and future generations will hail your strong stance in favor of beauty and nature.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4717	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sf, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:41:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ena O'Daniel

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4718	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:43:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lisa Ochoa

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4719	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:43:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kelley Keery

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4720	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:44:16				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Natasha Applegate

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4721	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	HOMe Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:44:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lynn Bell

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4722	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:44:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Thank you for creating a Dog Management Plan for the GGNRA.

Dogs off leash on trails or running on beaches hurt wildlife and lessen the visitor experience. When I visit the trails and the beaches I yearn to experience the park in a natural state without dogs chasing wildlife and mauling children.

I encourage GGNRA to restrict dogs to being on-leash at all time everywhere in the park.

Most importantly, whatever mix of restrictions are implemented, I urge you to vigorously enforce the new regulations by issuing citations from Day 1. Many dog owners are proud scofflaws. Enforcement is the only way for the new regulations to be successful.

Please install clear signage at trailheads and beach access that clearly states "Dogs on-leash only. Citations issued. No warnings given."

Robust enforcement, issuing citations, not warnings, is the only way that the new regulations will be followed. Please issue citations to violators.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4723    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94124  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:45:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Heather Cheda

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4724    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Hertford, NC 27944  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:45:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe the GGNRA should adopt Alternative A for dogwalking in the Golden Gate Recreation Area. The GGNRA was set up to allow for recreational use by an urban populace which included off leash dog recreation. To severely limit this historical use is shortsighted and will only lead to further confusion and hostile interactions between all stakeholders. These open hostilities will be supported by the GGNRA and the law enforcement division of the National Park Service as this is the bias of the National Park Service in the management of the GGNRA.

I live close to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that allows off road vehicles to drive on sensitive habitat for extended periods throughout the year. How can the National Park Service allow this activity but not off leash dog recreation? I'm certain there are equal numbers of threatened species in the Outer Banks Area due to erosion and development, but the NPS allows this recreational activity to continue. The hypocrisy of the National Park Service is sickening.

The bias against one type of recreation (dogwalking) in a very densely populated region is absurd in relation to other types of recreational activity the National Park Service allows in other units including snowmobiling and off leash dogs for hunting purposes.

I hope this will be the last time I have to write a letter to the GGNRA about off leash dog recreation. You have wasted a tremendous amount of money and time in developing "policies" that are contrary to the mission of the GGNRA when it was set up as a unit of the NPS. I hope when the NPS gets the result it wants, no people or dogs on their precious land, the communities in the Bay Area go to their elected representatives have have the lands they gave to the NPS reverted to local ownership. In the meanwhile, I hope that overzealous enforcement rangers do not kill a person or dog while attempting to enforce any new policy that may be adopted contrary to the public outcry against changing the policy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4725    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** York, PA 17402  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** February 17, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I do not live in the San Francisco Bay area, but my daughter and her family do. My daughter, her husband, and their dog Osby currently live in San Mateo, but over the past five years they have held addresses in San Francisco and Burlingame as well. My daughter exercises regularly with her dog in the GGNRA, and I join them on walks on GGNRA lands every time I visit. As the mother of someone who

has utilized GGNRA properties for years to exercise with her dog (and who would be drastically, negatively impacted by proposed dog restrictions in the GGNRA), I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent my daughter and her husband from recreating with their dog- -for their own health and the health of their dog as well- -as they have on GGNRA properties for years.

The new plan was not was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original Pet Policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Martha Clark

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4726	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:50:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As a frequent user of the trail network in the Presidio I am writing to express my recommendation that dogs be kept on lease as often as possible. The current on lease regulations are rarely observed by dog owners as dogs are allowed to roam free disturbing other park users and the non-human dwellers of the park. On Saturday 2/18/14, I ran throughout the Presidio on a rainy morning. During my run I encountered over a dozen dogs on the trails and not one was on lease. Having been bitten by a dog in 2000, I am highly sensitive to dogs roaming freely and I'm easily triggered by any aggressive dog behavior. On MLK Day, Monday 1/20/14, my wife and I along w/ our 2 daughters went for a clean-up hike on our favorite Presidio trails. We cleaned up about 6 bags of dog feces left by dogs owners on the side on the trail. Sadly dog owners seem to show little respect for the Presidio on multiple levels and are a very entitled group breaking NPS regs with regularity. Please continue to maintain and enforce current regulations.

Respectfully,

Ron Gutierrez

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4727	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:50:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** You need to put tight, meaningful controls of dogs (and their owners) I absolutely know responsible dog owner, but sadly I think they're in the minority. Your plan is a good compromise

---

and you should stick with it.  
People need to be educated.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4728    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Viviendasleon Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Evan Markiewicz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4729    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:55:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am very interested in striking a balance between dog off-leash availability, environmental preservation and safety for all who use GGNRA land. However, because GGNRA land is one of the few places that is available to dog walkers, and that those areas are already very constricted compared to GGNRA land available to all other audiences, I would want to see as much space as possible allowed for walking dogs.

Because I use only Marin County and some San Francisco GGNRA areas, I will confine my comments to these. However, in principle, I strongly support as much off-leash area as possible. It seems to me it reduces the environmental and safety pressures the more alternatives are available to those of us who must have places to walk our dogs off-leash. Because dog owners are expected to have dogs under voice control at all times, a great number of options for off-leash walking reduces the number of dogs in any given area at one time.

As a dog owner who also works during the day and must use a dog walker from time to time, it is also important that dog walkers have places available to walk their dogs, and be able to walk enough dogs to make a living so they can continue to provide this essential service.

So I explicitly support Plan A in the following areas: Stinson Beach; Oakwood / Alta Avenue; Muir

---

Beach; Rodeo Beach; Marin Headlands; all sections of Crissy Field; and all areas of Ocean Beach.

CGNRA is, to a great extent, serves an urban population. This isn't some wilderness accessible by a few. As part of our cities its use should be open to all of us. It feels as though the park service is bent on excluding the mass population (us) that walk with our dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4730    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** oakland, CA 94612  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Edward Laves

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4731    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:57:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am furious at the short sightedness of the proposed plan. Walking my two small dogs twice a day is my meditation, my gym, and my recreation. I do not accept the reasons for the proposed plan as the research is not conclusive about the effect of dog walking on these recreation areas. What I do know is that if this plan goes through and dogs do not get exercise and then flood the small parks we can expect the following; more bites and injuries for dogs and humans, increased euthanasia, more dogs begin abandoned at the shelter, decreased health benefits for people that cannot safely walk their dogs. I HAVE A DOG AND I VOTE!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4732    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 11:58:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco, and I am constantly worried about being bitten by off-leash dogs when I go to parks. In my experience, if there is one off-leash area, the vast majority of dog owners treat the entire park as an off-leash area. For example, in Stern Grove/Pine Lake park, dog owners let their dogs run off-leash in the entire park, even though not all areas are off-leash areas and even though the park is clearly signed. I've had a couple close calls while running in the park, and I'm considering buying pepper spray to protect myself. The problem is especially bad on narrow trails where dogs may be surprised by runners and other dogs. Please consider that experience when deciding whether to have off-leash areas next to "leashed" areas- -the vast majority of dog owners will not obey signage.

I would prefer the alternative that recognizes the interests of all San Franciscans, including those of us who want to use the parks without fear of being attacked. Please make sure that all off-leash areas are surrounded by fences or other natural barriers and can be enforced. Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4733	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:59:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

Regarding the GGNRA Dog Plan, I strongly support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy, especially as it applies to Fort Funston.

I have lived in San Francisco since 1982 and have walked my dogs off-leash since then, almost exclusively at Fort Funston, at times every day. I have seen many changes to the park to accommodate a diverse population of visitors. I have also seen over the years that an overwhelming number of park visitors are people with dogs, mostly off-leash. What I have NOT seen are damage to the park environment by dogs off-leash, dog fights, and dogs negatively interacting with people. In fact, for me, Fort Funston is the gold standard for a park where off-leash dog walking has been a total success for years.

It seems to me that the purpose of the GGNRA is to establish parks, which are havens of the natural environment, relief from the urban, densely populated areas of the Bay Area. Unnecessary fences and restrictive leash laws undermine this purpose.

If the new Dog Plan must be implemented, at least make an exception for Fort Funston and maintain the status quo for this unique and special place.

Sincerely,  
Janice McIntosh

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4734	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 11:59:43				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Becky

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4735	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I'm writing to express my strong concern and opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I walk my dog regularly in various areas of the GGNRA and the adoption of this severely restrictive plan would significantly reduce my use of these all NPS facilities. As a result, I would also be much less likely to support NPS initiatives as I would no longer be a user, and be very likely to ask my elected officials to divert money from NPS to other budget priorities that do impact me more directly.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The report even states in general that there were only minor to moderate consequences to natural resources for the majority of these changes with moderate to major changes to those of us who walk our dogs in this area. In my years of frequenting these areas, I have never observed any violation of NPS policies by dogs off leash. It is specifically mentioned in the report that citizens of the Bay Area have few other options of allowing their dogs to exercise off leash, and removing this highly-utilized resource would result in severe detriment to dogs and humans alike.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with large off-leash areas in San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin Counties and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I believe that this change is also contradictory to the NPS mission as it will drastically reduce the enjoyment of these areas for both dog owners as well as non-dog owners alike.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4736    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
s. garrett

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4737    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Nick M.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4738    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:01:01

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
s garrett

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4739	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94129 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 12:02:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As as 4 year resident of the Presidio and long time dog owner, I cannot support the current preferred course of action for this plan. The Presidio's relatively accommodating and open policy towards dog walking has played a significant role in my decision to live here. It has been my experience that the vast majority of people exercising off leash walking within the Presidio have done so responsibly.

More broadly, the Presidio is the closet and largest space for dog walking for many San Francisco residents. With a growing dog population, severely restricting owners' options in the GGNRA will only push dogs into other parts of the city which are less safe and less equipped to handle increased dog activity.

I support option A, the no action plan.

Sincerely,  
Stephen Gough

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4740	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941-3228 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 12:05:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I find it extraordinary that a new proposal further limiting dog access needs to be considered at all. Dogs need fresh air and freedom to run just like humans. The existing restrictions are already excessive and further restricting dog freedom in the parks would be deeply saddening. There is no necessity for this plan. Leaving as is, or even opening up more paths for dogs and their owners would be a far better plan; but I see no sign of improvement of access in this dreadful plan - just further constraint. Ooh and how many of our hard earned tax dollars have gone into this pointless one sided anti-dog consultation process?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4741    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:06:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sarah Jane

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4742    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Private Citizen Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:07:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My name is Marta Lutz and I live at Ocean Beach in San Francisco. I walk my daughter's dog, Tucker, either across the street on the beach or take him to Fort Funston for a good run. We have also walked from my place to Funston at a low tide and then all the way to Daly City and back. One of the ultimate dog and human experiences.  
These are the only two places that I know of where we are able to have the freedom to do this. It is a wonderful experience to witness the joy of freedom that Tucker, and so many other dogs we meet, get to have. He is an extremely healthy and fit dog and loves the opportunity to run! Really run. It is what dogs do. It is who they are.  
He gets lots of on leash walking but it is the running that he needs and we need to keep Ocean Beach and

---

Fort Funston open for Tucker and all his other dog friends and all their people that go with them. There is too much 'fatness' in America. We all need places to go that help us stay healthy. Every body needs a workout and it would be a shame and unAmerican to close off these perfect places for dogs and their humans to exercise, be outside and enjoy the beauty and uniqueness our very special corner of California.

Thank you for your consideration and I hope you'll do the right thing and vote for freedom,

Marta Lutz

A Native San Franciscan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4743	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 12:07:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir/Madam:				

I oppose the Draft Dog Management plan. It does not consider the needs of San Francisco residents and their pets. Furthermore, I disagree with the entire idea of giving a migratory bird preferential use of an urban park designated for recreational use.

San Francisco and its environs are not some sort of a remote game preserve. Native species have been displaced, non-native species introduced and cultivated and wildlife populations decimated. That horse is out of the barn. To now ban the use of recreational areas because it may disturb some wildlife is ridiculous on its face.

Respectfully,

Victor P Bartolotta

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4744	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94401 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Peter Pan BMW Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 12:09:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jordan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4745	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Foster City, CA 94404 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a strong national parks supporter AND a dog lover who regularly walks her dogs in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dogs for my own health and my dogs' health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

GGNRA is an essential resource for bay area dog guardians. It is extraordinarily difficult to provide dogs with the exercise and mental stimulation they need in the bay area. I am one of thousands of bay area dog guardians who depends on the physical and mental stimulation GGNRA affords our canine companions. My dogs visit GGNRA lands at least 5 days a week, and those visits are critical to their health and vitality; not to mention my own. **TAKING AWAY OUR ACCESS IS AN ACT OF CRUELTY; GGNRA FACILITIES ARE WHAT MAKES IT POSSIBLE TO HUMANELY KEEP A DOG IN THIS OVERCROWDED REGION.**

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jacqueline Harlow

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4746	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94158 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 12:17:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Fort Funston is one of the few areas that are enjoyable for walking my dog off leash. I see many dog owners there, and all are very respectful of their environment.

I would be very unhappy to see additional restrictions placed on leash free walking in this area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4747    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:17:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kim Mroczkowski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4748    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

---



deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4749    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4750    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4751    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:21:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jess Rollins

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4752	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 12:23:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

THP

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4753    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is much too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for over 15 years (particularly at Fort Funston). I have also been a member of the GGNRA for over 20 years, and I strongly believe that off-leash recreation for dogs and people is fully compatible with the preservation and health of the GGNRA.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco and San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

If Fort Funston's off-leash recreation is prohibited or curtailed, the quality of my life will suffer dramatically. That's not an overstatement. Running my dogs at Fort Funston has been a large part of my enjoyment of San Francisco - I go there to take exercise for myself and to visit with other dogs and dogs owners regularly.

Sincerely,

Margaret E. Murray

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4754    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:25:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am the owner of a dog (previously 2). My dog is socialized and enjoys running with other dogs in areas that I understand are under consideration for banning of off-leash and on-leash dogs. If the goal is to simply prevent people from enjoying these areas with their dogs (and by virtue of that, prevent people from going to those areas), then I think such a policy will achieve that goal. If that is NOT the goal, then I ask that the policy be considered more carefully. People with dogs like to enjoy outdoor areas with their dogs. While I'm not one of those dog owners who overly-anthropomorphizes their pets, I do see my dog as another member of the family when I have time to walk or exercise outdoors - much like I view my 11-year-old - I would rather bring him out with me if I'm enjoying the

---

outdoors. If I'm out in the city or elsewhere (in the Sierras), I will not go somewhere where I cannot bring my dog. It just isn't a good use of my quality time to do so because it means that I later have to bring my dog out separately. I hope this viewpoint is considered. I know that it is shared by my friends with dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4755    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:28:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jason Smith  
415-786-2255

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4756    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:29:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** When the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was passed on to the National Park Service for management, a condition was that people would still be able to enjoy the areas with their dogs, including in some places, off-leash dogs. I'm writing to oppose the National Park Service's efforts to restrict those areas.

I'm a dog owner, an avid environmentalist, a backpacker and a frequent visitor of Bass Lake, Fort Funston, Crissy Field and the Marin Headlands. I fully accept that my dog should not be allowed in most parts of our precious national parks. I do not, however, see any compelling reason, after consulting scientific research on the matter, why she shouldn't be allowed in some state parks and in the GGNRA.

Off-leash areas are particularly precious because dogs need to socialize with one another off-leash;

---

socializing is a core behavior and it's cruel to deprive dogs of it.

Dog-friendly areas make up a miniscule fraction of the lands in the GGNRA, and yet the NPS aggressively seeks to reduce them despite consistent public opinion in favor of keeping off-leash and other dog-friendly areas.

Muir Beach, Fort Funston and Crissy Field are vital spots for responsible dog owners to go to socialize and exercise and enjoy their dogs. It's no accident that these areas are so popular; they are successful parks where people enjoy nature and build community.

The NPS cites incidents related to dogs as a rationale for its proposed restrictions. But the number of incidents reported from dogs, according to the NPS's own statistics, is a tiny fraction of the total number of incidents rangers handle. Citing owners who disobey the rules is a sign of the success of the off-leash policy, not its failure. Indeed, if you applied the same rationale to people that you do to dogs, you would simply ban all people from the parks because a handful commit crimes.

On the other hand, unreasonably banning dogs and off-leash dogs from areas which are clearly not pristine wilderness creates a perception that dog rules are unreasonable and unfair, and, as such makes it more likely that reasonable people will break the rules. Because dogs will not simply disappear if these restrictive rules go into place: They will continue to breed, and people will continue to love them and keep them as pets, and they will seek outdoor recreation with their pets.

Dogs that get adequate exercise and socialization are healthier, safer dogs. Dogs that are cooped up become a threat to city dwellers. Any animal deprived of its basic needs becomes a problem, as the NPS must surely know.

The GGNRA lands belong to the residents of California. Many of us moved here to be able to enjoy such areas, in many cases, with our dogs. The NPS has no credible justification for defying the will of Californians. If your internal processes simply can't accommodate dogs, then please return the land to the state for management.

Sincerely,  
Cameron Scott

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4757	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 12:30:33
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	We frequently walk our dogs at nearby Fort Funston, and it is a great way for all of us to socialize and exercise. We find that off-leash walking is much more effective in terms of exercise, and dogs in general, not just our dogs, are much better behaved when off-leash. When our dogs are walked on-leash, especially our Australian Cattle Dog, they are more territorial and protective. When our dogs are off-leash they have a chance to authentically interact with each other and figure out how to behave. The only negative encounter we have had with another dog at Fort Funston was with a dog that lives in our neighborhood, and who we encounter on leashed walks.
------------------------	---

Closing the GGNRA to off-leash walking would have a very negative impact on city parks where off-leash walking and playing is allowed. We often take the dogs to Stern Grove and McLaren Park, and can

imagine these areas being overrun with dogs and owners (and professional dog walkers) if Funston and Crissy Field are put off limits.

We are also bird watchers, and are certainly concerned about wildlife. We are conscientious about keeping the dogs out of sensitive areas such as plover nesting sites, and would like to see these areas more clearly protected, while allowing large areas, including other parts of the beach, to stay open to off-leash dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4758    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:31:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area as proposed in the Fall 2013 release.

I believe that there are too many dogs in the park now and steps should be taken to control the growing impact of dogs on the visitor experience. In particular Baker Beach has a problem that needs to be addressed now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4759    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:33:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Megan Brezovar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4760    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:33:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** San Francisco must be one of the most dog-friendly cities in the world.

Of course, dogs off-leash causes problems and complications.

Because these inevitable problems are effectively managed, and continue being tolerated, speaks volumes about the quality of life in San Francisco.

Don't you dare try to take that away from us.

Bill Williams  
50 Lucerne street #1  
san francisco, ca 94103

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4761	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 12:34:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jay Brezovar

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4762	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Moreover, the conclusions of the report are simply not logically derived from the studies it cites! There is no persuasive evidence that restricting dogs will improve the site's ecology.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Alex Chaffee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4763 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94062  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I support safe sustainable use of GGRNA lands. Wildlife and the natural environment around us need the safeguards requiring better management of dogs in our wild and natural areas. Yes I support this statement:

"The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

â€ Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

â€ Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4764 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** sanfrancisco, CA 94118  
United States of America



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:38:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i love my dog and we go to crissy field 2-3 times a week and have never had any problems with walking him off lease. please do not change this

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4765    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I often walk my dog in the GGNRA, and I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Thank you,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4766    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. You are treating these areas as if it were a remote wilderness, when it's actually located within a large and heavily populated major urban area. These trails and beaches (less than 1% o

the 80,000 acres that comprise the GGNRA) have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Sandra Shuhert

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4767	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	PLEASE READ!!!!				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach Loop, and several other areas we now have the freedom to enjoy.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

PLEASE CONSIDER that a good many people regard their dogs as family, and the exercise and rigor of off-leash walks keep a great many in the Bay Area with marginal MENTAL HEALTH stable and engaged with the world in positive ways.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4768	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Nick Chaffee  
57 Oakwood St. SF

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4769	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog running on Miwok and Rhubarb trails, as a loop from our house on Marin Ave. I love hills and your proposal would mean absolutely no hills for us. We also take him and our son to Muir Beach regularly and they love the water and sand. It is sch a treat and one of to primary reasons we got a dog, to be outdoors as a family.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I can't tell you how frustrating it already is to not be able to run my favorite trails of Marincelo and warm springs, with very little reason behind it. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. And as a woman, often running alone, I feel safer with my dog by my side.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4770	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 12:51:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I continue not understand what harm is it for dogs to enjoy our beautiful surroundings. God made these areas for humans and their canine friends...If a human is allowed to visit these areas, why can't they bring their friend. My hard-earned tax dollars get squandered away on all kinds of projects that I never see any benefit from. I want this benefit of having access to beautiful area where I can take my dog and enjoy my life in the area that I support with my tax dollars.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4771    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:53:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean:

I sincerely hope the National Park Service and the GGNRA will abandon the proposed unreasonable plans to deny most San Franciscans use of the vast majority of recreational land within their city, and replace them with reasonable plans that serve the people of San Francisco and the surrounding area.

The GGNRA controls nearly all of San Francisco's recreational waterfront, leaving the City powerless to act on behalf of its citizens. From the two proposal drafts submitted to date, it is clear that the GGNRA has completely ignored the wishes of the people of San Francisco and of their local government (the City and County has passed a resolution opposing the GGNRA plan).

Without these areas accessible, San Francisco dog guardians and their canine companions will be limited to city parks. While some have dog-play areas, they are small, cramped, poorly maintained, and very unfriendly to the many dogs who thrive in open areas. This is not a reasonable outcome.

As you know, the majority of San Francisco households have canine family members. Confining those households to small, dangerous areas in remote corners of the city simply fails to serve the needs of the people of the City of San Francisco.

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

You also know that there is no danger from off-leash dogs, only the tiny minority of irresponsible guardians. The existing proposals punish all dogs and all responsible guardians (the vast majority) for the actions of a small minority. It is like banning all shopping to prevent shoplifting.

The proposal is untenable and must be changed. While I would love to ask that you act to return these lands to local control, I know that is a longer-term and more complex issue.

For now, please know that a large plurality of your constituents use these areas with their dogs. People and dogs enjoy the freedom of playing on the beach, hikes in nature and (for my dog in particular) the lush grass of Crissy Field. We do so with few incidents of trouble with dogs (which are almost always the fault of the guardian), and fewer incidents than between non-dog-related people in city parks.

Please change the plan. I suggest that you focus the plan entirely on using highly knowledgeable (about dogs) enforcement, and far stricter enforcement, of good, civil behavior within the GGNRA.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jeff Weinberger

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4772    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

~Zoe Rolland

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4773    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:54:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Crissy Field convenient and accessible for both dogs and people. Dogs are a valuable part of a lively urban community, and we need off-leash areas and open space. Areas that are not welcoming to my dog are effectively unavailable to me and everyone in my family.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4774    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 12:57:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

Dogs are proven to support mental health and workplace productivity. Off-leash areas are absolutely essential for the health of these dogs.

For the love of all the hardworking, super smart, productive people and canines of the San Francisco Bay Area, we MUST preserve off-leash access.

Any move to restrict off-leash access will likely be met with unnecessary and politically costly hostility. Let's avoid this unwise step while we still can.

Many thanks for your support,

Kristen Lee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4775	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 12:58:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please reconsider this plan to eliminate so many acres of off-leash areas for dogs. There are literally hundreds of thousands of dogs in San Francisco and it's unreasonable and unfair to the dogs and their owners to make this drastic change. You're ignoring the interests of hundreds of thousands of residents for a short list of flimsy justifications.				

A quick trip to Fort Funston on a weekend illustrates how vital these areas are and how often they are used without frequent or serious negative outcomes.

Please listen to the people and don't make this change.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4776	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:00:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Roland W. Turner

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4777    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:01:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't restrict dog access to GGNRA parks. I don't have a dog nor do I even like dogs that much, but they need a place to play, unleashed, to have a reasonable quality of life in such a space-limited city. GGNRA parks are part of our community as are people and pets. Please find a better way for us to work together.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4778    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:02:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Growing up in Mill Valley and now living in San Francisco, I am spoiled by the beautiful surroundings just minutes from my home. I am grateful for the opportunities I've had to visit trails and beaches for leisure and as a professional. I want to see these areas remain accessible for future generations of people and their pets to enjoy.

Throughout my employment as a National Park Service Park Ranger in Yosemite Valley, it was always difficult turning people away from NPS areas where dogs were not permitted, leashed or not. Although the rationale was to protect wildlife and other hikers, dog activity in the area was hardly ever a problem. The difference here is that Yosemite National Park is a designated wilderness area, unlike the GGNRA. The Dog Management Plan to further restrict areas where dogs are currently permitted in the GGNRA will discourage people from 1) exercising in these beautiful areas, and 2) will cause people to be less supportive of maintaining these areas. Perhaps the efforts and funds to draft lengthy proposals should be redirected to enforcing restrictions that already exist and providing educational outreach to the populations experiencing the GGNRA. In one of my primary roles as a Park Ranger, I was an educator and it is far more efficient to teach outdoor etiquette than it is to discourage people from recreating in areas that were meant for that activity. Each time I enter these areas I am reminded that people and dogs alike love the GGNRA, so why change what already brings joy and promotes health for so many?

I urge you to support Marin County Board of Supervisors president Sears' proposal! Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4779    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:03:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Christine Dodds

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4780    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:04:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not let dog owners intimidate you or undermine your commitment to protecting our dwindling wildlife preserves and populations. As it is, I regularly see dog owners violating existing restrictions, letting their dogs off leash on trails where this is forbidden, and bringing their dogs into areas where they are not supposed to be, leashed or otherwise. These dogs then run off the trails and deep into the surrounding hillsides, disturbing any possibility of sanctuary for the wild animals who live there, and when on the beaches, relentlessly chase any shorebirds that are present, making it impossible for them to rest or forage for food.

People's attachment to their domestic animals does not trump the imperative to protect and care for our natural environment and its creatures, whose viability is increasingly being eroded by human cluelessness.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4781    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---



**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:07:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Katherine, and I have a large breed dog here in SF. I use Crissy Field every single day to exercise my dog. I use the park to let my dog off-leash in order to give him freedom, fun, and exercise. I strongly oppose the GGNRA's new draft of the dog management plan. Public San Francisco beaches were designated by an act of Congress in 1972 to give open spaces to the residents and visitors of San Francisco. The people of the city are dependent upon this public space for recreation of many kinds, and it would be unfair to repeal this privilege (especially since the city continues to grow in population). This is a recreation area, meant to be used by the people of San Francisco; it is not a national park similar to Yosemite or Glacier National Parks. The trails and beaches of San Francisco were set up with dogs in mind (based on the pet policy formed in 1979), and it would be fair to the residents to keep it that way.

The new plan was not changed in any significant way to reflect the objections opponents to the plan had during the 1st phase. In addition, there hasn't been a single site-specific study (as required by law) that supports a restriction of our current dog-friendly public real estate. Furthermore, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated for its creation was to make more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors to the city with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of the original intent for the use of Crissy field. The restriction will also impact all park visitors in a negative way, since there will be increased concentration of dogs in a much smaller area. This is setting the dog management plan up for failure, and it's setting dog owners up for increased risk.

We benefit from off-leash walking because we're able to let our dog play with other dogs (and us) freely. With off-leash play and walking, we aren't limiting the amount our dog wants to run and get exercise. If we lost the privilege to walk our dog off-leash on Crissy Field, we feel that it would hurt the health of our dog. We do not feel that walking our dog in a city dog park filled with other dogs is adequate. He needs continuous aerobic exercise daily to ensure that his weight stays down (which in turn helps ensure he has healthy joints). Off-leash play in open spaces is also important for him to remain comfortable and social around all different types of dogs. The existing dog parks are already too crowded, and too overwhelming for dogs and owners.

I strongly oppose fences to restrict access to areas of the GGNRA. Fences feel like pens to dogs and to humans. When out-of-control dogs are enclosed with other dogs, the possibility for problems becomes higher. Fences also give courage to dog owners who have poorly behaved dogs to let their dogs off-leash. This disrupts the entire area, and encourages dog owners who have well-behaved dogs on voice command to not use the area.

Lastly, the most recent data that was released by the GGNRA (in 2013) shows that in the last year, out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people who own dogs, there have only been 6 reported dog bites; 5 reported dog fights; 2 cliff rescues; 2 reported cases where people were "scared" by a dog; 1 instance of a wildlife killing; and 1 horse bite incident. Reported incidents involving people are much higher than any statistic involving an incident with a dog. This data, released by the GGNRA, does not support the argument that there is a need for major change. This data also does not support the request for more rangers, which would cost another \$2MM per year.

San Francisco is a unique community that has always embraced dogs and other pets as a part of its culture and happiness. To ban our pets from being able to run off-leash in a park that was created for this very purpose would be a loss of a unique freedom that San Franciscans appreciate, and value very highly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4782    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:08:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
B Bennett

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4783    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

This is an URBAN park not a rural park, servicing a population of over 1,000,000 people within 30 miles, not a remote park.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

---

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Dean

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4784    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:13:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the GGNRA's dog management plan. Dog walkers should not be earning income from the use of our parks, but this plan at least addresses the reality of our urban/parks congestion. Six dogs on a single width trail is disruptive to visitors and to tour programs. A limit of 3 dogs is preferred.

With the disappearance of 'empty lots' in our developing in-filled cities, pressure to use our parks as dog walking/pooping grounds has increased tremendously. I am grateful to the parks staff for their tireless years of attention to this important issue that will affect the future protection of our beloved parklands. I have been an interpretive docent volunteer leading tours in the natural areas of the Presidio since 2000, and witnessed the proliferation of dog owners whose behavior shows their lack of understanding and respect for other park visitors, valuable natural resources, volunteer stewardship, and basic civility. I also believe that as this issue has now taken years to be resolved, the dog groups have become politically aggressive, so the time is crucial to finalize a dog management plan that will monitor the use of the parks, and have the ability to enforce all aspects of the plan put into use.

I expect the public to additionally be able to monitor and report dog issues, and suggest that appropriate signage, outreach and internal procedures will be in place to empower those most affected most by dog issues, so that the dog community will know that it is not just the park staff and police monitoring their behavior.

thank you,

Barbara Corff

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4785    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have lived in San Francisco for 22 years and have regularly walked with a dog in the GGNRA throughout that time period. I mostly use the Crissy Field area, but also recreate with my dog in the Presidio, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Rodeo Beach and on hiking trails throughout the area. I am writing today to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's most recent Dog Management Plan. The preferred alternative does not significantly reflect the substantive concerns and objections that I and thousands of other people submitted in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that the supports the drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas that the preferred alternative would impose.

The preferred alternative of the Dog Management Plan is too restrictive. It will prevent me and the thousands of other responsible people who enjoy recreating with their dogs in the GGNRA from doing so, thus negatively impacting our own mental and physical health and the health of our dogs. This valuable aspect of RECREATION should be retained as outlined in the 1979 pet policy. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Of course there are other voices that support a different position than mine, but the "scientific" and real evidence of the impact of dogs in the GGNRA just doesn't hold up. In the 22 years that I have used the GGNRA spaces with my dogs, the wild flora and fauna of the parklands has thrived. With proper signage and enforcement by the National Park Service, conflicts can be minimized. The preferred alternative is a recipe for disaster, as more people recreating with their dogs will be forced into smaller spaces. The small percentage of the GGNRA that is available to people with their dogs needs to be retained and protected. Please keep the RECREATION in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for all of us.

Sincerely,

Laurie Berk

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4786	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:15:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
William Sanjour

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4787	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Pinole, CA 94564  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:15:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As someone who recreates on a regular basis with my dogs in the GGNRA, I am strongly opposed to the preferred alternative outlined in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The overly restrictive nature of the proposed restrictions will prevent large number of law-abiding dog owners from recreating in the area and offering dogs a natural and healthy outdoor experience. As a wildlife biologist who has studied dog and wildlife behavior for years, there are simply no credible peer-reviewed studies documenting that dogs have a negative impact on wildlife in the area. There are simply As a regular visitor to the area, it is also evident that unruly children are a more common annoyance than are off leash dogs. This proposed regulations do nothing but further restrict people's ability to offer a natural experience to their dogs and their families.

The current off leash areas are already highly restrictive and while I believe the appropriate action would be to expand off leash pet areas, the current rules have worked well in the GGNRA for decades. This new plan ignores many valid comments from thousands of GGNRA users submitted in response to the first plan. National lands are by charter to be maintained both for the preservation of nature and responsible human use. The current trend toward overly restrictive rules for these areas, including GGNRA, reflects an undoubtedly well-meaning but short sighted approach, essentially banning normal human and pet activities without credible evidence supporting the action. GGNRA is by name a national recreation area for a densely populated region. I strongly oppose new policies that reduce the recreation opportunities for myself, others, and their canine companions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4788    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Jennifer Kattula and I walk my dog on Crissy Field every single day. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach (not to mention the other beaches that we frequent as well) in the future.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

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

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

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

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Finally, this proposal is without evidence or merit that it will positively impact the current open space dog areas and surrounding areas. Not only is it an unfortunate use of taxpayers dollars, it dramatically reduces the dog-friendly city that San Francisco has been for many years.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Kattula

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4789	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	sf, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:17:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I have been walking my dogs on Ocean Beach for nearly 20 years. It is vital for you to understand that everyone needs this beach to be off leash year round. The beauty of a free dog makes everyone happier and more appreciative of this vast, wild treasure. You need to know that this Park area is unique, it is not your noThis beach has historically been off-leash, and your draconian efforts to thwart the canines is very short sighted. Please allow dogs to run free on the entirety of Ocean Beach - it is the right thing to do. Thank you, Peter Munks

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4790	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 994118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:19:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing to express the strongest possible opposition to the new GGNRA's draft dog management plan.

I have lived in SF with dogs for more than 25 years, and I exercise my dogs in different parts of the GGNRA on a daily basis. The new plan is draconic, needlessly restrictive, and will make it incredibly difficult for me and my dogs to exercise and enjoy the outdoors as we have been doing for over two decades.

Many thousands of people have submitted concerns and objections to the new plan, yet all of these citizens have been ignored.

There is no valid reason whatsoever to restrict dogs and the humans who own them from enjoying the existing dog-friendly parts of the GGNRA. 99% of the GGNRA already restricts dogs.

The GGNRA is supposed to be a recreation area, and was created to serve a heavily populated area. The trails, beaches, and areas that allow dogs have done so since 1979. There is no reason to change this existing situation.

I often walk on Baker Beach and Chrissy Field at dawn, and invariably, if there are any other people out at that early time, they are walking their dogs. San Francisco has over 100,000 dogs, and these animals and their human owners need a place to exercise and enjoy the outdoors.

If the misguided and wrong-headed new policy is put in place, an enormous and untenable strain will be put on the city parks in San Francisco. This should not and cannot be allowed to occur.

The original pet policy formulated in 1979 must be continued and formalized.

Sincerely,

Glen Jasper

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4791    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** retired Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:21:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To: GGNRA Superintendant regarding the Supplemental Draft GGNRA Dog Management Plan  
Date: February 16, 2014

As a resident of Montara and previously Pacifica and San Francisco, my dogs and I have enjoyed use of Fort Funston, Mori Point, Rancho Corral de Tierra and other open spaces. I am concerned and

---

disappointed that the GGNRA is proposing an increasingly restrictive policy on dogs on their lands.

The GGNRA's mission is to provide access to nature for residents of an urban area. It's an essential mission - having open places that urban residents and visitors can enjoy and to foster taking care of our natural environment. AND, it's a fact that urban dwellers have pets who bring joy and companionship into their lives. These pets deserve space to enjoy fresh air and exercise. These elements are important components to good health and disposition.

Over the last 19 years I've walked with my dog or dogs on many trails and open spaces now controlled by the GGNRA. I specifically consider access to open space for my animal companions in choosing where to buy a home. When I go walking MOST of the people I see have dogs with them. This is particularly true at Rancho Corral de Tierra in Montara. If dogs are banned or required to be on-leash everywhere, this is a DISSERVICE to the majority of people who use the open space.

The GGNRA needs to consider the comments and suggestions made by local residents - serving the public in an urban area is the organization's reason for existing. It;s time to stop being unrealistic about who really needs and uses your lands. It's time to stop pushing anti-dog restrictions.

Thank you for considering and ACTING in concert with the comments submitted by thousands of citizens who use and love having access to local open spaces for themselves and their dogs.

Sincerely,  
Ann Sasaki  
Montara, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4792	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	MDG Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:23:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** For three decades my husband and I have been walking our dogs off leash in the Rancho Corral del Tierra open space. Contrary to GGNRA's stated purpose to maintain recreational activity, the closing of more than 4,000 acres to off leash activity would seriously limited the use of this land. It does not appear that GGNRA did any research into how this land was used before they arbitrarily redefined how it will be used in the future.

During my daily walks in the area between the horse stables (Amber Ridge, Moss beach Corral) and Renegade Ranch I have NEVER seen anyone out there who did not have an off leash dog, a horse or both. Who will use this beautiful open space if dogs are restricted to leashes? Dogs can not be adequately exercised if they are restricted to leashes.

It seems absurd that I live in the middle of over 4,000 acres of open space and I have no where in the area where I can legally run my dog off leash. What I have been doing is driving up to Crissy Field where there is a legal off leash area so my dog can get a good run. How absurd is that? I leave my rural setting to drive to big city so my dog can run.

Our daily off leash dog walks are the single most important component to my husband's and my daily exercise. In all the 30 years we have been doing this I have yet to see any serious altercation involving off leash dogs (unless you count the ranger tasing a violator). The GGNRA report cites things that dogs



COULD do to cause damage. Where is the evidence? What about the bountiful coyotes on this land? These wild animals COULD pose a much greater danger than our coddled pups. Are you going to remove them too?

For all of its volume, this "study" is a poorly thought through and poorly researched document. If you want a successful plan you need to include the people who will be using the land in drafting the plan. Please, come on down to Montara and get to know us and the lovely open land that you are writing about and dictating rules for. You may just find that things were working just fine before your interference. So far I have seen no value added by GGNRA's stewardship, just a few signs and the removal of an "unsanctioned" bench and adding a sanctioned bench. MDG continues to manage the garbage removal and the doggie bags. GGNRA's major impact has been to deprive us of our greatest recreational opportunity.

Thank you for listening,  
Maggie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4793	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:26:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ashley Wessinger

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4794    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:26:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I am writing to urge you to keep the off leash areas as they are. My dog is a runner and needs more exercise than I am able to provide. My physical limitations may hinder me from walking fast, but when we do reach the off lease sites, my dog has the ability to run free! This means he gets his exercise and great socialization. Please don't agree to more limitations and restrictions, life already has enough barriers.

Thank you for your time.

Becky Edens

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4795    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:27:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge you not to restrict both on leash and off leash dog walking in the GGNRA. I am a longtime resident of San Francisco and visit Fort Funston and other GGNRA areas on a weekly basis because I can walk my dog off leash there. Most times I am at Fort Funston I see hundreds of other responsible dog owners there is well. Being able to exercise in a natural area with their dog off leash provides a vital benefit both physically and mentally for people and their dogs. If off leash dog walking is restricted many of these people will no longer be able to get this benefit. The city parks in San Francisco do not have the capacity to absorb the influx off people and dogs that would occur if dog walking is restricted in the GGNRA.

As Fort Funston and many areas of the GGNRA are within the city of San Francisco it is vital that the GGNRA administration consider the needs of San Francisco and its residents. With over 100,000 dogs in a city with only 50 square miles it is critical that the current areas open to off leash dog walking in the GGNRA stay that way. The Mayor of San Francisco, several of its the Board of Supervisors, representative Nancy Pelosi and many other leaders representing San Francisco have all expressed opposition and concerns about restricting dog walking.

The only restrictions on dog walking that could be justified would be to limit the amount of dogs that professional dog walkers can walk at a time. Virtually all the negative impacts from dog walking I observe are when professional dog walkers are walking groups of over six dogs. Overwhelmingly the people walking their own dogs are responsible and have their off leash dogs under voice control.

A majority of the public comments to the original EIS were opposed to restricting both on leash and off leash dog walking. Yet the SEIS does almost nothing to acknowledge these concerns. Furthermore the SEIS does not provide substantial and specific evidence that restricting dog walking will provide a significant benefit. Therefore the best course of action is to continue with the 1979 Pet Policy that is currently in place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4796    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** SFFD Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:31:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please dont close down Fort Funston.  
Bob Jackson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4797    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:32:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I am writing in opposition to the Preferred Alternative. This plan is too restrictive. The GGNRA should be an area for all to enjoy equally. Taking away off leash areas and creating this limited access is unfair. I walk my dog off leash at Fort Funston and it is good for my health as well as my dogs. I am a good steward to this beautiful open space. I always pick up after my dog and go to weekend clean ups. The GGNRA's purpose is to set up recreation areas in densely populated, urban areas. Please don't loose sight of your mission.  
Sincerely,  
Phillip R Benedetti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4798    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:35:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** i have been a dog owner for the last 20 years in san francisco. what i enjoy most about being a dog owner in the city is that i am able to walk with my dog throughout the city. eliminating parks and dog walking area is only gonna congest the parks that we are allowed to walk in. there are way too many dogs for such a small area. please reconsider.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4799    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:36:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Even if I try to remove my subjective understanding from it, this plan seems like an unfair penalty to dog owners.

---

Yes, there are irresponsible dog owners. Whether they're leaving excrement out of laziness, or lack the

---

will to control their dogs, their actions are offensive to everyone. Fortunately it's a small group.

Conversely, there are people with children that disrupt public space and wildlife. They chase birds. They throw things. They have uncontrolled temper tantrums. Their actions are offensive to parents everywhere. Fortunately it's a small group.

There are fishermen who station themselves at Ocean beach, blocking the water for vast stretches from people and wildlife. Fortunately it's only a few most of the time.

Groups of people discard trash carelessly, ruining parks and beaches for an overwhelming majority who don't behave so carelessly. I could go on citing any number of people behaving in a manner that is less than helpful.

What I'm trying to say, is there are all manners of nuisance born of irresponsibility. But we don't react to every nuisance with a ban that adversely affects huge, targeted sections of our city's population. Particularly one with a bias that seems almost too specific to anything other than politically motivated, under an umbrella of science that discards an opportunity for appropriate discussion, independent audit, or policy.

Dog owners, on the whole, are a very responsible group. And most of the time, our dogs are practically our children. And while I'm not comparing a pet, no matter how beloved, to a human being, I am saying the love is real and that our collective lives will be dramatically impacted by a huge reduction in available space to not only bond with our pets, but for them to simply get outside. A large population of cooped up dogs is good for no one. Unable to socialize and exercise, bad things are more likely to happen than good. Once that happens, I worry the dog owners will also be blamed.

For every person who composes a well crafted argument citing dogs' collective negative impact on our parks, I could find another who could likewise find equal blame and equal potential damage from other sources entirely. These things are often dependent on the lens one peers through. In this case, some like dogs, some do not.

But all of us love our parks. Most of us are quite responsible with them. Everyone deserves to enjoy them without such specific bias. And history tells us that bans are rarely a good idea, typically born out of agenda rather than practicality.

Irresponsible dog owners are bad. This is not in dispute. The solution, one might argue, is not to collectively ban all of us but to fine people for their infractions. Fine them significant amounts. The parks would make money, and offenders would be punished individually. It just seems a more fair way to go. And an option I hope might be considered.

But for now, the most liberal place on earth feels a lot less liberal.

Sincerely,

Ben Dutro  
San Francisco resident

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4800	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	South San Francisco, CA 94080				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to you with concern and opposition to the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas preferred alternatives in San Mateo and San Francisco Counties. Our family walks our dog almost daily in GGNRA lands including Sweeney Ridge, Fort Funston, Mori Point, Rancho Corral Tierra and occasionally in the San Pedro Highlands. These areas have been open to dog walking for many years and have been a great area for recreation and source of joy for our family. We have been lucky to enjoy the environmental and historical beauty of these lands while exercising with our dog. I understand the need to protect fragile areas and balance public recreation needs; however, it appears we are being excluded from use of these public areas despite years of responsible use and minimal to no environmental impact. Perhaps better signage and enforcement could accomplish your goal without restricting the areas we are currently able to bring our dog. Significant portions of Northern San Mateo County are owned by GGNRA. It would be unfortunate to loose our recreation and the associated tax base that dog walkers bring with them.

**Sweeney Ridge**

I prefer option 19A with the addition of all of the Baquiano trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica to its conclusion at the Portola Discovery site.

I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to:

"Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System

"Over stating of damage caused by on leash dog walking given the historical use of area (once an active military site, 4x4 vehicle trails, gas/water/electricity rights of ways, mountain biking, horse riding).

"Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation.

"No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing.

"Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

"Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable.

"Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

**Fort Funston:**

I prefer option 16A over any other.

I do not prefer options 16B,C, D, E, or F for the following reasons:

"Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Funston trail systems.

"Over stating of damage caused by dog usage given the historical use of area (once an active military site, horse riding).

"Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation.

"No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing.

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural, open park setting.

"Fort Funston is nationally-recognized as one of the greatest dog parks in the country. This kind of open space is not available anywhere else in the greater bay area.

"Is enforcement realistic? It would seem by virtue of the vast, interconnecting trail system, the GGNRA would have to resort to excessive enforcement measures to regulate the trail use.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

"Fort Funston has no real appeal to any other user group due to its cliffs, steep terrain, and climate. It is my opinion that restricting dog use will not invite the perceived low-impact user(hikers), rather it will invite an element of transients, loiters, and trespassers. The dog users are both the stewards and proprietors of this land; the presence of such unwanted elements is diverted by virtue of the presence of dog enthusiasts among others.

#### Mori Point

#### I Prefer 17A

I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to:

"Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

"Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (4x4 vehicle trails, motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding).

"Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

"Consideration for ADA accessibility

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a rural park setting.

"Area is in a densely populated area with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience.

"Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking.

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

"Symbolic fencing and signs have been effective in keeping people as well as people with dogs out of sensitive areas

#### San Pedro Highlands

#### I prefer 20E

I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F

"Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

"Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle club/ motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.)

"Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

"Consideration for ADA accessibility

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the

GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a park setting.

"Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience.

"Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Rancho Corral Tierra

I prefer 21A

"I do not support the the preferred alternative of 21F due to

"Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

"Over stating of damage caused by on or off leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.)

"Consideration for ADA accessibility

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a park setting.

"Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash or off dog walking

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by dog walking.

"Has been unregulated for 30 years

"More research needed due to only being a park for less than two years

As you know the GGNRA is a unique special place that was created to accommodate the recreational needs of an urban area, essentially creating an urban park. Any attempt to mirror dog restrictions used in national parks with a wilderness experience would be misguided and would go against the intended mission of the GGNRA when it was created. Please continue to allow us to recreate with our dog in the GGNRA and consider my concerns.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4801    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:38:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing in support of the formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I am against the Preferred Alternative as it is unfair. The GGNRA should be open to all and to virtually take away all land for those with dogs is unconscionable. The beautiful open space that is the GGNRA should be enjoyed by all. Many of these areas have frequent visitors who own dogs. I think that if the park service were being fair, they would see that these people respect and take care of these open spaces. Please be fair and keep these areas accessible to all.

Sincerely,

Cynthia A Benedetti

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4802    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** South San Francisco , CA 94080  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to you with concern and opposition to the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas preferred alternatives in San Mateo and San Francisco Counties. Our family walks our dog almost daily in GGNRA lands including Sweeney Ridge, Fort Funston, Mori Point, Rancho Corral Tierra and occasionally in the San Pedro Highlands. These areas have been open to dog walking for many years and have been a great area for recreation and source of joy for our family. We have been lucky to enjoy the environmental and historical beauty of these lands while exercising with our dog. I understand the need to protect fragile areas and balance public recreation needs; however, it appears we are being excluded from use of these public areas despite years of responsible use and minimal to no environmental impact. Perhaps better signage and enforcement could accomplish your goal without restricting the areas we are currently able to bring our dog. 51% o The City of Pacifica is owned by GGNRA. It would be unfortunate to loose our recreation and the associated tax base that dog walkers bring with them.

Sweeney Ridge

I prefer option 19A with the addition of all of the Baquiano trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica to its conclusion at the Portola Discovery site.

I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to:

"Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System

"Over stating of damage caused by on leash dog walking given the historical use of area (once an active military site, 4x4 vehicle trails, gas/water/electricity rights of ways, mountain biking, horse riding).

"Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation.

"No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing.

"Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

"Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable.

"Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Fort Funston:

I prefer option 16A over any other.

I do not prefer options 16B,C, D, E, or F for the following reasons:

"Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Funston trail systems.

---



"Over stating of damage caused by dog usage given the historical use of area (once an active military site, horse riding).

"Degradation of area with existing non-native vegetation.

"No attempt to protect proposed areas with signage or symbolic fencing.

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural, open park setting.

"Fort Funston is nationally-recognized as one of the greatest dog parks in the country. This kind of open space is not available anywhere else in the greater bay area.

"Is enforcement realistic? It would seem by virtue of the vast, interconnecting trail system, the GGNRA would have to resort to excessive enforcement measures to regulate the trail use.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

"Fort Funston has no real appeal to any other user group due to its cliffs, steep terrain, and climate. It is my opinion that restricting dog use will not invite the perceived low-impact user(hikers), rather it will invite an element of transients, loiters, and trespassers. The dog users are both the stewards and proprietors of this land; the presence of such unwanted elements is diverted by virtue of the presence of dog enthusiasts among others.

#### Mori Point

#### I Prefer 17A

I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to:

"Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

"Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (4x4 vehicle trails, motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding).

"Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

"Consideration for ADA accessibility

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a rural park setting.

"Area is in a densely populated area with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience.

"Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking.

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

"Symbolic fencing and signs have been effective in keeping people as well as people with dogs out of sensitive areas

#### San Pedro Highlands

#### I prefer 20E

I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F

"Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

"Over stating of damage caused by on leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle club/

motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.)

"Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

"Consideration for ADA accessibility

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a park setting.

"Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience.

"Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on leash enforcement rather than unregulated off leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash dog walking

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on leash dog walking.

Rancho Corral Tierra

I prefer 21A

"I do not support the the preferred alternative of 21F due to

"Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

"Over stating of damage caused by on or off leash dogs given the historical use of area (Motorcycle trails, mountain biking, horse riding.)

"Consideration for ADA accessibility

"Impact on other local parks (the San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy) making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk out dog in a park setting.

"Area an urban park with proximity to neighborhoods not a wilderness back country experience.

"Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on leash or off dog walking

"Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by dog walking.

"Has been unregulated for 30 years

"More research needed due to only being a park for less than two years

As you know the GGNRA is a unique special place that was created to accommodate the recreational needs of an urban area, essentially creating an urban park. Any attempt to mirror dog restrictions used in national parks with a wilderness experience would be misguided and would go against the intended mission of the GGNRA when it was created. Please continue to allow us to recreate with our dog in the GGNRA and consider my concerns.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4803	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:40:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from

recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Russell Ulrey

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4804	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94158 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Shaul Teplinsky

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4805	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Julie Trestman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4806	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:45:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I support the no action alternative in the S EIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. I would urge you to retain the long-standing 1979 pet policy. I have lived in and around Millvalley for over 40 years and have owned four different dogs during that time. I have hiked with my dogs on a regular basis during all those years in the areas mentioned above. It is a wonderful resource that is always been available to people like myself and our dogs. To deny us access to these areas seems to me unfair and discriminatory. Most of the open space around here is restricted. These 4 or 5 areas mentioned above are the few areas available to dog owners like myself that like to enjoy the outdoors with our pets. Please don't take that from us.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4807	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:46:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** These off leash areas are the highlight of my life with my pup and also the thing she looks forward to the most in her life. They make living in the city with a pup possible and gives them the proper exercise. I have never encountered a negative interaction or inconvenienced anyone in our outings. I always clean up properly and make sure she doesn't bother with growth or vegetation. I think it's ridiculous that this is even a topic or issue. We will be forced to overcrowd already overcrowded off leash city parks. Please do not go through with this.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4808	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Audubon Society-Marin County Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:47:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I favor the preferred alternative regarding the GGNRA's current plan to further restrict dog activity on GGNRA lands. Almost every town and city in Northern California has at least one

---

dog park. Dogs are not people and most can only react to thousands of years of instincts that have made the dog a PREDATOR in the natural world. The wildlife that dwell on the GGNRA lands also must react to their instincts to avoid any predator. Dogs 'mark' where they roam. The wildlife will move from areas that are constantly marked by these predators. The negative impacts to the native wildlife are obvious.

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

The Cult of the Dog is strong in Northern California. Professional dog walkers are organized and have their 'jobs' on the line. Please do not succumb to the demands by elected officials who are mostly responding to political pressure and potential votes. Many county supervisors and a few other politicians have decided to ignore the real problems of too many dogs roaming free in natural or restored areas that need upmost protection. We have lost too much ground to the whims of special interests and the interference from bonehead politicians. Please stand tall and follow a plan that provides ultimate protection of the wildlife and the habitat that these creatures depend on to survive.

Thank you.

Richard Fraites  
Novato, California

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4809	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:47:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not adopt plan that restricts off leash dog walking more than current arrangement. I use the park with my kids and dog weekly				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4810	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:48:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Many others have stated their objections to the proposed dog restrictions. I reflect their opinions, particularly well-stated by the Marin Humane Society. It would be so helpful to know why, exactly, dogs are considered so detrimental to the parks environment, and then perhaps dog owners would not feel so persecuted. As it stands, I feel like my little dog, my outbound poop bags and my innocent little week-end walks are being victimized for no reason. Are the NPS officials not themselves dog-owners? Do you not get why this new proposal is so cruel? Give us some evidence please, as to why dogs should not be allowed to traipse along the trails with their owners. Otherwise, it just feels like random vindictiveness on your part. Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4811	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:48:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am strongly opposed to restricting dog walking in the GGNRA. The new dog management plan could ban people with dogs from 99.9% of the GGNRA's 80,000 acres. There is no way that this plan can be balanced or fair, since it denies dog-walking access to hundreds of thousands of people who live in 1/3 of the Bay Area households and who have dogs. It is vital the GGNRA consider the recreation needs of all of these people with dogs by continuing with the 1979 Pet Policy which gives them and their dogs access to a minute percentage of the total GGNRA land area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4812    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. These seem fair and we'll developed.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Fred Winograd

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4813    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:49:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** SAVE OUR DOGS OPEN SPACE. I AM A TAX PAYER AND A VOTER. DON'T FENCE THE DOGS OUT.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4814    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:49:16**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not put this ban into place. An overwhelming majority of San Francisco residents have dogs, in fact I recently read that more residents have dogs than children, and off-leash parks and beaches are part of what is special about this city!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4815    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132-2625

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** San Francisco citizen and dog owner Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:** Member**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:49:32**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:**

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

When San Francisco's Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all San Francisco park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

When San Francisco granted GGNRA the open space lands in our 7 mile by 7 mile city, it was with the granted promise these lands would be for recreation as it had been since it began. Now the GGNRA wants to go back on their promise for made up excuses. San Francisco has a relatively small and limited recreational use areas. We are NOT a national park needing tight oversight by the Fed's. We need our few recreational areas for our local residents. It's not as though the rest of the nation will be coming to SF as they do to national parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4816    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:50:03**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** February 15, 2014

77 Cuvier St.

San Francisco 94112

Frank Dean, General Superintendent

GGNRA

Building 201, Fort Mason

San Francisco CA 94123-0022

Re: Draft Dog Management Plan/DEIS  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

My last correspondence about this took place May 26, 2011 - those views remain unchanged (see below). However, I have since learned more about the importance of formulating a rational policy about dogs in the national parks and other recreational areas. There's an epidemic of obesity and other health problems in this country, many of which can be traced to a lack of exercise - recent studies indicate dog owners may get as much as 34% more exercise than non-owners.. As a dog-owner yourself (are you still?), I'm sure you understand how important owning a dog can be in addressing this issue. In addition there are new studies indicating pet ownership can play an important role in preventing allergies.

I realize dogs in national parks is a thorny issue with which the Service has been grappling for several years. However I also think the GGNRA has been a largely successful experiment, a Peaceable Kingdom which those who have been at Ft. Funston on a weekend know firsthand. I agree that Ft. Fun is currently being overused, but attribute this to the scarcity of other options, especially in San Mateo county.

Were the Park Service to draw on the experience the GGNRA has acquired there could be a national policy developed which would allow me and millions of other dog owners to fully enjoy our national parks. Right now, as you know, dogs are mostly excluded, and this also excludes me unless I want to pay \$50 a day to board my girlie while I experience the Great Outdoors. This is nuts. What's required is imagination and WILL to allow some modest changes which could include: off-leash play areas from 1 - 5 (fenced) acres adjacent to campsites; on-site daycare for dogs while owners hike in areas inappropriate for dogs, designated on-leash areas where dogs would have little or no impact on wildlife - surely a panel of dog experts could come up with many more ideas, including the training of Park personnel (which could be funded by a special license for dogs) in dealing with dogs and their owners, preferably without tasing either. Therefore I'm forwarding this correspondence to First Lady Michelle Obama in her capacity as chairman of Let's Move, as well as to Gov. Jerry Brown suggesting a similar program for our state parks to be funded by dog owners and/or a portion of the taxes we already pay.

I understand that the primary NPS mandate is to Preserve and Protect, and listening to recent interviews with the author of *The Sixth Extinction*, Elizabeth Kolbert, have brought home to me how dire the situation is. If the GGNRA is used as a model for recreational options near major population centers it will help reduce carbon emissions as well as contribute to our health.

Having seen how much flak the NPS has been taking in Congress, and how much has been cut from the budget, it occurs to me that dog owners represent a natural constituency which could be incredibly supportive of the environmental principles of the NPS - I, for instance am a long-time member of the Sierra Club. Perhaps its time to build bridges with us rather than continuing to pursue policies which damage us and our dogs.

Sincerely, Judith D. Kucera

Letter dated May 26, 2011

My husband (64) and I (67) have owned our small (lot is 25 x 100 ft.) home in the Glen Park/Bernal neighborhood of SF for 30 years. 2 years ago we adopted a rescue dog for companionship and exercise. Because of our ages we initially looked for an older dog, but fell in love with Penny (now 3, a 60 lb.



Chow/Shepherd mix) at the SPCA pet fair and embarked on a new, demanding and immensely satisfying relationship.

Over the past two years we've spent countless hours exploring San Francisco with Penny, but our favorite spot has been Fort Funston because of the dog-friendly environment where we can go for long walks together and she can socialize with other dogs and humans off-leash. Twice a week she goes there in a play group with a dog-walker (I quite often tag along because it's so much fun watching them play together - Penny's best friend is a year-old Weimie she's known since he was 2 months old), and 2 - 3 times a week she goes there with Mark or me; other days we go to city parks for her daily 2 mile walk. For a year and a half we went to A Better Way for Dogs and learned voice control and how to work with her on and off leash, and we've worked hard to be responsible dog-owners. As long-time environmentalists (I'm a Sierra Club member) we also try to be responsible stewards of the natural world (we used to go to Ocean Beach to do clean-up in the '80's - young people thought we were weird!), so we keep a close eye on her when we're out there, and have worked hard to exercise voice control when she's off-leash.

I've attended 2 NPS meetings as well as the SF Supervisors meeting to learn about the Draft Proposals for the GGNRA and have been utterly dismayed at the extreme reductions in on/off-leash recreation outlined for dogs and their guardians. After studying the Fort Funston ROLA proposals it seems clear that no dog behaviorists were included as DEIS advisors, because neither the on or off-leash areas have any shade!!! Also, as a senior, I'd risk injury trying to get Penny to the beach (which as you know is often unusable because of high tides or bad weather) on-leash, and because the trails would be crowded Penny would be anxious, esp. on-leash, and more likely to be aggressive (evinced possible leash rage). The ROLA proposed next to the parking lot is completely inadequate for the number of dogs using Fort Fun and is an invitation to non-compliance which under the current proposal would eventually result in dogs being banned entirely.

The DEIS fails to consider that the GGNRA is the front/back yard for a large metropolitan area. The fundamental purpose of creating the GGNRA was to provide open space for recreation (including dog walking as a form of recreation) for residents of the Bay Area. NEPA requires evaluation of impacts on the human environment, but the DEIS fails to do so by failing to adequately address how the proposal affects recreational values for these local residents, or to evaluate the impact on local parks of such a drastic change in existing policies..

The recent brochure I got in the mail from the Golden Gate Conservancy was headed Parks for all Forever - unfortunately as dog-owners we feel excluded from this generous vision by the DEIS. Having read quite a bit about NPS dog policies, it seems clear that our dog, and therefore we, are not welcome in the national park system, with very few exceptions, most of them a thousand or more miles away. Obviously there are areas where dogs shouldn't go, for endangered species preservation or their own well-being. However, in general, we don't understand why the policy doesn't allow leashed dogs wherever humans are allowed, and why there are not many more ROLAs in the NPS as a whole. Since some 60% of American households own dogs, it does not seem unreasonable that 1% of Parklands would be set aside to allow access for them too, and to this end we think:

- 1) The National Park Service should treat the GGNRA as a model for developing more enlightened dog policies throughout the park system, which could be co-ordinated with the Let's Move efforts which our First Lady Michelle Obama is so actively involved in, encouraging families to get outside with their dogs, educating them about dog behavior, and providing room for off-leash recreation (you can't play catch when your dog is leashed!).

- 2) Hire dog behaviorists to improve the existing models Fort Funston, Crissy Field and other important GGNRA dog recreation areas including the New Lands. Point Isabel Regional Shoreline is a sophisticated model of multi-recreational use which could be drawn upon and then used throughout the park system. Consider experimenting with a green approach to dog waste, providing compost stations like those coming into use in Canada, or biodegradable bags which could then be composted instead of going to

land-fills.

3) Signage and fencing or other barriers for areas closed to the public and/or dogs should be abundant and educative.

4) Remove the poison pill plan with regard to compliance.

5) Require all dogs using the GGNRA to display a current license together with contact information in case of emergency and to be under voice control when off-leash.

6) Set up a low-cost automated permit system for dogs (\$1 - \$2 a day per dog) which will help defray any extra maintenance costs.

7) At Ocean Beach either: retain and expand existing snowy plover protections to include human disruption as well as heavy equipment, kite flying, beach fires and other known factors affecting the bird population. Where feasible create plover-friendly areas including oyster shells for cover. Or, recognize that Ocean Beach may never become a nesting area because of the heavy human presence there. Is it true that only 7 plovers have been sighted in the annual counts since the dog ban was instituted? Maybe GGNRA plover restoration efforts should be concentrated elsewhere instead of closing off 2 miles of a beach much needed for human recreation, with dogs welcome on-leash and off in a larger designated ROLA..

After much thought, I support Alternative A, the No Action alternative, and retaining the existing 1979 policy with changes as outlined above. Its especially important that the New Lands policy be changed to include respect for existing uses of the lands including on and off-leash dog-walking. I see many dog-walkers at Fort Funston who drive up from San Mateo County because there are so few off-leash areas there, and the New Lands proposal would exacerbate this situation. State and county parks in San Mateo have extremely restrictive dog policies - perhaps an enlightened NPS policy would have a trickle-down effect in this regard. Its important to remember that dogs have important well-documented roles to play in providing companionship, exercise and protection (I feel much safer hiking now that I have a dog) for their humans.

Other changes we would support:

Pit-bulls (and other breeds specified in local ordinances) must be neutered or on-leash.

Owners/walkers must have a leash for each dog and a bag for feces pickup.

Dogs may be off-leash during daylight hours only

Dog caregivers must leash excitable dogs within 50' (? not sure how far) of horses, hang-gliders, and other stimuli known by the owner to cause prolonged barking or aggression. When sharing paths with young children and bicyclists, owners must leash their dog and/or withdraw a safe distance to reduce other users anxieties. Owners are expected to act as good-will-toward-dogs-ambassadors, recognizing that many people have a high level of anxiety about dogs. Inappropriate or aggressive behaviors which caregivers dont take immediate steps to control should be reported and may result in the dog and its caregiver losing access privileges.

Those reporting such behavior can call a hotline and give an incident report describing the dog, its caregiver, time/place and vehicle license number if known, as well as a brief description of the problem. If urgent they should call 911.

No off-leash dogs in or within 25' of parking lots.

We hope that you and the Park Service can find ways to reconcile the many conflicting interests surrounding this issue, and develop a more humane and sensible approach to the problem which will continue to welcome us and our dog in the GGNRA.

Sincerely, Judith D. Kucera and Mark Hein

cc The Honorable Nancy Pelosi, Secretary Ken Salazar, Mr. Jon Jarvis, NPS Director

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4817    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:52:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In the years that I have lived in the Marina district of San Francisco, I have walked Chrissy Field virtually every day. I have long commented that both dog owners and walkers are incredibly responsible with their dogs. They manage them, pick up after them and insure that their dogs have no impact on the many people who enjoy this recreation area and co-exist without a hitch. It is a social gathering spot that breeds community. Why limit the usage of this area and dictate rules that are not necessary. I truly hope that you can let the park continue as harmoniously as it always has without uncalled for monitoring or enacting of a policy that the majority are content to leave be.  
Thank you,  
Minette Nelson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4818    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94566  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:53:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off leash in San Francisco has built a great dog community. It is social and more healthy for dogs to be able to roam freely in parks. I strongly appose this move toward banning off-leash and fetch.

As long as people pick up after their dog and socialise their dog so the dog is safe and able to be among other dogs, there is ABSOLUTELY no reason for this change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4819    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 13:55:05

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I take my dogs to Muir Beach almost every day!  
I don't understand why they are trying to ban dogs?

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4820	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94141 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 13:56:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County, San Francisco and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jane Adams

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4821	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94611 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Amy Levine

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4822	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 14:01:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Cynthia Burtson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4823	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

Just one more effort to ask you to reconsider or, at the very least, modify your up and coming decision to reduce the open space we enjoy with our pups.

I grew up in Marin. I cherish the memories of hiking with my German Shepherd Dog in the hills surrounding my home. I left for college, married and did not return for 30 years. Oh what a difference a day makes!!!! Clearly, I am saddened but, more than that, I wonder if you could think out of the box for a moment.

For a number of years, my husband and I have been cognizant that dog walkers and irresponsible pet owners are chipping away at our rights to enjoy this breathtaking landscape.

Why was it ever allowed that DOG WALKERS may "walk" 10 plus dogs at a time? Many of these dogs are loosely under voice control. That would mean that they eventually come when called but, only after they have sniffed out every bird, trampled plantings and eliminated just about any old place they wish! Why not require additional, recognizable licenses of every dog that profits from the open space we so desperately want? If there was for example, a large red heart hanging from the collar of every dog we see on and off leash in open spaces, we would all know that dollars had been paid for the privilege. Owners would feel more responsibility if they knew that a hefty fine would follow if the license was not visible. Additionally, all the rest of us would know who paid and who did not. There is emotional power in numbers.

And, what about DOG WALKERS? Whenever was it O.K. to safely and responsibly walk (I use the term loosely), 10 dogs at a time?! We think nothing of requiring smog controls of our automobiles. People break and test rules when they think they are not being monitored. I am certain that those many of us who are responsible, who do have our pets under visual and voice control would be happy to help the state/parks etc. identify the rule breakers. All we need is visual identification. Somewhere around 80% of Marin is already off limits. Why cannot we police ourselves or, at least intimidate the less responsible with a few rules that make not complying uncomfortable?

Can't we come up with some solution that presents compromise?

Sincerely, Carmelita and Bill Ellis

30 Harbor Cove Way

Mill Valley, California 94941

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4824	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 14:02:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear NPS and GGNRA,				

Please do not implement the proposed changes to dog-accessible areas within the GGNRA lands! As a dog owner I strongly believe that people have a right to visit places sans dogs, and people with dogs have a right to enjoy the outdoors - a healthy compromise is certainly possible. The current rules are already very restrictive of dog access, and limiting where we can go will create further difficulties.

I've owned dogs for 17 years and can attest that the vast majority of owners are very responsible people who care about the environment. Please do not let a few bad apples represent the vast majority. Should dog owners be fined when their pets chase birds - absolutely! But people are the big culprits when it comes to creating damage. I live across from Ocean Beach and am constantly picking up garbage and

hearing illegal fireworks being set off, not to mention watching people themselves chasing birds. The environmental problems facing Ocean Beach are vast and pinpointing a few canines is only the tip of the iceberg of the problem, scapegoating dogs here is inaccurate.

As a woman I greatly enjoy the peace of mind of being able to hike solo on trails with a dog by my side. This is one of my most treasured activities. Without my dog along I do not feel comfortable alone on hikes, and I know there have been cases of women being harassed and attacked on trails. Limiting dog friendly trails even further also limits my own access and enjoyment of the outdoors. With precious free time, many other dog owners also only get to enjoy hikes and trails if they combo that activity with their dog. By limiting where the dogs can go, the people lose access as well.

Another place I've greatly enjoyed has been Fort Funston. If Funston dog activity is limited, that place will likely see a crime spike as it is isolated and has many hidden nooks and crannies. In addition, dog walkers voluntarily have monthly cleanups of the park. People really care about and love the fort, and this cleanup is pure volunteer work that costs taxpayers nothing. As for concerns about native plants, the outer sunset and Fort Funston used to be sand dunes. The plants at Funston are introduced, usually via the bottom of people's shoes. To truly return Funston to a natural state, the foliage would have to be ripped out. Obviously this is no solution either.

I beg you not to restrict the dog access within the GGNRA further. It leaves very few outdoor places for people and their pets to enjoy. Dog owners care about the outdoors because we spend so much time in it. Please do not take that away from us!

Sincerely,  
Alison Clinch

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4825	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Richmond, CA 94803 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 14:04:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern,				

Recreating with a dog is a common and healthy practice. It lifts our spirits and gets us out into the fresh air. Some people, especially the elderly, would not make the effort to go outside for a walk on a daily basis if not for the desire to take their best friend out for some necessary exercise.

I'm very concerned about the NPS's dog management plan for the GGNRA. It would take away that opportunity from countless people. Having your dog tethered to you is much different from being able to run and play with your dog off leash. And having to walk your dog on city streets instead of being able to enjoy the beauty of nature lessens the experience.

We need more off-leash areas, not fewer. I urge you to reconsider the dog management plan.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4826	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Foster Ctiy, CA 94404 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:04:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Marc A. Laberge, MD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4827    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** none Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:07:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived at my home on Ivy Street in Montara for 28 years. During this time, I have been fortunate to have enjoyed the companionship of three dogs. A ritual my dog and I have enjoyed together nearly each day is to walk up Alamo, down Park, then onto the bluffs west of Torrello Ranch where I've let her off leash to run and smell the fresh smells from the Pacific Ocean not far away. We return to our home after a 40 minute "holiday" from the restraint of being house-bound, both refreshed and stimulated by the exercise, the views and the smells of the great outdoors. We rarely pass anyone, but when we do, it's typically a horseback rider with his dog whom we've met on our walk many times before. It may be selfish of an old man such as myself, but I can't bare the thought of having this special time each day, with my favorite companion, denied to me because of fears that something "bad" might happen which has never occurred, from my experience, for the last 28 years! Can't everyone just get along in the future as they have in the past? Must we change what hasn't been broken, just because our size and power says we can? Please let those of us who have depended upon such wonderful landscapes in the past continue to be good stewards over this land, manage any discord should it arise, and enjoy where we live for the rest of our days.

- David Biehl

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4828    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to many of the Bay Area beaches, but my favorites are in the GGNRA. I live in Marin County and we are known for being responsible dog owners. Without the people walking their dogs, many of the beaches would not be as clean. I regularly pick up all sorts of trash when picking up after my dog as do most of my friends. We live her, we LOVE these places and take responsibility for them.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. These areas are our own backyard in so many instances. Please don't regulate us to death. We have existed so long in harmony with nature and our public lands.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I sincerely thank you for your further consideration of this very important matter.

claire halenbeck

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4829    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:13:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jo Evans  
San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4830    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My wife and I walk our dog Lou regularly both at Fort Funston and Chrissy Field and I was shocked when I heard that restrictions to off leash might be put in place. As a regular visitor I can verify that the VAST majority of people who access Fort Funston are walking their dogs - the number of people sans dog is sub 10% even including the handful of hang gliders. At Chrissy Field it is about 60% dog owners, still a clear majority. Both parks I see dog owners consistently picking up after their dogs and the parks always seem pristine, no dog litter or other litter. So what alleged problem is this plan addressing? I can't help but feel that the proponents of this new plan are a small but vocal minority. From a purely political perspective, think about it - if you own a dog you are very likely to have a partner to help with the walking duties and due to basic dog needs own outdoor yard space. So you are talking about primarily married homeowners who keep dogs. These people are passionate about their dogs and they will VOTE accordingly.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Michael Linton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4831    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94966  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:19:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kristy Monti

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4832	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 14:21:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely  
Nancy C. Rasmussen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4833	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:22:05**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs are wonderful companions to all ages, genders, races, all strata of society. They need and crave exercise. You cannot take away all places for them to frolic and you cannot condemn them to concrete dog runs. We can all coexist! I'm for saving breeding birds, too. There is a way. Find it.

Respectfully, Renay Davis (a cat owner).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4834 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The primary focus of the ocean and bay front in this densely packed urban environment should remain recreational, as opposed to the nurturing of species that can be accommodated elsewhere. Species protection remains important, but not blindly pursued in areas that already support a wide variety of people-oriented uses. And don't lose sight of the fact that people threaten far more species than dogs ever will!

Sincerely,  
Andrew Leahy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4835 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Woodside, CA 94062

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:28:26**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** What a ridiculous and condescending initiative.

I sure hope this does NOT pass.

best regards  
christian

**Correspondence ID:** 4836    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

GGNRA is not really a National Park, designed to keep a pristine environment for generations to come. It was cobbled together out of city land and ex-military land. Many parts of the current GGNRA have been used for off-leash recreation \_long\_ before the National Park Service was ever involved. The S. F. Bay Area has a reputation as a very dog-friendly area, in part because of these off-leash areas. The new draft dog management plan is way too restrictive and will prevent me and my dogs from playing the way that we have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Chris Muir

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4837    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Mary Jo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4838    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:33:50**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Okan Sener  
3088 Market Street  
San Francisco, CA 94114

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4839	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94108				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

One of the greatest joys of living in SF is our respect for and tolerance of ALL creatures - including our beloved pets!

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4840    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a resident of San Francisco's Lower Pacific Heights for the past 14 years, and a dog-owner for the past 9, I am writing to strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston for many years.

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

It will drive dog owners, like myself, to the neighborhood parks in masses. Not good for park lawn upkeep, picnickers, etc.

The notion that \$2,000,000 will need to be allocated for more rangers is not supported by the data. The numbers released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change.

Please understand how this alternative will negatively impact not only the open spaces that currently allow off-leash access, but will in turn impact the health of the city's dogs, dog-owners, and crowding in neighborhood parks.

That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you for your time,  
Lisa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4841    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94402  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:39:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Henriette

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4842	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 14:40:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There are so few open spaces in San Francisco, it would be a shame to change the current policy at Chrissy field. If I did not want to be around dogs, there are many other ocean access/beaches to select but so few places that are dog/family friendly.				

I have never heard of a dog bite at Chrissy Field and in the many visits, I have not witnessed any dog aggression.

Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Baranowski

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4843	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Douglas R Bourgon MD

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4844	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose , CA 95125 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Mark

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4845	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 14:42:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I support more land for wildlife as this is an important part of the National Park Service's mission. Dogs in San Francisco do have other options, but wildlife does not in the fringes of the urban San Francisco area. I love dogs, but their owners are sometimes significantly less intelligent.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4846    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:43:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My dog plays respectfully off leash every day at Crissy Field or Fort Mason. She has never caused any problems, never gotten into a fight, never left her poop on the ground and never broken any laws nor will she ever unless you take away her right to exercise off leash.

She goes for walks everyday and has never been hit by a car because she looks both ways before crossing and follows the rules of the road. She has never taken up the time or resources of the police or fire department.

Perhaps the City of San Francisco should be focusing on their resident humans, not dogs as I do not think the same can be said for them. Why punish the ones who are behaving?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4847    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** St Francis Memorial Hospital Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:47:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4848    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:47:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very much opposed to the Draft Dog Management Plan. It appears to be responding to anecdotal information. There are no hard data to support this change. Given that 90% of the Golden Gate National Park does not allow dogs off leash, people who do not want to associate with off leash dogs have plenty of places to go. However, those of us who consider our dogs to be part of our families are already extremely restricted. As a driver of the New Economy, the San Francisco Bay Area is innovative in its approach to our canine companions. Many workplaces, hotels, cafes and bars allow dogs, so this Draft Plan seems to be reactionary. Like it or not, we dog owners are not going to accept this proposed change without a fight, and I hope the National Park Service is willing to spend the money, time and resources to defend this change, and if worse comes to worse, enforce it. At a time when energies should be put to planning for the effects of climate change, it is utterly lamentable to me that our taxes are going into something like this Draft Plan which seems to be responsive to NOTHING.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4849    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94402  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Keren Kotowitz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4850    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:48:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose any changes to the GGNRA dog-restriction policy. I regularly walk in areas where dogs are permitted and have seen many examples of owners scooping dog waste into bags and then leaving them right there on the trail or path. This is not the exception, it is the rule. Anyone who

walks such areas will tell you that they are littered with bags of dog waste which are not removed by the owners, they simply remain on the path. This is unacceptable and don't believe for a moment that an "educational information program" of any sort will help to change this well-established behavior. It won't. Prohibition of dog presence is the only policy that will work.

Sincerely,  
Rob Hughes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4851    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:54:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This plan has ignored several things and is SO confusingly presented it is very hard to understand what the government is suggesting. But regardless of this, there are some things that are clear and need to be fixed.

1. The needs of people with handicaps has not been addressed. Some of us can't walk dogs on leashes.
2. The proposal "emphasizes (meeting the needs of) the diversity of users of GGNRA sites...across the counties" and then gives San Mateo County no off leash dog walking trails.
3. In San Mateo County the EIS states that dogs could have a negligible impact on endangered species. With some fencing or other mitigations, we bet this could come down to no impact. It seems as though this wasn't even considered.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4852    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:58:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** There are so many other user groups for the GGNRA beyond owners of off-leash dogs. And of course, the NPS must prioritize protection of the place and its flora and fauna.

In some areas, I think this current dog management plan almost strikes a good balance (eg Crissy Field with its no dog areas, dogs on leash areas, and limited off-leash dog areas); however, I suggest that you increase the no-dog areas (on or off leash) so that users who do not like dogs/are afraid of dogs / or want a more peaceful experience can enjoy more of the incredible Crissy Field environs.

At Fort Funston, I think that the plan gives way too much space for off-leash dogs - I love Fort Funston, but it is essentially a dog park now and in the current plan. I suggest that the future plan should further reduce areas for off-leash dog use. Fort Funston should have a much smaller area for dogs (especially off-leash dogs), so that people who want a dog-free hike can also enjoy this beautiful area.

I feel that the dog owners who are pushing for more off-leash areas are incredibly entitled; it never ceases to amaze me that they are unable to see that there are other park users to accommodate as well as park resources that must be managed. Please do not let these well organized and very vocal dog owners push

the park to over-accommodate them at the expense of the other user groups or park resources.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4853    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 14:59:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Regards,  
Susan W

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4854    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:01:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the NPS plan to close down access on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to off-leash dog recreation. The NPS/GGNRA new version of its proposed "dog management plan" would be a disaster for dogs and their people. It is a fact that we live in a world with dogs as companions. Until this is outlawed, we need to be responsible for the well being of our dog friends. That means access to off leash areas so they may be physically and mentally healthy. You can't ignore the fact that we live with dogs-this plan would be cruel and inhumane.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4855    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:02:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Weinstein

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4856    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fremont, CA 94538  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:03:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Sheri Shima

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4857    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Belmont, CA 94002  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:06:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is already insane that we can't take our dogs on dirt hiking trails but we can take them into Nordstrom and Tiffany's! These areas are great for dogs and the owners are very mindful of others that are there. I have never seen someone not picking up after their dog and think it's a travesty that you would remove these areas for dogs to run and play. Owning a dog leads to a healthier and happier life which has been proven through several research studies and in this day and age that is great to have. Why restrict where we can take our dogs and therefore restrict our happiness in this great area of the country!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4858    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4859    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Kelly Halper

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4860    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Crissy Field Dog Group, Sierra Club, Fort Funston Dog Walkers  
Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am someone who regularly walks my dog in the GGNRA. I am a lifetime San Francisco resident and a multi decade home owner. I am writing to express my enormous opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative described in the new draft dog management plan. Not only is it way too restrictive in preventing me and other responsible dog owners from recreating with our dogs for our own health and our dog's health but it feels punitive and discriminatory in preventing us from enjoying and sharing GGNRA properties the way we have for many years.

I don't believe the new plan took into account the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Robert Nino

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4861    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:13:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I admit that I have not read the various plans under consideration, nevertheless on the issue of dogs in the park I have had a long held view. I would oppose plan A if that merely maintains the status quo since it would turn GGNRA into a dog run which it should not be. A national park should be for preserving nature and wildlife and for those who wish to enjoy them not for recreating one's domesticated animals. I am not a dog owner but I enjoy the company of dogs and I can get that in urban parks around the bay area. I gave up on going to Muir beach years ago because of the preponderance of unleashed dogs, which I can accept, but we must restrict dogs in the rest of the park. There should be rules and they should be enforced, since, unfortunately, too many dog owners have a sense of entitlement

---



- - - they simply ignore signs. Whichever of the other plans is chosen, I endorse the Park Service's effort to protect wildlife above all and I believe that involves limiting the presence of dogs.

Sincerely,

David Kimball

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4862	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Edward Walket

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4863	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	sunnyvale, CA 94086 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 15:16:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Susanne Edgerton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4864    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:16:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I visit Fort Funston daily with a several fellow dog-owners. It is a very important part of our day, providing exercise and contact with nature. We love Funston. We have great respect for its environs, and we feel a sense of stewardship towards it. We diligently keep our dogs from disturbing the land or its animal occupants. We also clean up trash left by others, and that which washes up on the beach. Requiring us to leash our dogs would not serve to protect Fort Funston, it would only serve to ruin the experience for both dog and human.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4865    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:16:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** These areas have been such an important part of San Francisco and Bay Area citizens and their dogs for many years. It is such a dog friendly part of the country that many comment on when visiting. Losing these areas to off leash policies would be an incredible loss to everyone who seeks out these places to spend time with family and their pets

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4866    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:19:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I just caught wind of what is going down on this. WE CAN NOT limit even more area's for dogs. I don't even own a dog at this point (but grew up with them), and I know how limited the areas are in SF for dogs to run free. ESPECIALLY Crissy fields, and Fort Funston. I am a Mom of toddler, and do respect there should be boundaries for dogs in certain areas, especially when kids are around. However, we need to trust that the majority of people who won dogs, know their dogs well enough to NOT let them run free if they were a risk. Don't let a few bad apples ruin it for everyone else. I'm a SF NATIVE (one of probably only 10 left in this city) and I'm tired of how uptight this city has become. We need to just CHILL OUT everyone and stop being so uptight!!!!!! CHILL OUT ON ALL THE CONFINEMENT! Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4867    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:20:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please let dogs play off-leash. I don't own a dog, I care about the environment, and I think dogs should be able to play freely. They need it to be healthy and happy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4868    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:23:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not ban dogs in these areas. Most dogs are well behaved, and most dog owners are responsible and pick up after their dogs, and do not let their dogs damage property. Please do not punish all dogs and dog owners because of a minority of problem dogs/owners. The greater good does not equal banning dogs from there areas, this is just the lazy politician's solution. Instead, cite irresponsible dog owners and use this money to improve public works and infrastructure. Hence, punish only the people causing the problem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4869    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Sobrante, CA 94803  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:24:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I just visited Muir Beach and was impressed with the salmon creek restoration objectives and peoples' comments regarding sightings of otters: GREAT. I have a dog. We obeyed the posted rules. It is not clear to me why these rules are at risk of being changed. They are working well now. Dogs are allowed on few beaches in Marin. Muir Beach has for the past 30 years been an especially treasured play place for us. I urge you to please keep it so.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4870    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:24:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dog owners are some of the most responsible citizens. Please don't force all these dog owners to move out of SF because there aren't enough off leash dog areas. Also, dogs behave well when they have large areas to run off-leash on a regular basis. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4871    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

It seems like more dialogue is needed before moving forward since such a large number of people and pets will be impacted by this. Is there more of a middle ground that can be met? I appreciate that there is a need for preservation, but perhaps it would be more prudent to take smaller steps in cutting back dog off leash areas to test things out? Also, is there something else that dog owners can do to help? Are volunteers needed to help keep the areas in question more clean? Is there a small tax or fee that dog owners might pay, which could help? I think it important to understand where both sides are coming from and that dog owners can't have everything that they want, but right now, this proposed GGNRA plan seems far too restrictive.

Sincerely,  
Mary Cronin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4872    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:26:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 17, 2014

Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate Nation Recreation Area

Mr. Dean:

I am an environmental consultant (over 25 years) who is familiar with the federal document process. I am also a San Francisco dog owner for 20 years who has been frequenting Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field at least once a week for that duration of time. While I support changes to the 1979 Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Pet Policy (and associated updates), the preferred alternative (Alternative F) in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) is too restrictive and not supported by the data provided. In addition, the SEIS is over 1,500 pages (not including maps and appendices), organized using only major section numbers and the Table of Contents is not hyper-linked to allow the reader to easily find a specific section. This makes the document virtually impossible to navigate, let alone to provide useful comments. Never the less, general comments are provided below.

Estimation of Visitor Use

The 2008 and 2012 visitors surveys, upon which it appears the SEIS conclusions are based, are inherently flawed, thus making any conclusions regarding both current and future visitor use erroneous. In San Francisco County, the 2008 survey was conducted at Crissy Field, Baker Beach, and Ocean beach for four days (two weekdays, two weekend days) and the 2011 survey was conducted at Fort Funston (two weekdays, two weekend days). This is not a representative sample of park use. As noted, on page 307, "... the mix of seasonal visitor activities could have been impacted by unusual weather or special events." At Fort Funston, the annual hang gliding race and barbeque occurred during the on-site count weekend. There was also unusually warm weather during the weekend counts in 2008, which may have increased the number of visitors pursuing water-related activities. Yet, the next paragraph states that "monthly visitation estimates were developed by combining visitation estimates from the four-day count period with monthly vehicle counts provided by NPS." At Crissy Field, the use of monthly vehicle counts to estimate park use is even more inherently erroneous since a large number of visitors are tourists either walking or on bicycles and do not drive to the park. In addition, the methodology that is essentially one dog per one person is in error because the majority of people who frequent parks tend to do so in groups; therefore, the estimation of visitor use for dog play/exercise is at best inaccurate. Based on the inherent flaws in the underlying data calculating park visitation, it is unclear how any conclusions can be made as to the advantages/disadvantages of any of the alternatives developed. It is recommended that visitor surveys be conducted at least quarterly on two weekdays and two weekend days and that count estimates are modified to include the total number of people who use the GGNRA (i.e., total number surfing, total number dog walking, etc), and specifically at Crissy Field, to differentiate between promenade and beach use; these data will allow the NPS to obtain a more realistic understanding of park use. The lack of understanding of visitor use may be due to the fact that the environmental contractor does not have a local office (indeed per their website, they have no presence in California) and therefore was unable to conduct more reliable visitor surveys.

## Environmental Consequences

For sites in San Francisco County, Table 4 indicates that there is only a minor difference in the benefits of Alternative F over Alternative E. Completely closing off portions of Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field from dog access may minorly benefit vegetation and soils, wildlife, special status species, and cultural resources at these locations (although numerical estimates have not been provided), but will have a negative impact to these same items in other parks of the Bay Area where dog owners/walkers will be forced to frequent. As such, there is inherently no difference between Alternative E and alternative F in relation to environmental consequences.

## Health and Safety

Table 5 shows that over an 11 year period, there were a total of 4,932 reported dog-related incidents out of a total of 45,700 total incidents over this period. This is approximately 11 percent of total incidents and averages about 450 per year. Figure 5 presents the annual visitation to the GGNRA from 1973 to 2011. Looking at years 2001 - 2011, visitation at the GGNRA is approximately 14.5 million visitors per year. This equates to about 3 dog incidents per 100,000 visitors per year or 0.003 percent per year. This is substantially less than approximate 1-2 percent of dog incidents in the United States (Centers for Disease Control and US Census Bureau). Dog-related incident data for the 11 year period for on- and off-leash dogs at GGNRA, which is especially dog-friendly, shows that these incidents are substantially less than national averages.

Off-leash violations account for the majority of dog incidents in the San Francisco County sites; 74 percent, including off-leash violations from the Wildlife Protection Area at Crissy Field and the Snowy Plover Protection Area at Ocean Beach (Table 36). These violations do not suggest that there have been any beneficial or adverse environmental consequences. While limiting both on- and off-leash dog access at GGNRA will undeniably be beneficial to health and safety, the current threat to health and safety is

below the national average.

#### Park Operations

There is little difference in cost between Alternative E and Alternative F (Tables 32, 33, and 34). Detailed comparison shows that in fact estimated cost is exactly the same except in the areas of Visitor and Resource Protection and non-personnel costs. These differences are 11 percent and 8 percent, respectively (higher for Alternative E). Costs for both of these alternatives are substantially higher than Alternative A - No Action (4.5 to 5 times higher). It is unclear how the difference in costs for the Visitor and Resource Protection Division between Alternative E and Alternative F were determined. In addition, it is unclear where funding will come from to pay for the overall increased cost. With overall federal funding for the NPS decreasing, it seems unlikely that five times current funding will be provided for GGNRA dog management.

#### Conclusion

Overall, Alternative E is the best compromise as it restricts access to areas currently used for dog walking, which is beneficial to both human health and the environment, while simultaneously providing the most dog walking access of the alternatives evaluated. The cost-benefit between Alternative E and Alternative F has not been sufficiently evaluated and as such, the cost-benefit of Alternative F as the preferred alternative is not substantiated.

Sincerely,  
Lynne Srinivasan  
655 Duncan Street  
San Francisco, CA 94131

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4873	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 15:28:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My dog Porkchop and I are regular visitors of Fort Funston and Sutro Bath trails. Porkchop is happiest when he is able to run freely (he is designed to run and explore) and frolic in the water with his doggy friends. We live in SF, where space is VERY limited. The only time we get to enjoy quality time together is out here at the off leash parks. There are already so many people needing a place to hang out with their doggy besties, where on good days it is already almost near impossible to find parking and access, limiting the amount of area we have by a staggering 75% rally is cruelty and neglect for these animals, as well as their owners. I honestly believe that having these quality off leash areas promote healthy ownership of animals. Please keep your citizens happy, who in turn takes care of the city. Please do not take away my puppy's biggest joy in life.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4874	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 15:29:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I am a resident and tax payer of San Francisco. I have lived in San Francisco for over 13 years and 16 in the Bay area. I have had the pleasure to live in other major cities such as Seattle, Washington DC, Paris (FR)and London. This is one of the best cities in the world (the best in my opinion) and one huge reason is the terrific number of diverse and beautiful open spaces the residents of San Francisco can take their beloved four legged family members. Dogs are family and they need to exercise and socialize in open, safe and large areas. Restricting exercise and socialization to limited contained spaces will increase the risk of dog fights and make those areas unfit for good use due to the sheer volume of dogs in one area. Further, the majority of tax paying homes in this city have dogs as members of their families. The tax payers of this city demand their tax dollars are not used to limit access to park and beaches for their 4 legged companions but instead are used to preserve abundant safe and fun access to parks and beaches. Please listen to the tax payers of this city and not to the various special interests who seek to limit access for their own narrow benefit. Please do not restrict the use of beaches and parks for dogs and their human companions. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4875    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:30:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a Bay Area resident since 1996, I've long enjoyed the wonderful beaches, forests, and trails contained within GGNRA. For 16 years (1996-2012) I hiked and recreated without a dog and never encountered any issues with misbehaving dogs.

In 2012, my wife and I adopted a dog and have become even more dedicated users of GGNRA lands. Our small, sweet mutt is an avid hiker who loves following us through the hills of the Marin Headlands, though Fort Funston is her favorite recreation area. Our dog inevitably charms and wins smiles from all who meet her, whether or not they have a canine companion.

Having seen the dog issue from both sides, I am sympathetic to the concerns raised by some members of the community. However, it's clear to anyone who spends a great deal of time in these wonderful natural areas that dogs are nearly always well behaved and carefully guarded by their humans. The city's most irresponsible dog owners, in my experience, tend not to frequent the GGNRA lands.

Off-leash areas are particularly important for positive relations between constituents: most dogs are more relaxed and less likely to feel threatened when off-leash (under voice command). On-leash walking is better than nothing, but dogs are on their best behavior when obeying voice commands and moving at their own pace.

Any reduction or restriction in today's off-leash / voice-control areas would be a great loss to this city's community. In particular, I advocate strongly for continued off-leash access to the trails in the Headlands, including the Coastal Trail, and continued on-leash access to the Coastal Trail north of Hill 88, which we utilize on longer hikes despite the limited access.

Similarly, at Fort Funston, any new restrictions would be a great loss. The area is a great melting pot of those who pursue different types of recreation, and conflicts between groups are rare enough that we've never witnessed any issues despite our weekly walks.

If ecological or environmental impact is a concern, note that Funston's commercial horseback-riding operations routinely deposit large piles of horse feces on the beach, whereas dog feces is rarely seen.

In summary, the public benefit of allowing dogs and their guardians to hike and explore GGNRA, off-leash whenever possible, should be among the biggest factors considered in this debate. The health and happiness of our community rely on such opportunities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4876    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Anthony A. Eason, M.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4877    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:33:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



There are very few places that I can hike with my dog off leash! Please, do not take them away from us.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4878	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 15:34:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern.				

I've lived in San Francisco for 17 years and can't imagine living anywhere else. This city is my home and I cherish it.

I have owned a dog in San Francisco for 11 of those years. I live within walking distance of several on-leash parks and a bit farther from off-leash alternatives. My dog is not the kind of dog that can go without regular exercise. At roughly 60 pounds, she's very energetic and active. Without daily exercise my personal belongings are in serious jeopardy.

It may seem unreasonable to own an animal like that in the city. Where I in New York I'd probably agree with you. But in San Francisco, a city with more dogs than children, it's not only possible but pleasant. My dog is one of the reasons that I walk so much. Every day I head out and walk a few miles with her. This is part of what makes San Francisco \*my\* home - I cover a lot of it on foot each day.

The current plan to reduce off-leash dog areas in the city seems wrong headed to me. The city has so many dogs and already there are so few places where it's legal to let them run. The city needs more places not less.

The recent conversion of Duboce Park comes to mind. This park is in the middle of some nice neighborhoods and features a playground, an off leash dog area, and an area that is not for dogs. It's a vibrant part of the neighborhood, a nexus even. A new park side cafe opened around the same time and is thriving. On any given day one can pass through there and see a crowd of people on the benches, with their kids around the playground, and owners with their dogs playing in the dog area (which isn't fenced in but rather bordered by an open chain rope that implies the dog limited area). This kind of cohabitation \*improves\* a park area and energizes more citizens to both use it and care for it.

If this plan were more widely circulated - on a city wide ballot initiative or something - I'm certain it wouldn't pass. I only found out about it because of my dog walkers who are some of the most awesome people I know. If the purpose of the parks is to care for the public commons, it makes little sense to me how it can clearly offer less value to the public and be a good plan.

Please reconsider this initiative.

Sincerely,  
Aaron Newton  
San Francisco resident since 1997  
Dog owner since 2003

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4879	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:35:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Madeline Feldman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4880    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:35:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4881    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Redwood City CA, CA 94064  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:36:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Limiting off leash areas for pets will be punishing responsible pet owners who area following guidelines of parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4882    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:39:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a San Francisco resident, I object to any plan that prohibits or greatly reduces off-leash areas in the City. Dogs are family members and they need off-leash exercise just as children do. As any parent loves seeing their children enjoy and benefit from free play, running and ball play, so do dog owners.

Restricting off-leash activities to small defined areas causes many problems, including dog fights since the pooches lack adequate personal space. In addition, small "dog parks" generally force needless congestion causing excessive terrain damage due to non-dispersed foot and paw traffic. Places like Chrissy fields, Fort Funston, Baker Beach, the Pan Handle and Golden Gate Park should be generally open to off-leash activities. Of course areas that require protections for bird nesting, etc., should be fenced off so humans and dogs stay out. Of course dog owners must act responsibly and clean up after their pets and fines imposed if they don't.

If needless or excessive restrictions on off-leash areas are enacted, I will work to have the City take back control and full ownership of areas under GGNRA control. And I stop our donations and will oppose any additional funding for the GGNRA. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4883    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115-1624  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:39:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Richard Springwater  
3024 Clay Street  
San Francisco, CA 94115

February 16, 2014

Mr. Frank Dean,  
GGNRA Superintendent,  
Building 101, Fort Mason,  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Mr. Dean,

I recently became aware of the Park Service's plans to restrict off-leash dog walking on Crissy Field and I am writing to object to this proposed policy. I have reviewed the GGRNR Dog Management Plan and its accompanying EIS and find that the arguments presented in the Plan fail to make a persuasive case for the need for a change from the status quo. Furthermore, the analysis presented in the EIS fails to present actual adverse impacts from off-leash dog use of Crissy Field, relying entirely on speculation as to what "may" happen, or what "might" be the case. On the other hand, the EIS entirely ignores the very real adverse impacts that would occur if off-leash dog walking were further restricted at Crissy Field.

My dog and I visit Crissy Field several days a week to run the promenade between the Crissy Field Center and Fort Point, and we know Crissy Field intimately. The location and views, the quality of the landscape design and the diversity of visitors from the Bay Area and around the world all make Crissy Field a local and national treasure. Restricting off-leash areas would significantly degrade this environment by eliminating an activity enjoyed by thousands of visitors every year.

This letter presents three separate comments to the EIS:

- 1) Law enforcement issues related to the presence of off-leash dogs are very minor in relation to the heavy use by dog owners at Crissy Field;
- 2) Conflicts between dogs and wildlife at Crissy Field are non-existent given the extent of currently fenced areas; and
- 3) Crissy Field is a unique urban park and regulations that apply to National Parks and Wilderness Areas elsewhere should not be applied at Crissy Field without consideration of the differences.

Law enforcement issues are minor. As the Park Service well knows, the number of dog-related incidents is extremely low, with reports showing a total of six dog bites throughout the entire GGNRA during 2013, among hundreds of thousands of visitors. While a dog bite is a serious matter regardless of how few occur, the Park Service currently has the authority to restrict dogs that do not respond to voice command. Furthermore, a leash is no guarantee that a dangerous dog will not bite a stranger. Restricting the freedom of all dog owners because of the actions of a very small number of irresponsible dog owners is fundamentally unfair.

All uses of Crissy Field present potential undesirable consequences: bicycles collide with pedestrians and other bikes, picnics create litter and packaging endangers wildlife, auto access generates air pollution and pedestrian and cycling hazards, surfers and sail boarders create risks to self and others, yet these activities are encouraged because they serve the GGNRA's recreational mandate and enhance the diversity of visitors to the site. Off-leash dog walking is indistinguishable from these other uses.

Conflicts between dogs and wildlife on Crissy Field are non-existent. I have read the letters from the birding community and respect their opinions. My family and I have in the past been members of the Golden Gate Raptor Observatory and watching the birds at Crissy Field is a big part of the joy of being there. In twenty years of running on Crissy Field, I once, and only once, saw a dog chase a bird on the meadow. The dog was a puppy who did not know any better, and the bird simply flew away. Dogs are not predators like feral cats. The assertion that the off-leash dogs at Crissy Field endanger wildlife is unsupported by evidence and absurd on its face. I fully support the extensive fencing of sensitive areas to protect landscape and wildlife, including the Snowy Plover nesting area from humans and dogs, but the

current policy of allowing off-leash dog walking cannot be shown to have any impact on the well-being of the avian population of Crissy Field.

On this point, I would also add that I am very sympathetic toward the goals of birders at other sites within the GGNRA where landscape and wildlife may not be well protected by fencing. Preservation of bird habitat should be a high priority within the GGNRA. I support fencing and limiting off-leash pets in such sensitive areas. Crissy Field, however, is a model of how sensitive habitat can be protected by fencing in such a way as to eliminate conflicts between birds, sensitive habitat, people and dogs. It needs no additional restrictions.

Crissy Field is Unique. Aristotle wrote: "There is nothing so unequal as the equal treatment of unequals" and that certainly describes the proposed GGNRA Dog Management Plan. When I started running on Crissy Field twenty years ago, the site was derelict and resembled a superfund site more than a park. Thanks to the efforts of the non-profit Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy and the generosity of the Haas family and other private donors, Crissy Field has become an urban paradise, but it is a man-made paradise. Crissy Field is a simulation of a natural shoreline, designed by Hargreaves Associates, to replace the industrialized wasteland the Army left behind.

Quoting Michael Boland in "Crissy Field: A New Model for Managing Urban Parkland," in the Design Observer: ([http://places.designobserver.com/media/pdf/Crissy\\_Field:\\_925.pdf](http://places.designobserver.com/media/pdf/Crissy_Field:_925.pdf))

"Until the mid-nineteenth century Crissy Field was occupied by sand dunes and salt marshes. Filling began in the 1870s and was completed in time for the area to become part of the grounds on which the Panama Pacific Exhibition was staged in 1915. Then, when the exhibition came down, the site was transformed into the first military airfield on the West Coast. Thus it was that when the National Parks Service inherited the site in 1974, 70 of its acres were covered in asphalt and hard packed dirt while rubble lined much of its 6,000-foot shoreline."

Treating Crissy Field as a pristine wilderness area just because it looks like one today misses the mark. There may be other areas within the GGNRA that qualify as preservation sites but Crissy Field is not one of them. Crissy Field is an urban recreation area designed for local community uses and paid for by a local community with the clear goal of encouraging a rich and diverse range of human recreational activities. I share the belief that the National Park System is "America's Best Idea," but it is important not to conflate the National Park System, including its mandate to preserve our natural resources, with this "new model" of an urban park. Crissy Field was conceived through ten years of intense local community participation, designed with artistic imagination and ecological research, and constructed on a brownfield site formerly owned by the U.S. Army. Superimposing wilderness preservation restrictions on a man-made park in contradiction to the priorities set by the community that created the park, disrespects the community and is unjust on its face.

Throughout its history, Crissy Field has permitted use by off-leash dogs under voice command as part of a happy mix of uses that reflects the needs and desires of its local community. The conflicts between dogs and people, and dogs and wildlife, which have been asserted by the Dog Management Plan and analyzed by its EIS, do not occur at Crissy Field except on very rare occasions. Restricting off-leash dog walking at Crissy Field ignores Crissy Field's community legacy and degrades the richness and diversity of its environment.

Very truly yours,

Richard Springwater

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4884    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:42:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Peggy Burnham

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4885    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:42:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I write to implore GGNRA to keep areas of its parks off leash, for the good of the community and its four-legged friends. San Francisco is a welcoming beacon to dogs and their owners and we are so grateful for the beautiful areas available in which our dogs get necessary exercise and the community is strengthened. As a responsible dog owner who picks up after her dog and makes sure he's

---

leashed in appropriate areas, I ask you to please not punish the majority of us for the few who do not follow your guidelines.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4886    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

thank you very much,  
Amy Blanchard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4887    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:44:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** My wife and I bring our dog to Crissy Field and Fort Mason regularly, and it is one of the few opportunities our dog has to really run and get the exercise he needs. This is a meaningful and valuable part of our lives in this city, and it is essential in keeping our dog happy and healthy. There is \*no way\* that we could get him the kind of exercise he needs on leash, and the dog parks, which are fine for daily use, are not a substitute for the kind of safe and vigorous exercise our dog Kid can get in more open spaces.

We are respectful and responsible dog owners, and we always pick up after our dog and watch his play carefully, as do most of the owners in this community. That is more than you can say for many of the humans in this city, who litter our parks with beer bottles, garbage, and excrement every day.

It's unfair to responsible dog-owners and to their dogs to take away these venues as off-leash areas, simply to cater to the wishes of a few loud opponents.

San Francisco is a dog-friendly city, and it ought to stay that way. Save off-leash for the health and happiness of our four-legged citizens.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4888	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Louise Wees

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4889	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

---



I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Joanne

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4890	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 15:47:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs need a safe and fun place to get exercise and run and play with their owners. Keeping GGNRA open for this use is important to the health and well being of dogs and the people who love them. Please keep these areas open for off leash play.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4891	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 15:47:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Margaret E. Cupman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4892	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We live in Muir Beach with our 4 year old dog. We moved to Muir Beach in 2010 and bought a home. One of the most attractive parts of moving to Muir Beach was the dog friendly beach where our pup could exercise and play freely. We take him to the beach almost every day and he is a very happy dog. Our daughter loves to visit the beach and play with all the dogs too.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy Plus off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4893    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:50:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My partner and I live a half mile from Ocean Beach with Carmen, our dog. The highlight of our day is to walk on the beach and experience its power and beauty. There we exercise our bodies and minds. We share our walk with birds, people and other dogs. Everyone not only gets along, but thrives in this coveted, natural place. It is a myth that dogs are endangering other species. The gulls, crows, willets, comerants, sanderlings, snowy plovers, and other birds know how to survive with people, dogs and horses. This is an urban space they have chosen as their home. There is NO PROBLEM. The management at the GGNRA is creating serious divisions between dog owners and others. This is an abuse of power. Wars are being fought around the world. Ocean Beach is a sanctuary of peace among all species. I say to the management: DON'T CREATE WAR WHEN WE CAN LIVE IN PEACE.

Sincerely,  
Anne M. Herbst

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4894    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:51:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to oppose the GGNRA's dog management plan. I am in favor of some regulations on dog access and limits of numbers of dogs dog walkers can walk and limiting commercial dog walkers to certain areas but your plans are overreaching and would increase pressure on The already limited space we have to exercise our dogs in now. It is my understanding that all of the land given to the ggnra to manage by the city of San Francisco was given with the understanding that recreation would not change in these areas without public input. I hope you stick to that agreement and make your decisions based on what looks to me like overwhelming opposition to your plans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4895    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:52:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lauren McCollom

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4896    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:53:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Taking our dogs to ocean beach is the most enjoyable part of my weekend. I feel very fortunate to have found something that so simply embodies happiness for myself, my dogs, and my

family.

I spend every possible moment of I have the beach, and I respect it as one of the great benefits of living in San Francisco.

I clean the beach, and preserve it in a way to provide for others the same benefits have enjoyed.

Finally, while I work full time, I also hire the services of local professional dog walkers. Having ocean beach as an alternative for them is also very important to me, and the service they perform is very important.

Please reconsider this law to ban off leash at the proposed affected areas.

Thanks for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4897	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Belmont, CA 94002 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 15:53:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog lover and former dog owner of many years, I give my wholehearted support to the Golden Gate Audubon Society's recommendations for management of dogs in the GGNRA. The presence of wildlife in our midst, in its many forms, brings beauty and mystery to our lives, in often unpredictable and surprisingly touching ways. In a small lake this last weekend in Golden Gate Park, two Pied-billed Grebes splashed and charged each other in an early territorial display, a Snowy Egret, Great Egret and Great Blue Heron were fishing at the edge, and numerous American Coots were swimming around. I was looking for an American Bittern, a more rare bird that occasionally frequents a small bath of reeds here. This natural scene (and any chance of seeing the bittern) was completely disrupted by an unleashed dog that jumped in the water and charged the birds - the egrets and heron flew away and the grebes scrambled for safety. The dog's owner paid no attention to the wildlife and ensuing disruption; he was oblivious to how much this ruined the enjoyment of the lake for others. It is sad that such places of refuge for wildlife and small snippets of tranquility are destroyed by irresponsible dog owners. It is clear that further measures need to be put into place to raise awareness and increase responsibility for resolving these problems.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4898	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 15:54:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To: Superintendent, GGNRA				

I am writing to oppose The GGNRA Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement which will severely impact my wife's and my enjoyment and exercise at a variety of GGNRA sites.

I am a long time resident of San Francisco and my wife was born here. We have two miniature poodles

who are responsive to voice command and are walked off leash only under voice control. We are very careful where we walk our dogs because they are vulnerable due to their small size. We walk in areas that are away from joggers, crowded pedestrian areas and bicycle riders because of their small size. We enjoy walking with our dogs over the area from East Beach to the Bay Bridge as well as Fort Funston and areas north of Ocean Beach. We usually go monthly, but more often since my retirement. Our dogs move much more quickly when off leash, allowing my wife and myself to get real exercise while walking at our normal pace with our dogs heeling or just in front of us. This type of walking is not possible when they are on leash and now many areas where we could walk them in parks, areas of Pine Lake and in GG Park are too dangerous due to reports of coyotes. While I have joined the Sierra Club of the Bay Area, I do not agree with their support for the SEIS - - their leaders do not speak for me nor, I suspect, for many other members on this issue.

While I do agree with the present fence demarcations of sensitive dune areas around Crissy Field and the beaches, I oppose any expansion of fences. Such fences will ruin the welcoming feeling and open quality to the current spaces and have not been studied with regard to their impact on wildlife: if they are secure enough to prevent our dogs from wandering-which they absolutely do not do under our voice command-they are likely to impact movement of wildlife and cut the area into small pens. If they are not secure enough to corral dogs, why have them?

The Preferred Alternative in the SIES is too restrictive and the SEIS does not rely upon actual valid studies at GGNRA areas to support any major changes. The 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands acquired by GGNRA is much more reasonable.

Even on the most crowded weekends at the areas from the SF Yacht Club to Fort Point, we see that bikers, joggers, pedestrians and dogs get along very well. As mentioned earlier, we tend to have our dogs scamper along the beach itself or on the grass of Crissy field. They never interfere with walkers and always stay under our control. We are two dogs and two humans, and this area is by far the safest and most enjoyable of any walk we take in the Bay Area. We see others walking their dogs with respect and at Crissy field and on the beach we see very little dog litter, if any.

The entire methodology of the SEIS demonstrates a purely political agenda. The important thing to monitor is the actual impact of dogs on resources and other users at these specific spaces. No other methodology is valid. Therefore, we oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy of the SEIS.

It is a disappointment to me that this anti-dog agenda has extended to the inadequate response of the SEIS to comments made by those in favor of dog walking. In addition, the citations regarding dog impacts on wildlife have not been based on actual studies in the areas in question. It should be quite straightforward to study the impact of the current practice of dog walking at specific sites but on literature reviews! Well designed, unbiased studies at the sites regulated by policy are the least owed to a public which will be impacted for decades by any change in policy.

There is no need to talk about possible or hypothetical impacts in GGNRA. They have no place whatsoever in the formulation of policy. Surely this is not the same as introducing off leash dog walking for the first time in GGNRA where it never has occurred. In such a case, one might be justified in extrapolating from studies in other areas that are not in the GGNRA. But here we have a perfect laboratory-off leash dog walking is occurring and any impact can be defined with regard to seriousness and then studied in the real world. If it cannot be measured, then it cannot be a basis for policy. Therefore, it is inexcusable in our democracy to make policy based on extrapolation, bias and supposition when real actual data on environmental impact can be gathered. I call into question the validity of any policy which will impact thousands or tens of thousands of residents, which is not based in site specific real world data. Don't we deserve that? Literature searches are no substitute.

When policy is to be made, actual controlled valid studies are required. Anecdotal reports may point to studies that should be done, but are never considered sufficient and in the field of medicine have been invalidated time and time again. Peer reviewed studies are needed and these have not been done at the sites in question. Therefore, every anecdotal observation of impacts, especially where the impact was not quantified and where it is based on already biased NPS staff, should be stricken from the SEIS. Opinion surveys, such as 2008 visitor use survey at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, which are not rigorously controlled for observer bias, are similarly invalid for the sake of public policy.

By now, the GGNRA has firmly established its anti-dog bias and lack of competence and interest in doing studies and obtaining data -the only valid pillars for public policy. This bias, however, extends even to reporting of the opinions solicited by GGNRA. What is incredible is that of the 4700 comments obtained on the DEIS, there has been no disclosure of how many were for and how many against. What is the purpose of seeking opinions when they are not released and have no chance of impacting the policy or impacting public opinion? Is it merely to give window dressing to prescribed process?

Finally, the intention of Congress in creating the GGNRA was " expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." The SEIS goes against the wishes of Congress.

In summary, walking off-leash with my dogs, in a mindful way, respectful of non dog owners and the environment is hugely important to my enjoyment and well-being. I find that the SEIS and the GGNRA attitude toward responsible dog owners such as myself, will preclude our enjoyment, exercise and some of our most treasured experiences. If the proposed policies were based in site specific data, if the surveys conducted were adequate, valid and free of observer bias, if the GGNRA did not show an implacable anti-dog bias, and if the GGNRA showed any flexibility and responsiveness to those of us who have walked our dogs off-leash for decades without demonstrable negative impacts, then I would have to respect the findings and recommendations of the SEIS. However, clearly none of this is the case.

I personally plan to oppose any curtailment of off-leash walking with civil disobedience, even if it means significant fines.

Sincerely,  
Sanford Goldstein, MD  
San Francisco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4899	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I have enjoyed the GGNRA with and without my dog for many years, and in that time, I have never had a negative experience because of a dog. In fact, it has been quite the opposite, and I believe the off-leash areas of GGNRA are some of the biggest benefits to living in the Bay Area.

Broadly, this kind of recreational area offers great benefit to the health of myself, family, friends and extended community. Given the positive experiences I have had, I don't see any evidence that merits such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas in GGNRA.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Without that, these new restrictions seem unnecessary and extremely limiting.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for the needs of a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kristin

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4900	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 15:56:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not further restrict off-leash areas for dogs. Dogs need exercise, and while it is a form of recreation, it also serves important purposes, with life-and-death consequences. Dogs need exercise to behave appropriately. Not properly exercised dogs often develop behavior problems out of boredom, and too often then end up at shelters because they are deemed unmanageable. A simple walk on a leash will not suffice to keep these behavior problems at bay.				

Dogs need to be able to run free, to explore their surrounding with all their senses, which is most stimulating to them, and therefore most tiring. Off leash play is the most efficient and effective tool dog owners have to maintain healthy and well-behaved dogs. Many dog owners run busy lives, and having to suddenly travel far to get to an off-leash area will mean that many dogs no longer get to go, or get to go as often, which will result in more dogs with more behavior problems who end up at shelters. Many people, including myself, purposely live near off-leash areas so that we can maintain busy lives and still uphold our responsibilities to our dogs. Drastically reducing the current off-leash areas will upset the lives of dogs and their owners.

Having access to the fantastic off-leash areas we currently have also means that owners are more likely to obey on-leash or no-dog rules at other locations. Dogs will still need to be exercised despite any restrictions that take place, and many owners will feel compelled to break these rules, not only in former off-leash areas, but also in no-dog or on-leash areas that they once respected. While your interests are valid, restricting off-leash areas is not the answer. These regulations could be drastic for the health and well-being of dogs all over the Bay Area. Shelters are already overrun; please do not enact regulations that will contribute to the death of animals.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4901	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	S.F., CA 94112 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 15:57:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I wish to register my opinion that Ft. Funston should remain a place in S.F. where people can walk their dogs off leash. This area is not in the city center and is an appropriate open space where dogs can get good leash-free walking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4902    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** ear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Ariana Luchsinger, CTC, CPDT-KA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4903    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:01:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an older person with mobility problems due to a disability, I find that the East Beach of Crissy Field is the only place I can comfortably take my dog to the beach. Parking is close enough to the water and there is an access ramp that makes it possible to get to the water with ease. To take away that particular area from off leash possibility would, in my view, discriminate against the older and disabled people that take their dogs there for exercise. Please consider this in your dog management plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4904    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:02:54

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my strong opposition to the plan.

Since when does the recreation in GGNRA mean taking away recreational venues for residents?

Is enough attention being given to actual use of the areas for which new restrictions are being imposed? I walk my dog at Baker Beach (for example) almost every single morning. So I can tell you firsthand that the folks enjoying that beautiful stretch of land in the early morning consist only of (happy) people with their (happy) canine companions (and seasonal crab fishermen).

Why would you take that away from those tax paying, appreciative recreators? Are school aged families vying for a little beach time on weekdays from 8 am to 10 am? No.

And Fort Funston? Really?

Please consider a solution that truly works for residents.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4905	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:06:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern:				

As a Marin County resident, and a hiker, I am dismayed to find that further restrictions are proposed on dog access in the GGNRA paths of the Marin Headlands. I will not refer specifically to the voluminous A through F proposals but rather simply state my comments.

I frequently walk my dog on the paths in the Marin headlands and less frequently on Muir Beach. As a hiker I enjoy the various pathways in the headlands and want to have dog company as walking is a solitary joy for me.

As an urban dweller in a major metropolitan area and a professional geographer, I am delighted to have such close access to nature. However having grown up in Africa and been concerned with wilderness degradation I understand that the sheer volume of visitors poses a problem to the long-term management of parks and recreational areas.

The reduction of access for dogs in Alternative F appears to unfairly restrict a particular group. I have no problem accepting dog leash restrictions that allow me access on paths, for I believe dogs must be restricted to roads and pathways and not trample the natural vegetation. In my rambles I have been chagrined to see people (often without dogs) straying over the natural vegetation.

I believe that

1. the current access should be preserved and dog access even expanded but that much more emphasis should be placed on the education of ALL users to walk on the trails, and
2. a system of planned and rotating closures of hiking trails be instituted so that access by hikers, dog

walking, horse riding and bikers can be allowed for a period of time before the trail is closed. This type of system will reduce the impact on the land in a more just manner and continue to allow "recreational access" to areas that are invaluable the quality-of-life for urban dwellers.

The reduction of access for dogs as proposed from the 1979 plan appears to unfairly target only one segment of users. By instituting a more measured opening and closing of paths and open-access areas, the same objective will be reaching in protecting the wilderness while being impartial to all groups of users. This is a system that has been applied successfully in other parts of the world with similar struggles to protect nature from overuse by residents of nearby urban areas.

Education and information is the bedrock of what I have suggested, (I like many responsible dog owners deplore those who don't cleanup and/or control their pets in these areas).

Just as location,location, location is paramount to the joy of using these natural areas, so I believe is education, education, education in instituting a system of resting the land to prevent its degradation by dog-users or indeed any other users.

Sincerely,

Dr.Sandra de Montille

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4906	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:07:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	If I don't have a safe, large off-leash area for my dog to run she's going to get irritable and bored. One of the reasons I moved to SF was because the city is so dog friendly. I vote. I pay my taxes. My dog is licensed. Don't take my rights as a dog owner away.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4907	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:08:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

SF is a city full of loving responsible dog-owners, and I don't understand why this new plan doesn't reflect the importance of our feedback... not to mention there haven't been any peer-reviewed, site-specific study, as required by law, to support such a draconian measure.

Our recreation areas are for RECREATION, after all. Just because I choose to share my recreation time with a well-mannered, well-trained, four-legged friend rather than a two-legged one, that doesn't mean I should be prevented from enjoying the parkland that makes SF so special. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979â€¢ a policy that needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely and passionately,  
Barry Perlman  
830 Cole Street  
San Francisco, CA 94117  
barry@astrobarry.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4908	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94159-0603 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:10:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Oh, come on. Don't fix something that isn't broken. You want stricter rules regarding voice control, picking up after one's self, sure, go for it. But the park is for everyone, and that includes dog owners. The school system is already chasing families and their children out of the city, go ahead and make the GGNRA clamp down on families and their dogs to move out of town too.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4909	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:10:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The proposed plan should be put back on the shelf where it was in 2011. This is preposterous, to shut down so many areas with no concrete reasons. These dog areas are already in balance with other users and wildlife. Your plan isn't about dog management - it's about dog removal.				

---

Leave things the way they are and find something else to do with your time. The minimal amount of space the dogs have now is the least they should have. It's no wonder that you lost the SF Board of Supervisors by a unanimous vote - the plan is that bad.

Mike

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4910	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94611 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:11:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kathy Law

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4911	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Vacaville , CA 95687 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:11:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4912	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94705-1826 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:12:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It's not the same for the dogs to be on leash. They don't get the same amount of exercise. My dogs have never posed a threat to anyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4913    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:13:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Yves Cornaz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4914    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:13:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Scott Law

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4915	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:13:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Patricia Flynn

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4916	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Bollinas, CA 94924 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I understand people's fear of some dogs. But all dogs must not be denied any free space just because of some others. Dogs that are known (by their owners) to be people friendly, and owners who pick up after their dogs must also be allowed to use public, tax-supported lands and parks.

Thank you for your consideration  
Dolores Richards

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4917	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:16:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please, dogs need to have off leash options in our city. Isn't SF supposed to be the city of the patron saint of animals? I don't have the good fortune to be able to have a dog, but I know the need for dogs to have off leash play time, especially in a city. Please....do not enact these leash laws. It's a very sad day for our area if we do this.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4918	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Bolinas, CA 94924 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:17:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am deeply concerned that GGNRA does not consider those of us who are not visitors, we have invested our lives in these communities of the Bay Area.				

The term preferred in Preferred Alternative is alarming, like a sugar coating on a plan of extreme and unnecessary restrictions. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

As a divorced woman I feel secure while walking with my dogs, and it is part of their joy to have time off leash. They are always within my voice control range.  
Adding fences is a bizarre solution... we live here, pay our taxes here,vote here-GGNRA should not be the bully in our neighborhood!!!

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Elia Haworth

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4919	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, MA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:20:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a San Francisco resident without a dog, however I still strongly oppose this measure. One of the things that makes San Francisco so unique and special is all of our beautiful outdoor spaces, dogs running too and fro, frolicking in the water, having fun.

Please don't take these beautiful spaces away from all of the city's dogs that need to run!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4920    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Napa, CA 94558  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:22:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Stefanie George

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4921    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:25:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support your recommendation for alternative F to manage dogs in the GGNRA. It is a well-balanced, reasonable resolution of the remaining issues regarding dogs in the park, and should be adopted without further delay.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 4922    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:28:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not limit/reduce the dog areas. This is a great resource for people who have dogs, and it would be very sad for it to go away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4923    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:29:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a person that likes to watch wildlife, implementing more rules to help keep sensitive areas of GGNRA dog-free is very important. Areas with dogs on-leash has negative effects on wildlife as well but in such an urban area, I see the importance of compromising with the dog community if deemed compatible with the GGNRA mission and their responsibilities to plants and animals with special status. Please reduce the number of off-leash areas, fence these areas for better protection of people and natural resources, increase signage so that visitors can easily identify where each activity is allowed, include both law enforcement and outreach personnel to reach out to visitors, and include monitoring to track the effectiveness of removing or limiting dog use and the positive effects on plants and animals.  
Rachel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4924    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:33:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4925    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:34:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to many of the different areas throughout the bay area, especially Marin and Chrissy Field in the city.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you,  
Alicia Robb  
San Rafael, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4926    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:36:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Janet M Suzio  
1553 35th Ave  
San Francisco, CA 94122

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Janet Suzio

AKA mom of Snoopy (Walker Hound) Red (small mix)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4927    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-3305

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:41:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dog ownership is not something most people living in a big city undertake lightly. Most of us pondered all the details involved in having an active pet in an urban setting. One of the resources that makes it possible to have a fit, healthy and happy dog is off leash running and swimming which we undertake at our, and I stress our, parks and beaches including but not confined to Crissy Field and Ocean Beach.

The notion that this resource would be taken from us is confusing. People and animals have coexisted for many years and will continue to do so regardless of a fence or a posted sign. 75 percent of dogs in this country are spayed and/or neutered indicating a level of commitment toward and responsibility for their pets that is hard to deny. Most dogs are off leash only if they have recall and someone is supervising them. Of course there are exceptions as there are to all generalizations. This kind of drastic limiting measure will not just impact the quality of life of our dogs but also our families who enjoy the companionship and small amount of freedom allowed in these parks. I often meet people who don't own pets but come out to watch the dogs swim and run around as well as tourists who enjoy taking photos of my dog's "swim team". This plan is too punitive and severe for a city known for being tolerant to one and all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4928    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:43:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep off leash accesses available in the GGNRA areas that presently allow off-leash. San Francisco dog owners need these outlets for their dogs and are a very respectful lot when it comes to managing their dogs around other people. This is not a problem today, so don't punish the dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4929    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:45:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:**

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4930    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:45:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Ft. Funsten an off lease park for dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4931    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94947  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I can't believe that you would want to put more restrictions on dogs being off leash in a county that is known for more dog lovers than anywhere else in the country...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4932    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:48:46

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I applaud the National Park Service for its efforts to regulate dog activities in the GGNRA through the setting of goals and public debate, and I fully support reasonable limitations on dog walking (particularly off leash areas and activities).

It is prudent and necessary for the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that will provide the opportunity for a quality National Park experience for all visitors, not just the vocal few who use park areas for the recreational use of their dogs. As such, the Plan must adhere to all established NPS management policies and practices elsewhere in the Park system, and include strong protection for park resources, especially the protection of habitat for birds and endangered species.

The plan must not allow commercial dog walking, which is not an appropriate activity for national park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking provides no service or benefit to other park users, adversely impacts park resources and values, and only serves private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Having witnessed countless violations of posted NPS policies and flagrant disregard for the park environment by dog owners, it is most imperative that the NPS not only implement a strong Dog Management Plan, but also ensure appropriate resources for its monitoring and enforcement.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4933    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** El Granada, CA 94018  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:49:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In the midst of the development of the Dog Management Plan, it just astounds me at the amount of time that GGNRA is spending developing this plan and still they are not looking at the core of what GGNRA is all about. The dog walking issue should not even be an issue if they would not keep overlooking the main word in their title "Recreation".

I just cannot fathom why and how this is done on a continuous basis. So, in my rational thinking, it is totally done purposely, and again I ask WHY?

Why do they not want to allow off-leash dog walking?

What is it they do not understand about Recreation and the Urban Environment, ignoring any and all comments that would be a positive for dogs off-leash or on leash. How do they figure that dogs are having such a negative impact on the lands that are in GGNRA? More people are coming to these areas since they have taken over, does this not cause more of a negative impact...why just dogs?

When GGNRA was acquiring their most recent lands, no forethought was given as to public access points. GGNRA was planning on going into populated housing areas and establish portals at the main entrances to these housing areas. Who in the world would want their home next to that, with potential visitors parking anywhere they can and walking through owners yards. What that would do to the value of their homes was not even a thought to the officials at GGNRA.

At one meeting I asked if these recently acquired lands are the first for NPS to have so close to populated neighborhoods, the comment back was oh no, they have quite a few. I was not given any names or areas of where these parks were, they all of the sudden got to busy to continue the conversation with me. This happens to be the only one I have been able to find with this of location.

Why doesn't GGNRA establish off leash areas around the housing developments that their land borders?

---

These areas that have been used for decades for the purpose of dog walking and the land is still here and pristine.

so, my questions on all of this is:

- 1) When will GGNRA really consider why they were established?
- 2) When will GGNRA learn what Recreation really means?
- 3) When will GGNRA learn what the term Urban Development means?
- 4) When will GGNRA have actual true facts to back up their claims of how bad dogs are on their lands?
- 5) When will GGNRA realize that one of the most dangerous things on their lands has been proven to be their own Rangers?

Once GGNRA can answer the above questions, we can then go forward with clear and honest conversations of how the lands can be best utilized and how off-leash dog policies can be a positive for all involved.

Do I have confidence in GGNRA's ability to be honest and forthcoming in these topics? I think not, there has not been evidence of that to date.

5)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4934	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:52:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Sabrin Hanavan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4935	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:53:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Dave Webb

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4936	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 16:54:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Anna Mary Hanavan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4937    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:54:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Andy Gutierrez

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4938    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:56:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not remove the 1979 Pet Policy. I support the No Action Alternative in the SEIS for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. I believe the SEIS should by law include peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of public lands. Dog owners must be responsible for controlling and cleaning up after their dogs, but dogs need areas where they can go off leash, without criminalizing the owners. Please don't take away this public use of public lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4939    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:57:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Penny Andrews

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4940    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:58:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for over 20 years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4941    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 16:58:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ben Wilkens

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4942	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:00:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	ear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Erinne

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4943	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Palo Alto, CA 94301 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:02:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hi, My name is Shana, I have lived in Palo Alto for 5 years, and I bring my dog to Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Muir Beach once a month for off-leash play time under voice control.

I am writing to oppose the restrictive "Preferred Alternative" and support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands GGNRA acquires in the future.

These beautiful spaces allow for much-needed exercise and socialization outside of the small fenced pens available at most other parks. When dogs are off leash and allowed to interact with one another in a large, open spaces, they have a sense of freedom and joy that is wonderful to watch and interact with. They get much better exercise with these large swaths of beach to run on than is possible in a small, fenced city dog park or on leash running beside a human on city blocks.

Sometimes my friends and I meet up at these beach locations to let our dogs run and play together. My dog loves to interact with his friends on these beaches, wrestling and playing. He also benefits from meeting canine and human strangers and learning to interact appropriately with them while off leash. It is important that these interactions occur off-leash because leashes can change dynamics between dogs and create more tension in interactions with new dogs.

Furthermore, these recreation areas are intended to function as social "steam release valves" to allow residents of a heavily populated Bay Area access to fresh air, quiet, undeveloped scenic land to relax, get exercise, spend time with friends, and enjoy some peace. I respect the National Park Service's commitment to ecological protection, but I know that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was given over to National Park Service leadership with the agreement that these parks were to remain as recreation areas (which we know serve a different purpose from much-needed nature refuges).

To my knowledge, there is no comparison with Fort Funston anywhere in the USA for a beautiful beach that allows off-leash dogs under voice control all year round. It is a gorgeous place that feels like paradise to dogs and humans and I urge you to preserve this cherished space for Bay Area taxpayers and visitors and their canine companions.

thanks,  
Shana

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4944    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:02:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand that the Park Service is concerned about the possibility that large numbers of off-leash dogs in the same space as a large number of park visitors can lead to an increase in the number of dog bites. I understand that this concern is one of the reasons that the draft dog management plan cites to support a change in policy that will greatly reduce the amount of space available for off-leash dog walking. However, I have read the report carefully, and I have not found any evidence in the report that shows the planned change in policy will reduce the number of dog bites.

Does the park service have any statistical data reporting the incidence of dog bites for the two scenarios being compared (present rules or revised rules)? Without such data, I don't believe that there is a

---

reasonable basis for expecting the proposed policy change to reduce the incidence of dog bites. Please don't institute a dramatic policy change without first showing that the desired effects will be obtained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4945    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94707  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:02:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose GGNRA's plan to ban dogs from much of its' land. This plan would be a hardship to the 50% oS.F. households with dogs. It would also force large numbers of dogs into the small, already crowded city parks to try to exercise. We know that problems occur when too many dogs/people are crowded into too small a space. The existing rules have been working fine for years with no problems. This new plan is no good for anyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4946    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Franisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Anna K.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4947    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Brian Chase

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4948    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:06:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Please be advised that I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. Simply put the plan is way too restrictive.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy and off-leash access on any new land the GGNRA acquires.

I am also letting you know I am concerned that the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of submitted in response to the first plan. I am also concerned that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA was set up to be a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area. The land subject to the dog management plan is not a pristine natural environment requiring protection.

Moreover, the trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That is the policy that needs to be formalized, not what is being proposed.

Sincerely,

Troy W

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4949    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Berkeley , CA 94703  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Wendy Tico

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4950    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:06:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am writing as a dog owner because I find the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan too restrictive. Part of the reason I have a dog in San Francisco is because of the wonderful off-leash areas where I can take her to run free. I primarily use Baker Beach, Crissy Field and Fort Funston, and all of the dog owners and walkers I encounter in those places are respectful of the environment and other people and pets. Everyone I see cleans up after their pets, and most people carry extra bags to carry out garbage and dog waste that other people have left on the beach.

The GGNRA should not put fences around off-leash areas - this defeats the purpose of having off-leash areas in the first place.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please ensure that the GGNRA remains a multi-use area that includes plenty of off-leash space for dogs.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4951    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:07:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Best,

Shirley Foster

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4952	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:08:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean:				

As someone who has regularly enjoyed walking with my dog in various parts of the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is excessively restrictive and will prevent me from using park properties (principally Fort Funston and Ocean Beach) in the manner I have been accustomed to for many years.

The present plan was not modified in any meaningfully significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people- -including me- -who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of off-leash, dog-friendly areas.

Furthermore, adopting strict new standards because some people are ignoring current restrictions is essentially regulation to the lowest common denominator: some drivers speed and run stop signs but that does not mean we ban driving. I have seen obvious violations of posted "no-entry" rules and it galls me just as much as it does you. It seems to me, however, that a better solution is increased enforcement of such rules; something tells me that a few stiff fines and the message will be received loud and clear.

I also support efforts to exclude dogs (as well as people) from particularly sensitive wildlife habitat or other sensitive areas, but in my view the modified plan goes well beyond that goal.

I echo the concerns of those who feel that GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was established to be a RECREATION AREA adjoining a densely populated urban environment. GGNRA trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy should be formalized and expanded to apply to GGNRA areas in San Mateo County.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4953    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:08:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Dana Reik

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4954    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Anselmo, CA 94960  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:11:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a longtime resident of Marin County I have enjoyed many years of visiting Marin's beaches with our dogs. I am in favor of keeping the restrictions as they exist since this has worked successfully for many years, even before the national government took over. Regarding Stinson Beach, I prefer 2-A or 2-F. Muir Beach: A or 5-E. And Rodeo: 6-A or 6-E. I also would not object to partial closures of the beaches to protect nesting birds. I hope you will consider the great benefits to our canine friends that being off-leash can bring: freedom and joy!  
Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4955    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94945  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:11:14

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4956    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416    **Private:** Y  
**Address:** private, Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of Sausalito for about 3 years and an avid hiker and nature enthusiast. I hope that dog access to Alta trail in Sausalito is also part of the review process. In the last 2 years the Alta trail towards the trail head at the end of Donahue Street in Marin City/ Sausalito has been overrun by professional dog handlers who come here daily by the dozens, bringing hundreds of dogs per day. Even though the majority of them is quite courteous regarding pet waste ( There is a pet waste bin and bag dispenser at the trailhead ) there are so many dogs on this trail every day that lots of dog piles remain in the open, making this trail especially on warm days a disgusting experience.

I am also very concerned about the local wildlife, since lots of dogs can be seen in the underbrush , often unattended. When I started walking this trail more than 3 years ago I spotted bobcats several times, but did not see them since many months now.  
A lot of digging activity by dogs makes areas to both sides of the trail look like hog wallows which raises concerns about erosion.

I love dogs and don't think that the few dogs of my neighbours and local residents cause a problem, but these hundreds of daily dog visits are just too much for this area.

In my opinion an enforced leash policy might take care of the digging and wildlife problem , but what about the piles of pet waste ?

Sincerely,  
Steff Sommer

P.S. I ask you not to publish my name and address but will be happily available to local authorities for further questions, just email me.

P.P.S. I heard about this document by the posters that have been put up at the trail head of Alta trail.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4957    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:12:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the 90% reduction of off leash areas for dogs in the SF Bay area, specifically Fort Funston. A large portion of people and their dogs in the area use these parks to exercise their dogs, which in turn helps reduce destructive and aggressive tendencies in some dogs when properly exercised. I have never felt threatened or in danger at the dog park from a dog owner or their dog. If park maintenance is a concern, as in Washington where I once resided, I would be happy to pay a daily fee or even a monthly/yearly fee to attend the park. I depend heavily on these off leash areas to exercise my two large dogs as I cannot run alongside them to tire them out fully.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4958    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:17:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Although the following letter is copied, it reflects my sentiments and I couldn't have said it better.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Robert Wolffe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4959    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** belvedere, CA 94920

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:17:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a long time Marin resident, one of the greatest joys is being able to hike the gorgeous trails with my animal companions.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I support Alternative A and am strongly AGAINST Alternative F! Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

Please support Alternative A!!

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4960	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Albany, CA 94706 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:18:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4961	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:19:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 17, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is an addendum to my letter sent to NPS electronically on February 16. In my February 16 letter, I stated my support Alternative F because it is the best solution to balancing the needs of the competing interests and stakeholders who use GGNRA (Golden Gate National Recreation Area).

In this addendum, I would like to reiterate the importance of ensuring all dogs that use GGNRA are licensed in the owners' county of residence. This is a very important from a public and canine health and safety perspective.

It is important because licensing helps to prevent the transmission of disease and rabies from dog to people and from dog to dog. A dog can only receive its annual license if it has received certain inoculations such as rabies. Assuming the dog's license is current; if the licensed dog were to bite a person, the transmission of rabies would be non-existent.

Knowing which dogs at GGNRA have or have not been licensed can be difficult to determine for the rangers who need to enforce this provision. To help the ranger with enforcement, NPS could include in the GGNRA dog management regulations that the dog's license tag must be visible to allow random, unplanned inspection, within GGNRA boundaries, by the ranger in order to confirm the status of the dog's license. In the event displaying the license tag is not possible, the person walking the dog would need to present the papers confirming the dog license status to the park ranger.

Also for NPS to issue a GGNRA dog usage permit, the owner would need to provide documentation to demonstrate the dogs' licensing status is in good standing.

In the event the dog's license is not current or it cannot be confirmed, that is there is no tag or papers, the permit is not issued or the dog must leave GGNRA.

If a person tampers with or falsifies a dog's license status, that would result in a warning, a fine or possibly a misdemeanor. I have heard of instances where dog licensing was required to enter a location and owners swapped tags between dogs in order to enter the location.

Licensing is important from a public and canine health and safety perspective. I have found some people do not know they have to license their dog and once they know do act properly. On the other side of the spectrum there can be people who choose to ignore the regulation because they believe it will not be enforced by the local authorities. Fortunately, these people are few.

Having the ranger confirm dogs are properly licensed while in the GGNRA or before a dog walking permit is issued will go a long way to ensuring public and canine health and safety

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4962	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	berkeley , CA 94707 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely, Joe

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4963	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:21:43
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have lived in San Francisco near 40 years. I have had active dogs, all WELL TRAINED, under voice control, all needing space to run (one can spit across my back yard). Not only do my dogs need to run, I need to walk, being ridden with rheumatoid arthritis. Moving, walking allows me to be functional, working and out of pain. I remain in San Francisco because of all the gorgeous areas in which I am able to walk and my dogs run. PLEASE do not take away this from me and all the MANY dog owners and dogs (still more dogs per capita than anywhere else in the nation, I believe!). I could go on and on, but will not. I will say that dogs are my joy- they do not rob, rape, cheat, they do not graffiti buildings, break into cars, murder..... I have worked (and still do) as an RN in ICU for many years- I cannot say this about human beings, Oh.. by the way, dogs do not do drugs.
------------------------	---

Sincerely, Laura Small

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4964	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Los Angeles, CA 90046 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,
------------------------	---------------------------

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

J. Kim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4965    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Alternative A is the only solution. Keep the status quo. The 1979 Pet Policy is PERFECT and should not be altered at all.

I oppose all other plans because they are too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

As someone who walks regularly with my dogs in the GGNRA (6-10 times a month on Baker Beach, Crissy, Ft. Funston), I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the new draft dog management plan and any changes in the current laws. Any changes will significantly prevent me from recreating and exercising my dogs. Will adversely affect my health and my dogs' health. I have been using this recreational space in this way for over 20 years (well before the GGNRA took over) and it is extremely unacceptable to me for these changes to go in effect.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely, Denise Jasper

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4966    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service,

I strongly oppose the preferred alternatives listed in the draft Plan as I feel it is quite a drastic change from the current policy.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

It seems like more dialogue is needed before moving forward since such a large number of people and pets will be impacted by this. Is there more of a middle ground that can be met? I appreciate that there is a need for preservation, but perhaps it would be more prudent to take smaller steps in cutting back dog off leash areas to test things out? Also, is there something else that dog owners can do to help? Are volunteers needed to help keep the areas in question more clean? Is there a small tax or fee that dog owners might pay, which could help? I think it important to understand where both sides are coming from and that dog owners can't have everything that they want, but right now, this proposed GGNRA plan seems far too restrictive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4967    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Maureen Byrne

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4968    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pleasant Hill, CA 94523  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:27:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jean Kusz

(along with dogs Bella & Brady)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4969	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:28:55
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a former dog owner I would be very sad if the options for of leash dog walking where restricted. As a young child before my family got a dog I was actually very afraid of large dogs. Even then I still enjoyed Crissy Field and Fort Funston. When we got a dog my enjoyment of these places increased 10 fold. I could not have imagined our dog faith being able to get all of her puppy energy out any other way. These areas create great places for dogs and people alike to walk and enjoy the fresh air. Walking a dog on a leash is no where near as pleasant for ether the dog or the human. I would be such a loss to have these great dog and human parks be turned into a space where dogs could not freely run.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4970	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:30:42
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please take a considered, broader approach to the changes you want to make. I live in the Bay Area BECAUSE I enjoy the outdoors, and the recreational treasures we all share. We can get along. Drastic cuts in the access to OUR TAX-PAID LAND to our family (which includes our dog) would be a huge loss to our quality of life here. And it is unnecessary. I am a member of Front Runners, Different Spokes, LGBT Outdoors Club, Sierra Club, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition and Marin County Bicycle Coalition, among others. We deserve a voice. Please stop the process, breathe, and start again with community input.
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4971	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Anna Q Crowley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4972	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:31:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello GGNRA,				

My dog Teddy, a shih tzu, and I have enjoyed and thrived in our time spent on the Chrissy Field for 5 1/2 years. Teddy has become a relaxed and social dog, good with all kinds of adults and children, and all kinds of dogs. I attribute this to our many wonderful hours of playing off-leash with the mix of people and dogs at Chrissy Field beach as well as the many other beaches of the Presidio.

As Teddy's owner, I have had the opportunity to meet and become friends with a wide circle of San Franciscans and Bay Area folks that ordinarily I would never have had any reason to overlap with. This is what a tolerant caring community is all about. Having first hand experience I know our dogs of San Francisco contribute to the harmony of our city - small in geography and big in heart.

Kind regards,  
Carol Kranhold Ames

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4973	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:34:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Larissa Acosta  
San Francisco, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4974	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	oakland, CA 94606 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Leal Charonnat  
Oakland, California

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4975	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:35:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To the NPS administration,				

I live in San Francisco, walk my dog regularly in the GGNRA, and am a restoration volunteer in the Presidio of the GGNRA. The "Preferred" alternative is MUCH TOO RESTRICTIVE. I strongly support, recommend that you adopt, and will fight for, Alternative A.

The bulk of the resource degradation that I see as a restoration worker with Presidio Park Stewards is caused by HUMANS, not by dogs. The best way to protect our park resources is to have the people using the park invested in taking care of it and understanding, in their heart, its value. The people who walk their dogs off leash in the GGNRA are major caretakers of this land. They use it regularly, pick up trash, appreciate it and love it. THE NPS POLICY OF NOT ALLOWING DOGS OFF LEASH IS THE REGULATION THAT IS OUT OF WHACK, not the current, sane practices of the GGNRA.

Dogs and people walking together, in their own species-specific way is beneficial to both and encourages awareness of each other (dog of person and person of dog) and, very importantly, of their surroundings. My daily off leash walks with my dog enhance my quality of life in a way that is far superior to walking with the dog on a leash. I can walk at my pace and she can sniff and run at her pace. The level of stress relief is wonderful for both of us. Dogs interact with each other much more calmly off leash. They can actually play. Dog play, which is very important for the well-being of the dog and of tremendous enjoyment to their humans is not possible on leash.

In the 5 years that I have walked my dog daily off leash (over 9,000 hours) I have seen exactly 2 instances where dogs have actually done damage to another creature. The "safety" issue is really a fear issue. When people break the law or cause damage, or are in imminent danger of doing so, they should be corrected, or in the case of actual criminal activity punished. We should not create a situation where breaking the law is merely having ones dog walking or running without a leash. The current laws and regulations are more than adequate for this non-problem. The NPS could also formalize the 1979 Pet Policy plus off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am a scientist (UCSF) and I realize that I have above just given you some anecdotal data. This is not sufficient for making a conclusion, but these are the kind of data that you (the NPS) have used so far in bolstering your "preferred" alternative. The lack of data in the literature supporting canine-caused resource degradation coupled with the absence of site specific data for GGNRA leave these restrictions completely unsubstantiated. I strongly object to our freedom being impinged by fear and lack of proof that there is a real problem.

I also object to the lack of accounting of and response to the extensive comments that were made to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Of the 4700 comments how many supported off leash use? How many support restrictions? Such extraordinary restrictions require extraordinary proof. None of the comments and suggestions (such as time restrictions at Baker Beach) were mentioned.

In addition, I would like to specifically oppose the use of fenced off leash areas. Has anyone proposing this actually used one of these areas? It concentrates the impact of dogs to a ridiculous degree, turning the area into the dog version of a feedlot. It stinks and people and dogs just stand around! To think that this substitutes for an off-leash walk with your dog just shows the level of misunderstanding on the part of the folks proposing such "alternatives". I also am a wildlife rehabilitator and know how that kind of fencing can adversely affect wildlife.

This issue is very important to me, to my health and well-being and that of many of my friends and acquaintances. At this stage I do not believe that the regulatory and democratic process is working. I sincerely hope, and will follow up to encourage, that you will do the right thing and avoid these draconian regulations.

Sincerely,

Annemarie A. Donjacour

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4976	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:35:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to the Coastal trails, Muir and Rodeo Beaches.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4977	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:35:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Steve Keirn  
San Francisco, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4978	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:36:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the plan to throttle off-leash dog walking on GGNRA lands. As part of the legislation creating it, the GGNRA was explicitly meant to preserve existing recreational opportunities for all residents, not provide a wilderness experience immediately adjacent to a major city underserved by other kinds of parks. I would not even have known about Fort Funston years ago if it were not for going there with friends who had dogs, and I treasure the experience of visiting there to this day. I believe the arguments for changing the status quo are disingenuous in the extreme, and I have consequently lost my enthusiasm for visiting (or supporting) other national parks as well. As we might say, you are biting the hand that feeds you in pushing this plan forward over the objections of area residents.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4979    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:38:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I feel the need to write you to state my opinion against the proposed changes.

I moved here from Oakland in 2003 with my dog, Nomie (recently departed), and could not have imagined a better place to land. Well trained (he would never cross a corner without my directive) and fully under voice control, we enjoyed so much the city has to offer on a daily basis (especially Crissy, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach and the Headlands/ Rodeo) that was so special to both of us.

I always believed I would adopt another dog (Nomie found me and am waiting for the next connection). However, the potential restrictions proposed make me wonder whether it it would not be a fair environment to raise a dog (someone I consider a respectful member of my family).

Please reconsider the extreme measures being proposed. I understand there may need to be some changes or policing but it seems wholly unfair to penalize the majority that respect and enjoy a recreation that is unique to San Francisco.

Regards,  
Kara Forman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4980    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Humane Society Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:44:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA should take a leadership role in allowing and promoting recreation that involves off-leash dogs and their owners. As we understand animals and human-animal interactions it is becoming more apparent that walking and running free, but in a responsible manner, is very important for both dog and person. People visiting GGNRA from all over the country have expressed to me their appreciation for the freedom to walk/run/play with their dogs without a leash. This feature of the GGNRA is something that actually attracts such visitors here. In the absence of data on any harm caused by dogs

(and there is not hard data in this impact statement) we should continue to be pioneers in this area of outdoor recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4981    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Marissa Gomes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4982    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:46:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Carol Selsted, a resident of San Francisco and an Animal Assisted Therapy volunteer with the SPCA. Among the many amazing things about living in the Bay Area is having access to diverse recreational resources in the Golden Gate National Recreation area. Specifically, my dog and I enjoy early morning off-leash walks on the beaches at Crissy Field. My dog Sophie, is well behaved and is under my voice command at all times. I am mindful of cleaning up after Sophie and we are respectful of the designated ecological enclosures. These walks bring a sense of community and wellness to our daily routine.

I oppose the GGNRA's current Preferred Alternative as it significantly restricts and eliminates off leash walking in many areas within the GGRNA. As a resident of the Bay Area, I too am concerned about the long-term preservation of the GGNRA's natural resources and want to protect these natural resources as well. The DEIS notes some studies and the perception of dogs and the harmful impact on our natural resources, but there is little site-specific documentation to support the proposed restrictions. There is also insufficient documentation that considers other impacts to the environment, such as: other wildlife, cyclists, joggers, boaters, kite surfers, exercise boot camps, visitors, and large crowd events like races and walk-a-thons. I recently picked up a syringe from the shoreline and disposed of it. After a holiday

weekend or a warm weekend, the beaches are littered with food wrappers, glass bottles, plastic children's toys, clothing and other items.

SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that "In many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities." (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - "The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to ... expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972)

Please support the diversity of our population and of our visitors and come up with a more inclusive alternative to GGNRA's current Preferred Alternative.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4983	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	California Native Plant Society Yerba Buena Chapter Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:48:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Job 1 of a national park is to preserve the natural resources. The capture of large parts of the GGNRA by off-leash dog owners is a blot on the record of our National Park Service system.				

The presence of large numbers of hyperactive dogs is damaging to these resources. They harass birds and trample plants. They interfere with other people's pleasure, making some areas unusable for large numbers of people.

San Francisco is the third densest city in the United States. Yet some people journey here daily from the East Bay and down the peninsula, where they are not allowed to run off-leash. Does this make sense?

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4984	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:51:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

David Seidel

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4985	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Responsible Dog Owner Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:51:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Adam Nichols

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4986	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Private individual Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 17:54:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of San Francisco and live in Noe Valley. I regularly (between 4 and 6 times per week) walk my dog at Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Baker beach and enjoy the recreation that it provides me, my family and my dog. I support the 'No action' alternative for these areas. Please enforce the existing rules of the 1979 Pet Policy. It appears that the SEIS is a fatally flawed document				

---



with no peer-reviewed, site specific monitoring or data and that there is no legitimate or legal basis for the proposed changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4987    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:58:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I strongly oppose Alternative F. I support Alternative A, no action. GGNRA already limits so much recreation area for dogs, and there are more dogs than children in Marin County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4988    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:59:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Escalon and Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Regards,  
Jill and Steven Fugaro

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4989    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 17:59:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Lauren Godfrey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4990    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:01:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Don Walker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4991    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94502  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a Board member of GGAS I feel strongly that The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.  
Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.  
Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.  
Visitors to the park should be limited to a maximum of two dogs per person.  
The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4992    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,Mandy willian

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4993    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Stephen S. Sayad, Attorney at Law Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Via Electronic Mail

February 17, 2014

Mr. Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, California 94123

Dear Superintendent Dean:

I oppose the Preferred Alternative and all proposed Alternative as Dog Management Plans for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area ("GGNRA"). Each proposal is too restrictive. There is no justification , scientific or otherwise, in the Dog Management Plan for any changes from the 1979 Pet Police, as supplemented by the 1996 Compendium Amendment. Instead,I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy along with off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA has acquired since 1979 and acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Moreover, the GGNRA has violated federal law by failing to support its preferred Alternatives with peer-reviewed science. In fact, as was the case with the Drake's Bay Oyster Company, the GGNRA has fraudulently concealed relevant science, including the Warren Study out of U.C. Berkeley demonstrating the absence of any disturbance to the Western Snowy Plover's feeding habits from off-leash dogs.

The GGNRA has no power to regulate the tidelands it manages in the GGNRA. The GGNRA does not own these tidelands; they are held in trust by the State of California for the recreational uses of the citizenry. The management permit between the GGNRA and the California State Lands Commission only allows imposition of federal law to the extent it does not conflict with State law. There have never been any on-leash laws on the tidelands in the Bay Area managed by the GGNRA. Accordingly, State and federal law conflict on this issue and, pursuant to the management permit, the GGNRA must follow State law in attempting to change the historical uses of these tidelands. The California Administrative Procedures Act is far more exacting than federal law when it comes to changes in land management that are significant or highly controversial. As a result, the GGNRA, in following federal law, has violated the management permit and forfeited management over the tidelands it manages.

The GGNRA's attempt to change the 1979 Pet Policy is rife with illegalities and should be abandoned short of litigation.

Sincerely,

/ SSS /  
Stephen Samuel Sayad

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4994	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:03:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This letter supports the "No Action Alternative" for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of these areas.

Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy. The GGNRA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

My family and dog enjoy Muir Beach and every remaining site available to us as responsible dog guardians. Of course we understand the need for multi-use areas and we respect all posted requirements. Citizens are capable of self-monitoring these wonderful areas for enjoyment with their dogs, through training, voice control over their pets, keeping leashes handy and being aware of the regular interactions of life. Socializing dogs and people- -all kinds, young and old- -help us appreciate and value each other, rather than polarize populations based on forced prioritized notions of oppositional recreational needs or enjoyment. One size does not fit all, keep diversity in our recreational ares and interactions.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4995    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:03:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Julie Feldstein

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4996	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:06:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

This is not a National Park like Yellowstone, Yosemite or Grand Teton where restrictions are completely logical. But to restrict off-leash dog use in a recreational area that is part of a city like San Francisco, which has a long tradition of its people recreating with its dogs in many forms, goes completely against the grain of the use of these lands and is not what the City of San Francisco intended when they deeded you these lands. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up for recreational use for a densely populated, urban area. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco, San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you for your understanding and I hope you are able to arrive at a much fairer compromise for both your needs, the environmentalists' needs, and the people of The Bay Area.

Sincerely,

Merrick Wolfe  
Pacifica, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4997	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Brisbane, CA 94005 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-				

---

specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Additionally, in the SEIS the GGNRA asserts they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" as utilized in its enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI and the GGNRA's first Superintendent, the Honorable William J. Whalen, in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA. These promises, along with the conventional definition of the term "recreation", do not comport with GGNRA's current philosophy exemplified by Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management and Science for the GGNRA, who in 2007 was quoted as saying "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design.

Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it, e.g. the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management. Alternatively, for sites heavily utilized by dogs and their guardians, such as Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	4998	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Papacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:12:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	If there is no enforcement of dogs being off leash in specified leashed areas what point is all this?				

Every time I go for a walk/hike where dogs are supposed to be on a lease , there are dog owners who think that since there is no ranger giving them a ticket, it is OK to have their dogs off leash. Often I see folks with more than two dogs off lease, running in restricted areas, 40 Ft away from the owner. The owners cannot see what there dogs are doing and if they poo'ed the owners do not even know, or most times do not care. I've had dogs off lease run up to me and jump on me, and I am afraid of big dogs. Why do people who just want to go and take a hike/walk in a park , have to put up with this?

I say, "No enforcement, do not bother with rules about where leashed or unleashed dogs can or cannot go".

---

**Correspondence ID:** 4999    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Brisbane, CA 94005  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Additionally, in the SEIS the GGNRA asserts they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" as utilized in its enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI and the GGNRA's first Superintendent, the Honorable William J. Whalen, in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA. These promises, along with the conventional definition of the term "recreation", do not comport with GGNRA's current philosophy exemplified by Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management and Science for the GGNRA, who in 2007 was quoted as saying "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design.

Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it, e.g. the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management. Alternatively, for sites heavily utilized by dogs and their guardians, such as Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5000    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:13:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Everything I have heard and read about this proposal seems directed at blaming dog and their owners for the problems.

Especially in the Bay Area, much effort is being made to improve conditions to be conducive to families and their health. Dogs are part of family life, as well as wonderful companions to those living alone and seniors. Where are the dogs to get their exercise if they cannot run in the parks and beaches. Looking around Fort Funston this morning, everyone there had a dog. How many people would be walking and getting their exercise without a dog?

Chrisy Field is another favorite of ours. Areas that are protected are easily kept that way by fencing. A great option. The accusation that dogs dig up the lawns is incorrect...actually they may dig at the holes that the gophers make, but I have never seen a dog dig a hole in a lawn that is not already dug up by gophers.

Most dog owners are caring, respectful people who only want to enjoy the beautiful area we are lucky have with their pets. We clean up after them. They give us love and enjoyment in return.

please reconsider this very flawed plan. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5001    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Inverness, CA 94937  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:13:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly urge the Park Service to limit dog use of the GGNRA in such a way as to protect the habitat values for wildlife. GGNRA should not be a big dog park. Being so close to a populated urban area the unique wildlife within the GGNRA is already threatened by intense use by people. We do not need a lot of dogs running around on or off leash to harass the flora and fauna and leave their excrement around which could spread disease. The park service should make every effort to protect existing habitat and the wildlife which use it.

Edward Nute

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5002    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:14:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a daily user of these areas affected by the GGNRA policy. Not only in my neighborhood on the SUNset/Parkside area but also in Marin and San Mateo. The majority of the time I am enjoying these areas, there are only a handful of others that do as well. The enjoyment I derive from

---

Ocean Beach is why I chose to buy a home in this area. The GGNRA proposal will severely impact my enjoyment of the beach, my home and my neighborhood.

I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy for the following reasons:

In the event of the transfer of our beaches and other properties owned by the City and County of San Francisco to the NPS to become the GGNRA promises were made to the voters that this new recreational area would retain historical recreational access, including off-leash recreation.

When congress established the GGNRA in 1972, they included two "specific provisions" unique to the GGNRA:

First, the park was established "to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning."

Second, the GGNRA statute imposes a unique limitation on NPS's discretionary power for "management of the recreation area" by providing that the "Secretary of Interior...shall utilize the resources in a manner which will provide for recreation and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and

management."

The GGNRA does not use sound principles of land use planning and management or even follow their own rules and regulations.

The premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area is absurd. By their own admission, the GGNRA has no data or studies to support these claims. They ignore/omit all studies that contradict their desired outcome.

The GGNRA proposal fails in foresight of the environmental and societal impact of closing the beaches to dogs. If the claim of dogs compromising visitor safety were true, then their proposal should reflect such impact. In other words, why would they allow dogs to be in the areas of Ocean Beach that are more highly populated with humans. If this claim were justified then they should allow dogs to be where most humans are not. Yet their proposal restricts the areas of Ocean Beach to the areas where there is easy access, parking lots and known use by the majority of those that visit the beach. Why place the highest population of people in close proximity to the one thing they claim is compromising their safety?

The volunteers they use to conduct their "research" on the populations of the snowy plover is all volunteer who come out at varying times of the day, week, etc. There is no scientific approach. There is no one conducting long term research in the standard of viable data collecting to warrant a verifiable and repeatable outcome.

I am a citizen of San Francisco. I live a block from Ocean Beach. I am out there at least twice a day, every day. The impact I see on the environment from humans themselves is far more damaging than a few dogs running off leash. Humans bring all kinds of trash and leave it in the beach. They bring furniture, burn it

and leave the remains on the beach. Fisherman's sharp lures are buried in the sand or seaweed leaving potential dangers, fishing line is wrapped around birds legs and they do nothing to set the bird free.

If GGNRA is truly concerned about environmental impact, why have I never seen them stop to pick up trash? Why do I see them driving on the beach just to hand out tickets/warnings to dog owners? Why are they allowed to drive motorcycles on the beach disturbing the wildlife just to give tickets to dog owners? Don't these practices alone cause a detrimental impact?

I only see dog owners picking up trash as they walk their dogs, because they care about the environment they utilize and the safety not only of themselves, their pets but others.

If these areas are closed the impact on the rest of the city will take a toll. Dogs walkers walk their dogs at all times, in the morning, late at night. They have been one to report crimes, deaths, and other potential hazards on the beach. Dog walkers move out, homeless, vagrants, increased crime and gangs move in. Dog walkers act as a no cost preventive measure against these.

I would like the GGNRA to realize that the ones who care about the beach are the ones who use it daily, the surfers, the runners, the dog owners. We see the changes that happen and we do something about it, even if it is as little as picking up trash.

How can the GGNRA undertake a Dog Management Policy change as proposed in this SEIS without any evidence of monitoring or site specific studies (as required by federal law) as a means to identify the alleged impairment?! Anecdotal comments and the "potential" to damage the area just don't cut it.

Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Now called the Monitoring-based Management Strategy, the GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

My preferred option is one the GGNRA deliberately omitted: the original 1979 Pet Policy which was affirmed as legal and the current law of the land by Federal Judge William Alsup in 2005.

I urge you to reconsider the proposal because the after effects will be more damaging to the city of San Francisco and my neighborhood the Outer Sunset/Parkside and it will do nothing to address those issues because it will then be outside of your jurisdiction.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5003	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Tiburon, CA 94920 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:14:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs, whether on or off leash, have no more adverse affect on the environment than the humans that own them, or, humans without dogs. I have hiked the MMWD and to some degree the				

---

GGNRA w. my dogs, for the past 20 years and I see more benefit to dog owners/walkers than I see them causing trouble or a disturbance. Walking your dog out in nature is a enlightening experience and makes for happy peaceful people that care about the nature around them and take an interest in keeping it clean, pristine and safe.

I oppose your Alternative F and I strongly support leaving things the way they are; Alternative A. More rules and regulations are not going to change bad people in to good people, it will only cause more stress and conflict among those who generally get along really well on the trails and beaches.

Maybe a solution could be what I have experienced in San Diego County where there are A LOT OF BEACHES AND A LOT OF DOGS. They allow Dogs off leash on almost ALL BEACHES from sunrise until 9:30 a.m. and from 1/2 hour prior to sunset 'til dark in the evening.

There are also some trails that are open to dog traffic during the week but not during the week-ends. I guess this is to limit congestion on the week-ends?

Thank you for the opportunity to express my point of view.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5004	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:16:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This responds to the Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.				

Our family is comprised of me, my husband and our 2 year old, well behaved, fun loving rescue dog, who is a border collie mix. We walk daily around Sharp Park Beach, and the trails that lead us to Rockaway, Mori Point and the Moose Lodge in Pacifica.

What struck us about the area is the community and love of the open space. We encounter people fishing, kids playing, people walking, jogging, and biking with and without dogs. We have met people who have lived in this area for 10-30 years who have walked their dogs for years. We have not yet met an aggressive dog. We have simply made friends with others whose family includes joyful dogs. To increase restrictions for dogs to access this area is to create a hardship for a strong, established, law abiding community.

What struck me about the Draft Dog Management Plan are these points:

1. The vast majority of respondents prefer off leash rules: 550 v. 191. The vast majority oppose the management plan: 1279 v. 343. The vast majority of visitors enjoy dogs: 301 v. 153.
2. There is neither adequate evidence nor basis in any original mission statement that should restrict access by well-behaved dogs on leash or under voice control.
3. Comments and alternatives that include barbed wire, enclosed restricted areas for dogs, and allegations that dogs cannot respect human boundaries do not understand the cause of inappropriate dog behavior: inappropriate human behavior.

Dogs are loving family members of many families who live in the communities affected by the

Management Plan. To restrict access of our family members is a cruel hardship that cannot be justified or supported by any discussions or facts outlined in the new Draft.

What our family does support are:

1. Continued access by dogs that are leashed or under voice control.
2. A serious commitment to implement a plan that recognizes that dogs are family members and are a substantial part of our community who need and enjoy access to our trails and beaches.
3. Strict rules against owners who cannot control their dogs, who litter our open spaces, and who do not respect human boundaries.

Your own document comments on how the majority of dog owners support regulations against dog owners who act inappropriately. Don't punish all our dogs. Punish those dog owners who are in the small minority.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5005	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I have been a resident of Muir Beach for over 14 years. Our house sits directly above the beach on which our off-leash and supervised dogs run or swim everyday. In addition, we regularly run or hike with our dogs on many of the Marin Headlands Trails mainly on the Coastal, Miwok, Homestead & 4-Corners trails as well as fire roads.

I am writing to share my comments for the 2013 SEIS specifically pertaining to Muir Beach and the Marin Headlands Trails (Coastal Trail/fire road to Hill 88). While I applaud the efforts to produce this plan I am deeply concerned that the preferred alternative F will have devastating impact on the residents of Muir Beach and my family as we rely on the open space of the GGNRA everyday for exercise in the natural environment as this is literally both our front and backyard! My comments to the 2011 DEIS were not adequately addressed and most criticisms and concerns expressed in all comments filed in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Our isolated Muir Beach community of some 150 houses is home to about 60 dogs, and is completely surrounded by the GGNRA with the nearest town a 20-minute drive on the twisty rural 2-lane coastal highway 1.

Muir Beach is listed on the GGNRA website as a a quiet cove, beach and lagoon favored by locals. Reviews on popular social networks, Trip Advisor and Yelp describe Muir Beach:

Not usually crowded, low-key, folks playing fetch with their dogs and everyone just chills."

Love Muir Beach - Great for kids, kites, dogs BBQ's.

I found it to be very dog friendly which is good because I brought my doggie here and she loved it.

It's a dog beach (where the heck do I find a cat beach?) -  
So there are pets about - but generally it's a very good  
crowd of people in this area, it is Marin after all, and I have  
yet to see any problems with loose dogs.

Nice beach. Dog friendly.

The beach was perfect and lovely! Its dog and beer friendly...

Great place to have a picnic and bring family and friends.  
Also a dog if you have one.

People watching is also fun with folks grilling, chilling,  
surfing, kite flying and romping with dogs.

## OVERALL COMMENT

I strongly oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative F for Muir Beach and The Marin Headlands. I support Alternative A, the no-action alternative, or a revision to provide more access to GGNRA for people with dogs in Marin County. The current plan alternatives are too restrictive on dog walking in the areas that affect our small community and it does not protect and preserve the fundamental values for which the GGNRA was established in terms of recreational values. This plan ought to be about stewardship of a park that is situated within an urban environment. The SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

It is key note that the both the Marin County Board of Supervisors as well as our own Muir Beach Community Services District have passed resolutions opposing and recommending modifications to the GGNRA's SEIS, as they recognize that these lands are intertwined with vibrant communities such as Muir Beach.

## SPECIFIC CONCERNS

Address the needs of communities whose backyard is the GGNRA  
Page 1104, 'Limiting dog walking areas would reduce these (Muir Beach residents) visitors enjoyment of this site. Some visitors in this user group may prefer to find a different park in which to exercise their dogs off leash.

The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force our community into their cars to drive a minimum of 20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to Muir Beach is already choked and congested on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA. Since the new parking lot opened this year, a large portion of that traffic and user group is now descending upon Muir Beach. The plan further suggests that those who want an off-leash beach experience for their dog can go to Rodeo Beach. This change would force Muir Beach residents into cars to drive 45 minutes on the congested 2-lane highway, then the freeway and then another 2-lane rural road for an off-leash experience that currently exists literally steps in front of their homes. The 45 minute drive is assuming that there is no traffic congestion. On a crowded day when visitorship to Muir Woods tops

5,000 people, it takes residents nearly double the time to travel out of the community. It will be devastating to our community of 60 dogs and the environment!

On Page 114, the document calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as there have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the 'off-limits' creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

#### Need to Substantiate Claims with Scientific Analysis

There are not any single peer-reviewed, site-specific studies (as required by law) included in the plan that support such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA has the burden of proof to justify this drastic reduction in access to public land before making it legislation.

These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. The estimated 60,000 dogs will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves - it passes the buck to towns, cities and the county.

The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ from other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day! In fact as I write this letter, there are 7 people wondering around the dunes!

Regarding Visitor Use and Experience, on pages 1090 -1091 it states that "The practice by local residents of allowing their dogs to roam the beach unsupervised would be addressed by law enforcement staff; allowing a dog to be off-leash would be citable. Adverse impacts would be expected for visitors and local residents who enjoy seeing and playing with dogs off leash. Dog owners may also feel that their pets are not receiving adequate exercise when restrained on a 6-foot leash. In addition, it would be difficult for some visitors, particularly those that are disabled or elderly with mobility issues, to adequately control their dogs on-leash. Having dogs on-leash also limits the exercise dogs can obtain to the exercise abilities of their owners, which may not be sufficient. Some visitors in this user group may find a different park to exercise their dogs off leash.

This misleading paragraph implies that all local residents allow their dogs to roam the beach unsupervised. This is a false and unsupported statement. Residents legally allow their dogs off-leash, and these dogs are supervised. Off-leash does not mean unsupervised.

In addition, we are home to several elderly residents, most of whom own dogs and walk them on the Beach. The requirement to have a dog on-leash may diminish their ability to adequately exercise their pets and themselves. This is unjust.

On page 113 there is discussion regarding the planned changes to Muir Beach including the new footpath to the beach and fencing along the dunes. These have been installed. It is interesting to note that the report states that "The fencing would act as a visible barrier, but would not completely exclude dogs from the area, as this type of fencing would be inappropriate at Muir Beach and not sustainable due to tidal action. Allowing on leash dog walking on the beach and installing visual barriers would enable the park to

manage the area in order to restore, protect, and sustain the wetlands, creeks, dunes and lagoon. Allowing 'on-leash dog walking on the beach would protect visitor experience and enhance visitor safety.

The dune fences have been installed and block access to the dunes and wetland area for dogs, unless the dog enters the creek to cross to the county beach on the other side (as the SEIS directs dog owners to do (page 114) , or an owner is in the area with their dog. On most days, I watch from my living room window as people without dogs disregard the fence and signage and enter the areas behind the fence anyway.

Regarding safety, the plan states that the cumulative impacts for Alternative A are the same as for Alternative F: Negligible. Page 315, Table 14 indicates a total of only 24 dog-related incidents in Muir Beach over a 4-year period from 2008 - 2011. We have hundreds of visitors visiting the beach each weekend. On holidays and warm days the beach is packed and cars park along the highway and along community roads. On page 1253, Muir Beach Alternative A, Conclusion Table the language states 'Therefore, the cumulative impacts to the health and safety of park staff and visitors under this alternative are expected to be negligible.

To conclude, page 1085, 'Muir Beach receives heavy visitation by beachgoers and walkers on the weekends and moderate to high use on the weekdays. Overall, the number of leash law violations is low for this site, with only nine occurring in 2008 through 2011; no dog bites or attacks were reported during this period (table 9).

So why the concern over safety?

I have concern over being on trails without my dogs and feeling unsafe due to predators, both animal and human.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Educational signage and enforcement be used to change behavior with respect to sensitive habitat, refuse and visitor and staff interaction.

The plan calls out a budget to educate and enforce. Why not utilize this budget to educate and enforce the current rules and regulations that are currently not adequately enforced.

I watch each day as people traipse through the newly restored and fenced delicate dune and riparian areas. Children play in the lagoon and creek. Bonfires burn after hours. People camp in the dunes. Litter is strewn across the beach and left at the bridge entrance on the beach. I carry home an armful of trash each morning when I walk the dog. Where is the park maintenance staff to clean up the litter every day? The dispenser by the footbridge should have signage notifying owners and be filled with plastic bags, and in addition a disposal bin could be placed for pet waste.

Trail/Fire road access from Muir Beach to nearest town

Residents and their dogs need access on foot out of Muir Beach to Mill Valley (the nearest town) for recreation and safety. Two trail suggestions:

A) Muir Beach - Coastal trail & Coastal Fire Road - Coyote Ridge  
Fire Road - Miwok Fire Road.

B) Muir Beach - Diaz Ridge - Miwok Fire Road.



Both would connect to Homestead trails and allow access to Mill Valley.

#### Create On-leash Loop Trail

Provide a loop trail as opposed to dead end trails to allow for a recreational experience for the user. We desperately need a loop from Muir Beach and a suggested loop is:

Muir Beach - Coastal - Coyote Ridge - Middle Green Gulch or

Green Gulch Fire Road - Muir Beach

This loop is about 3 miles and would provide excellent exercise for both owner and dogs. Green Gulch fire road or middle Green Gulch trail would be the link required to make the loop.

#### Fire Road Access

The GGNRA fire roads are on average 12 feet wide allowing for a variety of users, including those with dogs, to safely share the road and are accessible from many neighborhoods and locations outside the GGNRA, encouraging people to walk directly into the recreation area instead of driving to the GGNRA or to other park spaces.

#### IN CONCLUSION

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the GGNRA. There are many trails and areas that currently do not allow dogs. These are areas that users who would like a dog-free experience can access. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. The GGNRA SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. To remove recreational access to these lands is not substantiated.

The GGNRA was established by involving communities, communities such as Muir Beach, to provide recreational activities for residents in the densely populated Bay area. This is not a pristine wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. It is a designed landscape with many constructed environments including the new parking lot in Muir Beach and the reconstructed wetlands. The GGNRA requires a different management strategy than a traditional National Park. While a keystone objective for the GGNRA is 'recreation, it does not appear at all in the plan's objectives, nor is it referred to as one of the park's resources and values.

The GGNRA is unique. There is not other National Park quite like it. Its mandate states that the Park possesses 'outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning. This dog plan should support these values and not diminish them.

Marin residents rely upon this open space to enjoy a balance in their lifestyle. It is the very essence of Marin. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

As a Yelp reviewer described Muir Beach:

Muir Beach is surrounded by mountains, dogs are playing in the sand, and artists painting. It's a true sight to behold.

Thank you for your consideration,

Coleen Curry

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5006    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:16:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lisa Higgenbottom and Trooper

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5007    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:17:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ashley Petersen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5008    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Cynthia Skovlin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5009    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
VV

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5010    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:20:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Katrina

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5011    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:22:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** One of the wonderful things about Californians is our appreciation and enjoyment of mother nature. Part of this enjoyment comes from sharing our experience with those we love...and this includes our 4-legged family members.

We walk our dog (a Border Collie Mix) every day on the trails of Marin. This keeps us all both mentally & physically fit and is an important part of our daily routine. The ability to enjoy mother nature with our

---

companion animal is one of our favorite things about living in Marin & one of the reasons we can justify the high cost of living (including property taxes) in this beautiful area.

We have great respect for our Open Space...we pick up, keep our dog on trail and keep after others who do not do the same. We would be devastated to lose access to the proposed areas...and an important part of our way of life in Marin County.

Thank you, Lisa

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5012	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5013	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:23:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet

policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Maria Da Costa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5014    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a resident of Muir Beach for over 14 years. Our house sits directly above the beach on which our off-leash and supervised dogs run or swim everyday. In addition, we regularly run or hike with our dogs on many of the Marin Headlands Trails mainly on the Coastal, Miwok, Homestead & 4-Corners trails as well as fire roads.

I am writing to share my comments for the 2013 SEIS specifically pertaining to Muir Beach and the Marin Headlands Trails (Coastal Trail/fire road to Hill 88). While I applaud the efforts to produce this plan I am deeply concerned that the preferred alternative F will have devastating impact on the residents of Muir Beach and my family as we rely on the open space of the GGNRA everyday for exercise in the natural environment as this is literally both our front and backyard! My comments to the 2011 DEIS were not adequately addressed and most criticisms and concerns expressed in all comments filed in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Our isolated Muir Beach community of some 150 houses is home to about 60 dogs, and is completely surrounded by the GGNRA with the nearest town a 20-minute drive on the twisty rural 2-lane coastal highway 1.

I strongly oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative F for Muir Beach and The Marin Headlands. I support Alternative A, the no-action alternative, or a revision to provide more access to GGNRA for people with dogs in Marin County. The current plan alternatives are too restrictive on dog walking in the areas that affect our small community and it does not protect and preserve the fundamental values for which the GGNRA was established in terms of recreational values. This plan ought to be about stewardship of a park that is situated within an urban environment. The SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

It is key note that the both the Marin County Board of Supervisors as well as our own Muir Beach Community Services District have passed resolutions opposing and recommending modifications to the GGNRA's SEIS, as they recognize that these lands are intertwined with vibrant communities such as Muir Beach.

The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force our community into their cars to drive a minimum of 20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to Muir Beach is already choked and congested on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA. Since the new parking lot opened this year, a large portion of that traffic and user group is now descending upon Muir Beach. The plan further suggests that those who want an off-leash beach

experience for their dog can go to Rodeo Beach. This change would force Muir Beach residents into cars to drive 45 minutes on the congested 2-lane highway, then the freeway and then another 2-lane rural road for an off-leash experience that currently exists literally steps in front of their homes. The 45 minute drive is assuming that there is no traffic congestion. On a crowded day when visitorship to Muir Woods tops 5,000 people, it takes residents nearly double the time to travel out of the community. It will be devastating to our community of 60 dogs and the environment.

The SEIS calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as there have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the 'off-limits creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. The estimated 60,000 dogs will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves - it passes the buck to towns, cities and the county.

The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ from other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day.

The plan calls out a budget to educate and enforce. Why not utilize this budget to educate and enforce the current rules and regulations that are currently not adequately enforced.

Residents and their dogs need access on foot out of Muir Beach to Mill Valley (the nearest town) for recreation and safety. Two trail suggestions:

A) Muir Beach - Coastal trail & Coastal Fire Road - Coyote Ridge  
Fire Road - Miwok Fire Road.

B) Muir Beach - Diaz Ridge - Miwok Fire Road.

Both would connect to Homestead trails and allow access to Mill Valley.

Provide a loop trail as opposed to dead end trails to allow for a recreational experience for the user. We desperately need a loop from Muir Beach and a suggested loop is:

Muir Beach - Coastal - Coyote Ridge - Middle Green Gulch or  
Green Gulch Fire Road - Muir Beach

This loop is about 3 miles and would provide excellent exercise for both owner and dogs. Green Gulch fire road or middle Green Gulch trail would be the link required to make the loop.

The GGNRA fire roads are on average 12 feet wide allowing for a variety of users, including those with dogs, to safely share the road and are accessible from many neighborhoods and locations outside the GGNRA, encouraging people to walk directly into the recreation area instead of driving to the GGNRA or to other park spaces.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the GGNRA. There are many trails and areas that currently do

not allow dogs. These are areas that users who would like a dog-free experience can access. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. The GGNRA SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. To remove recreational access to these lands is not substantiated.

The GGNRA was established by involving communities, communities such as Muir Beach, to provide recreational activities for residents in the densely populated Bay area. This is not a pristine wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. It is a designed landscape with many constructed environments including the new parking lot in Muir Beach and the reconstructed wetlands. The GGNRA requires a different management strategy than a traditional National Park. While a keystone objective for the GGNRA is 'recreation, it does not appear at all in the plan's objectives, nor is it referred to as one of the park's resources and values.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5015	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:25:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Andrew Maiorana

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5016	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pleasant hill, CA 94523 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:25:37				

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is important for dogs to have off leash areas in public spaces. We need more off-leash spaces, not less

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5017    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:28:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Marilyn Wacks

PO Box 370213,  
Montara, CA 94037  
650-728-7210  
mfw.work@gmail.com

February 17, 2014

Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Attn: SEIS

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing today to submit my comments on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft DMP/SEIS). I am a resident of Montara, California and have lived here for 26 years. It is very important to convey to you how severe an impact the GGNRA's preferred alternative for Rancho Corral de Tierra in the current Draft DMP/SEIS will have on recreational dog walking.

I write to you with a statement that you will not read in any of the hundreds of letters that will be submitted on this topic. My words are rooted in my seven years of experience working with the Congressional Sponsor (introduced as H.R. 1953 and passed as S.136, and became Public Law 109-131) of the GGNRA's acquisition of the Rancho Rancho Corral de Tierra property, Congressman Tom Lantos. As you may know, Congressman Lantos was an ardent dog lover and was frequently seen roaming the halls of the United States Capitol with his little white poodle. I can tell you with great certainty, that if Congressman Lantos were alive today, he would be first in line to defend the continued legal practice of on leash dog walking within the park.

I personally accompanied him on multiple tours of the property and remember clearly how excited and supportive he was of our community and its dog walking character. He was well aware of the importance of open space to the residents and understood the importance of providing continuity of the cultural and environmental values that we hold dear in Montara.

If the GGNRA's preferred alternative for Rancho Corral de Tierra (Alternative B, No dog walking allowed except on-leash on a few trails near Montara and El Granada) is enacted, it will be to serve the Park Service, not the taxpayers. It will also be a sad day for all of the residents and visitors who have used

this land for dog walking over the last five decades. The GGNRA is referred to as a "park" throughout the SEIS. The GGNRA is not a National Park. It is a National Recreation Area. If Congress had wanted GGNRA to be a national park, that is what they would have authorized. Also on the first page of the Executive Summary, the SEIS states: "The purpose of the GGNRA is to offer national park experiences (emphasis mine) to a large and diverse urban population while preserving and interpreting natural, historic, scenic and recreational values." If I want "national park experiences" (whatever that is) I will go to a real national park, such as Yosemite, Yellowstone or the Grand Canyon. I understand that the GGNRA's mission requires balancing the various values, but this SEIS does not give nearly enough weight to recreational values (such as dog walking), the main reason for the GGNRA's existence.

I fully support the Montara Dog Group's "preferred alternative" for Rancho Corral de Tierra: Alternative A, the "No Action" alternative, with the addition of two off-leash dog walking areas, one near Montara and the other near El Granada Dogs would be allowed on-leash throughout the remainder of Rancho Corral de Tierra as indicated in Alternative A in the SEIS.

There is a fundamental error in the status quo assumed for GGNRA's No Action alternative in the SEIS. As acknowledged on page 60 of the SEIS, there has been a long history of off-leash dog walking at Rancho Corral de Tierra, although not officially sanctioned. As such, off-leash dog walking should be the status quo or baseline for GGNRA's No Action alternative, not on-leash dog walking. As you know, Montara Dog Group and Crissy Field Dog Group have previously corresponded with you extensively on this issue, so instead of rehashing the contents of those letters, I have attached them to my SEIS comments, for the record.

The tone of the SEIS tends to pit dog walkers versus environmentalists, and that is not necessarily the case. With proper education, signage and enforcement, there is no reason for dog walking to cause environmental damage, either to wildlife or plants.

Another flaw in the SEIS and GGNRA's preferred alternative is the total lack of off-leash dog walking opportunities in San Mateo County. Page 43 of the SEIS refers to "Management objectives in the draft 2011 General Management Plan that are relevant to dog management include the following: The park has significantly expanded in size and includes many new lands in San Mateo County. This planning process takes a comprehensive parkwide approach that will help ensure that the management of the natural and cultural resources and visitor experiences are consistent throughout all park areas." The SEIS does not meet this objective because Marin County and San Francisco County both have off-leash dog walking areas, while GGNRA's preferred alternatives for San Mateo County have none. Off-leash dog walking areas should be provided by GGNRA in San Mateo County as well as the other two counties.

In conclusion, GGNRA's draft Dog Management Plan/SEIS is extremely biased against people who recreate with their dogs, with insufficient documentation to support that bias. It appears that the GGNRA's goal is to restrict people with dogs to the maximum extent possible, in spite of Congress' mandate in the enabling legislation to preserve and encourage recreation, including dog walking. I hope that the final plan will take our comments to heart, and provide more areas for dog walking, both on-leash and off-leash, within Rancho Corral de Tierra and the rest of the GGNRA.

Very sincerely,  
Marilyn Wacks

**Correspondence ID:** 5018    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a retired widowed woman, on a budget, and who walks my dog, off-leash, but under voice control in the GGNRA. I am a responsible dog owner. I do not allow my dog to chase birds, children, horses, or other animals. He does not roam through the bush or the forest, and I always pick up after him (as well as trash that is often left by other hikers and mountain bikers. I hike alone. Without an income, this is my form of entertainment and social activity. I hike alone, so my dog offers me security.

I strongly object to your "research findings", analysis, and Proposed Alternative for dog management in the GGNRA.

The reasons for my objections are as follows.

I"

Oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

Oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Optional Points to Make (Choose as many or as few as you want):

SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions.

SEIS still lists impacts that might, can, or could happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA

has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not to do them.

SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

SEIS says there has to be a no-dog area at all sites where off-leash dog walking is allowed. For example, the SEIS says Muir Beach is too small to have both an off-leash and a no-dog area, so therefore there cannot be an off-leash area at Muir Beach (p. 113). There's no similar idea that sites that are no-dog also have to include off-leash areas. This shows the inherent unfairness of the SEIS.

SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA document on the GGNRA website). They say they received over 4,700 comments, but never say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS says: NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas. (p. 100). But there's no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS.

SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by public comment to the DEIS and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The SEIS claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. It also claims that because people will still be able to walk their dogs on-leash at some sites, most will continue to walk in the GGNRA. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The SF Supervisors and dog walkers asked for a thorough analysis. What we got was cursory at best.

SEIS data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. The total number of dog bites or attacks from 2008 to 2011 (four years) was 95 (p. 21). Even if this number is undercounted and should be tripled or quadrupled, it still represents a minuscule portion of the millions of dog visits each year to GGNRA sites. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) in the GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.

SEIS still does not consider management tools that could mitigate alleged impacts from dogs in the No-Action Alternative. For example, dog training classes, dog-horse workshops, and poop cleanup days

could all mitigate concerns about dog safety and pathogens in feces that are used to argue that the No-Action Alternative will not work and therefore the GGNRA must restrict off-leash access.

SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that in many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities. (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to & expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972)

SEIS will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. The only site-specific consensus agreement to come out of Negotiated Rulemaking was to allow off-leash dog walking on a trail in Oakwood Valley in Marin. This was included in the DEIS. However, it was removed from the SEIS (Oakwood Valley is now proposed to be on-leash only) because the GGNRA decided that there would be no off-leash dog walking on any trail. All the money and work that went into Negotiated Rulemaking was wasted.

SEIS still will not allow any off-leash dog walking on New Lands acquired by the GGNRA in the future, even if dog walking occurs has traditionally occurred there.

SEIS cites several surveys of visitor use and visitor satisfaction, including two done in 2011 in response to DEIS comments, that were so poorly done that their results are essentially meaningless. A 2008 visitor use survey at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field used people who intercepted people at these sites and asked about their park usage. However, the interceptors were observed by several people to actively avoid talking to people walking with dogs, hopelessly skewing their results. A 2011 visitor use survey at Fort Funston and Muir Beach, done specifically in response to DEIS comments, only counted people as walking dogs if they had a leash in their hand. People walking with a friend and the friend's dog were not counted as a dog walker (because they did not have a dog of their own with them), even though they were only walking there to walk with the friend's dog. A 2011 Visitor Satisfaction Survey was so confusing respondents didn't know if they were being asked about their satisfaction with current conditions at GGNRA sites or with the severe restrictions proposed in the DEIS.

SEIS still describes the visitor experience as focused on people who don't want to be around dogs. This criticism was made of the DEIS too and apparently ignored.

Finally, I strongly object to your department TASERING people. It is unjustifiable. Dog owners are not criminals.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5019	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:32:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog and family in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my

---

strong opposition to the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. This plan is very restrictive and will prevent me and my family from using the RECREATIONAL spaces with our dog in a way that supports our health and the health of our dog. We routinely walk together, AS A FAMILY, and enjoy these spaces with our dog. Our dog is well-behaved, under control and we always clean-up after her.

The GGNRA was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. Please do not limit our family's ability to utilize and enjoy these spaces.

Sincerely,

Rachelle

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5020	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94129 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who lives in and walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I am extremely saddened and disappointed by the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The plan is simply a veiled attempt to rid the park of the already very limited areas open to dogs. Instead of "balancing" interests, every decision in the plan ignores the interests of dog owners and everyday park recreational users, and does not attempt to take common-sense decisions into serious consideration.

The new plan is deficient in several key respects: 1) it is nearly impossible to wade through the 2,200 page document to make sense of it or find any of the required foundation or support for decisions; 2) the plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan; 3) the plan for such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas is not supported by any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies (as required by law) and instead is based on conjecture and speculation of "impacts"; 4) the plan is clearly biased toward the very small percentage of the population that promotes extreme habitat values and dismisses recreational use of the park; 5) the plan does not evaluate common sense approaches such as enforcing habitat destruction laws already in effect; and 6) it is unclear what additional protection "on leash" laws have over "sight and voice-control" laws which, if properly enforced, serve the same purpose - to ensure dogs are not destroying habitat and interfering with other recreational users' experiences.

I support one simple alternative for all GGNRA areas that are already dog-friendly: VOICE AND SITE CONTROL. If enforced, this alternative clearly balances the various uses and interests of the park as it prevents dogs from destroying cultural and natural resources and bothering other users of the park.

I live on Baker Beach, walk my dog nearly every day on the beach, and hike with my dog on the already very limited trails in Marin Headlands. I spent over an hour combing through the proposed plan to find any support for the "on leash" proposal for Baker Beach and severe restrictions on Marin Headlands trails - I never found it. What can possibly be gained by requiring my well-behaved dog to be on a leash rather than voice control on the beach? What is the NPS trying to protect? The only "wildlife" I ever observe on the beach are large ravens and sandpipers. Ravens are non-native predators that kill off native species - surely the NPS is not trying to protect the ravens. The sandpipers are too fast for any dog to catch. As for

the native habitat existing around the parking lots and trails, humans are causing more destruction than dogs as I continually see humans tramping and urinating on habitat. I see nothing in the proposed plan regarding enforcement of errant human activity which is the root of these problems. The native habitat and species surely are not going to re-populate areas that are still heavily populated and used by humans - what difference does it make if a dog on sight and voice control is accompanying the human?

As for Marin Headlands, I have hiked dog-friendly trails from Rodeo Beach and have never once observed a dog running amok throughout the habitat. Even if one were to do so, doesn't NPS already have existing habitat destruction laws to fine offending citizens? How can you possibly state that the dog policy as-is is harmful when only <5% of the Marin Headlands trails are open to dogs now and habitat destruction laws are already in effect?

Please do not adopt this extremist plan. The GGNRA would be better served by focusing on enforcement of errant human activities that ruin the experience of dog owners and non-dog owners alike.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Coyle

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5021	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear				

I am writing to share my comments for the 2013 SEIS specifically pertaining to Muir Beach and the Marin Headlands Trails (Coastal Trail/fire road to Hill 88). While I applaud the efforts to produce this plan I am deeply concerned that the preferred alternative F will have devastating impact on the residents of Muir Beach who rely on the open space of the GGNRA everyday for exercise in the natural environment.

I strongly oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative F for Muir Beach and The Marin Headlands. I support Alternative A, the no-action alternative, or a revision to provide more access to GGNRA for people with dogs in Marin County. The current plan alternatives are too restrictive on dog walking in the areas that affect our small community and it does not protect and preserve the fundamental values for which the GGNRA was established in terms of recreational values. This plan ought to be about stewardship of a park that is situated within an urban environment. The SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

It is key note that the both the Marin County Board of Supervisors as well as the Muir Beach Community Services District have passed resolutions opposing and recommending modifications to the GGNRA's SEIS, as they recognize that these lands are intertwined with vibrant communities such as Muir Beach.

The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force the community into their cars to drive a minimum of

20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to Muir Beach is already choked and congested on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA. Since the new parking lot opened this year, a large portion of that traffic and user group is now descending upon Muir Beach. The plan further suggests that those who want an off-leash beach experience for their dog can go to Rodeo Beach. This change would force Muir Beach residents into cars to drive 45 minutes on the congested 2-lane highway, then the freeway and then another 2-lane rural road for an off-leash experience that currently exists literally steps in front of their homes.

The SEIS calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as there have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the 'off-limits' creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. The estimated 60,000 dogs will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves - it passes the buck to towns, cities and the county.

The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ from other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day.

Residents and their dogs need access on foot out of Muir Beach to Mill Valley (the nearest town) for recreation and safety. Two trail suggestions:

A) Muir Beach - Coastal trail & Coastal Fire Road - Coyote Ridge  
Fire Road - Miwok Fire Road.

B) Muir Beach - Diaz Ridge - Miwok Fire Road.

Both would connect to Homestead trails and allow access to Mill Valley.

Provide a loop trail as opposed to dead end trails to allow for a recreational experience for the user. We desperately need a loop from Muir Beach and a suggested loop is:

Muir Beach - Coastal - Coyote Ridge - Middle Green Gulch or  
Green Gulch Fire Road - Muir Beach

This loop is about 3 miles and would provide excellent exercise for both owner and dogs. Green Gulch fire road or middle Green Gulch trail would be the link required to make the loop.

The GGNRA fire roads are on average 12 feet wide allowing for a variety of users, including those with dogs, to safely share the road and are accessible from many neighborhoods and locations outside the GGNRA, encouraging people to walk directly into the recreation area instead of driving to the GGNRA or to other park spaces.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the GGNRA. There are many trails and areas that currently do not allow dogs. These are areas that users who would like a dog-free experience can access. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. The GGNRA SEIS does not



include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. To remove recreational access to these lands is not substantiated.

The GGNRA is not a pristine wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. It is a designed landscape with many constructed environments and thus requires a different management strategy than a traditional National Park. While a keystone objective for the GGNRA is 'recreation', it does not appear at all in the plan's objectives, nor is it referred to as one of the park's resources and values.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs, was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5022	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean				

I STRONGLY oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
JK JOHNSON

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5023	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94129 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who lives in and walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I am extremely saddened and disappointed by the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The plan is simply a veiled attempt to rid the park of the already very limited areas open to dogs. Instead of "balancing" interests, every decision in the plan ignores the interests of dog owners and everyday park recreational users, and does not attempt to take common-sense decisions into serious consideration.

The new plan is deficient in several key respects: 1) it is nearly impossible to wade through the 2,200 page document to make sense of it or find any of the required foundation or support for decisions; 2) the

plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan; 3) the plan for such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas is not supported by any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies (as required by law) and instead is based on conjecture and speculation of "impacts"; 4) the plan is clearly biased toward the very small percentage of the population that promotes extreme habitat values and dismisses recreational use of the park; 5) the plan does not evaluate common sense approaches such as enforcing habitat destruction laws already in effect; and 6) it is unclear what additional protection "on leash" laws have over "sight and voice-control" laws which, if properly enforced, serve the same purpose - to ensure dogs are not destroying habitat and interfering with other recreational users' experiences.

I support one simple alternative for all GGNRA areas that are already dog-friendly: VOICE AND SITE CONTROL. If enforced, this alternative clearly balances the various uses and interests of the park as it: prevents dogs from destroying cultural and natural resources and bothering other users of the park.

I live on Baker Beach, walk my dog nearly every day on the beach, and hike with my dog on the already very limited trails in Marin Headlands. I spent over an hour combing through the proposed plan to find any support for the "on leash" proposal for Baker Beach and severe restrictions on Marin Headlands trails - I never found it. What can possibly be gained by requiring my well-behaved dog to be on a leash rather than voice control on the beach? What is the NPS trying to protect? The only "wildlife" I ever observe on the beach are large ravens and sand pipers. Ravens are non-native predators that kill off native species - surely the NPS is not trying to protect the ravens. The sandpipers are too fast for any dog to catch. As for the native habitat existing around the parking lots and trails, humans are causing more destruction than dogs as I continually see humans tramping and urinating on habitat. I see nothing in the proposed plan regarding enforcement of errant human activity which is the root of these problems. The native habitat and species surely are not going to re-populate areas that are still heavily populated and used by humans - what difference does it make if a dog on sight and voice control is accompanying the human?

As for Marin Headlands, I have hiked dog-friendly trails from Rodeo Beach and have never once observed a dog running amok throughout the habitat. Even if one were to do so, doesn't NPS already have existing habitat destruction laws to fine offending citizens? How can you possibly state that the dog policy as-is is harmful when only <5% of the Marin Headlands trails are open to dogs now and habitat destruction laws are already in effect?

Please do not adopt this extremist plan. The GGNRA would be better served by focusing on enforcement of errant human activities that ruin the experience of dog owners and non-dog owners alike.

Sincerely,

Jerry Byrne

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5024	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:36:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is

way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Bodle

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5025	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:36:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Noelle Bakken

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5026	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941-2263 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:37:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

As a San Francisco native and lifelong Mill Valley resident (excluding undergrad academic years at Stanford), I write in full support of Option F within the Draft Plan (or Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/SEIS). I note the following, fall 2013 edits to the original SEIS:

- 1) Chapter 3 includes updated law enforcement, visitor use and experience, health and safety impact data. Importantly, it cites authoritative, additional peer-reviewed studies on resource impacts. This science-based data shows the importance of ensuring the availability and health of the GGNRA for the long term. These changes reinforce the future orientation of the Park Services 2011 Draft SEIS as it addresses and balances the needs of people, pets and wildlife for the future.
- 2) Chapter 4 elaborates on these meaningful updates, and includes expanded analysis of park operations budget data. Crucially, Chapter 4 addresses operational issues such as additional fencing and financial impacts. Taken together, these additions provide robust support for both the feasibility and the benefits of implementing the SEIS.

I appreciate the attention the Park Service has paid to both scientific and qualitative input in crafting the 2011 and 2013 drafts. The Park Services SEIS simultaneously addresses the long-term health of the GGNRA, and addresses the varied needs of a diverse and growing population of local and non-resident visitors and supporters. Importantly, it does so through evidence-based and ecologically-sound land management practices.

As do current regulations, some of the other Alternatives include provisions for owner voice control instead of dog-leashing or -exclusion. Previously, Park Service data has shown the failure of this restraint method to protect the safety of both dog and human visitors and employees. Leashless dogs provide even more opportunities for damage and injury, to both dogs and humans. Unfortunately, this damage potential extends to the unique habitats of the many rare and endangered plants and animals in the area. (All Sources cited below.)

In contrast, Alternative F offers a well-supported plan to ensure the GGNRA stays ecologically and financially healthy, and accessible for a diversity of visitors. Within the GGNRA, there are a total of 115 miles of recognized walking and hiking trails. The Park Services Preferred Alternative would allow 31 miles of these trails for dog walking use (27%).n Marin County alone, there are over 440 miles of on and off leash dog recreational trails. (All sources cited below.)

To show the returns on, and viability of, implementing Alternative F, I humbly offer the data relating to its benefits for the Western Snowy Plover, whose range includes many areas within the GGNRA. The Western Snowy Plover is a special status species whose habitat and individuals would be protected through restricted dog-access and other abatements, according to Alternative F (p. 272 of the Fall 2013 full text SEIS). These low-impact yet meaningful steps would be consistent with the recovery plan for the species, one of the many wildlife attractions for the millions of visitors to the area. They would also reinforce and sustain the GGNRA's ecological variety, which results from the synergy of its diverse species and habitats.

As a crucial attraction within the Bay Area's vital tourism industry, the GGNRA serves a wide range of resident and non-resident visitors. Alternative F addresses the varied needs of its diverse visitor population, through a science-based and future-oriented plan. While effectively balancing the needs of a wide variety of stakeholders, Alternative F promotes the health and availability of a vital Bay Area resource, for generations to come.

Please don't hesitate to contact me for any questions or concerns.

With appreciation,  
Aria Yow, MA (Political Theory)

Sources:

Sierra Club, San Francisco Chapter: <http://www.sanfranciscobay.sierraclub.org>

Cornell Lab of Ornithology's eBird Range Map: <http://ebird.org/content/ebird/>

California Native Plant Society: <http://www.cnps.org/cnps/>

The Wildflower Conservancy: <http://www.wildflowerconservancy.org/>

The Calflora California database: <http://www.calflora.org/>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5027	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:39:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I live in the city. I don't have a yard. Most of us don't. We live in apartments.				

Because we city dwellers have no yards, we rely on parks and communal green spaces for the basic ability to exercise and play- and so do our dogs. Dogs need a chance to be dogs. Walking on a leash is great- but running to chase a ball is better! Playing with other dogs is the best! Romping in the waves, digging in the dirt, rolling in whatever smells most likely to cause a bath later- those things are important to dogs. They need designated, safe spaces to do them.

I love wildlife, and if the dogs are impacting the wildlife, that needs to be addressed. But we NEED off leash parks. Big, roomy ones with varied landscapes. Places to hike with a dog. Places a dog can actually run. If some of these places are badly affecting the wildlife, just designate us other, less fragile, equivalent spaces to use! But don't leave us without.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5028	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:41:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Yvonne Biancalana

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5029	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:41:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm writing in support of Supervisor Sears Amendment. We need off-leash opportunities for our four-legged friends to stretch and run as well. Please endorse the Sears proposal. I encourage responsible dog care in all public settings and after all these many meetings, hope this can be achieved while allowing our dogs to enjoy the outdoors as well.				

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Laatsch

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5030	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:43:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Mary Mullen and Kiko

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5031	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Vallejo, CA 94591 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:43:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Supervisor Dean,				

As an avid hiker, surfer, sailor, and nature lover I would like to write you to thank you for not bending to the vocal minority of off leash dog owners. I am a regular to heavy user of the park from Tamales Point to Fort Funston. It is a difficult task balancing the needs of a vast variety of park users in a densely populated area. At times I'm sure you must feel stuck between Pinchot and Muir themselves discussing how we should manage park lands while still allowing access to visitors.

I support the preferred alternative and fencing of off leash areas. My park experiences have shown that dog owners do not follow leash and off leash restrictions. Just one example would be Limantour beach, where dog owners regularly do not follow off leash boundaries and let their dogs run freely along the beach. The trails down to the beach are filled with dog feces where owners do not pick up after their dogs. It was disgusting, and all the dogs on the beach does degrade my park experience.

Being a dog owner is a life choice, just as living in a densely populated area is a life choice. If an owner can't provide for an animals health and happiness without imposing on others or breaking laws, then perhaps they cannot afford to own that animal.

Thank you again,  
Pete Rowland

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5032	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a San Francisco resident, I regularly visit Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and the Presidio. While not a dog owner myself, I enjoy seeing the dogs people bring to the parks and appreciate that these areas provide a safe space for dogs to run off leash. I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Marie Beaugureau

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5033 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir and Rodeo Beach as well as the Miwok trail. There are so few dog friendly trails left. I pay a huge amount of tax to have the privilege of living in Mill Valley. Do we really want to create community where pets are not welcome to enjoy the out of doors with their owners? Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5034 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:51:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please let dogs continue to play in the parks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5035 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madame,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-

---



friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

My dog and I love to spend time together on the Oakwood Valley Trail, the Miwok Trail, the Coastal Trail, Wolf Ridge Loop, Rhubarb Trail, Stinson Beach, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, Chrissy Field, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston. We love the fresh air, exercise, variety of landscapes and social aspect of meeting other people and dogs.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Since I am out on the trails so often I see the impact of horses, bikes, running events, hikers, too. Everyone needs to share the land and share the responsibility of taking care of this beautiful land.

Thank you for your time,  
Polly Ing

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5036	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:52:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I do not currently own a dog but often visit various parts of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. In my hundreds of visits to parks on both the North and South sides of Golden Gate Bridge, I cannot recall a time in which dog did anything but add to the experience.				

In particular, I am concerned by the plan's limiting of off leash areas at Crissy Field. We live in an urban area and keeping dogs happy and healthy can be a challenge. Providing dogs access to off leash areas in and around the city is essential. Further limiting the area provided for off leash areas seems completely unnecessary and not in the best interest of the city's citizens or its dogs.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5037	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94706 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have been walking my dogs since 1990, when I lived in San Francisco. Even after moving to Berkeley, I make an effort to come to see the ocean and walk on the beach with my dogs, and meet friends a a wonderful way to enjoy the GGNRA.

I oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying this lovely expansive park with my dog for my own physical, social, and emotional health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

Please keep the GGNRA available as a park space for all kinds of use in this densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Mary

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5038	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's latest dog management plan. The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kate Sims

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5039	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	kensington, CA 94707 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:53:44**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:**

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5040 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Dog access is such a great resource to promote healthy outdoor activity for both people and their canine companions.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5041 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:56:06**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I VOTE FOR BAY AREA, CA HIKING TRAILS TO BE OFF LEASH.

I want to start by saying that Bay Area, CA is one of the most beautiful places to hike in the USA. I may be biased, but we are very lucky to be able to hike with so many beautiful things to look at: the pacific ocean, redwood and eucalyptus trees, San Francisco and all the other wonderful cities. One of the best parts about hiking if you have a dog is letting your dog be free from restrain. Dogs are couped up in human homes or stuck in the backyard all day while we are at work. Even through these daily turmoils they greet us with all the love in the world. If the hiking trails in the bay area no longer allowed dogs off leash or on the trails all this would spread out devastation to not only people living in the bay area, but

people who visit the bay area with their dogs. I don't know what the harm is to having dogs on the trails? Is it their poop? We pick up the poop? Is it them harming nature? They hike by our side.

I beg you with all the dog love in the world to keep bay area hiking trails off leash. A happy dog is an active dog. And sad dog is a sad owner. We don't want sad people in the bay area, right? One of the best parts about living in the bay area is the open minded free spirit aura that is spread here. Voting to ban off leash hiking trails would not carry on this mentality.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5042    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** none Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

My dog and I love to spend time together on the Oakwood Valley Trail, the Miwok Trail, the Coastal Trail, Wolf Ridge Loop, Rhubarb Trail, Stinson Beach, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, Chrissy Field, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston. We love the fresh air, exercise, variety of landscapes and social aspect of meeting other people and dogs.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Since I am out on the trails so often I see the impact of horses, bikes, running events, hikers, too. Everyone needs to share the land and share the responsibility of taking care of this beautiful land.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5043    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94065  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 18:58:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is

way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Megan French

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5044	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:58:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am for off leash areas for dogs because it gives my dog appropriate space and atmosphere to socialize. When on leash my dog is more defensive and less susceptibility to have 100% psitive interactions. He has NEVER had a negative experience with another dog off leash at fort funston. Without these areas I believe that there will be higher aggression rates				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5045	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94401 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:58:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep our off leash dog areas! Our family relies on these parks for outings together, and we love being able to run around with kids and dogs together. It's great exercise for everyone! I have always loved how the Bay Area is so dog friendly, it's part of what makes it unique. It is so special to be able to hike in the city and experience nature with our pets. Please do not change this.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5046	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 18:59:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please stand firm against the lobbying. People of San Francisco deserve access to intact natural spots, and the snowy plover needs protection. Fort Funston and other spots have been ruined for enjoying natural beauty.				

---

I have been a dog owner most of my life, but the attitude of dog owners in San Francisco has persuaded me not to replace my most recent very beloved pal. I just decided I did not want to contribute to the sense of entitlement many people have about taking over public spaces with little regard for children or for people who are elderly or disabled, or even other dog owners, not to mention the widespread reluctance to clean up after the dogs.

There are already over 300 acres of off-leash dog parks in San Francisco. This is according to a website operated by dog lovers. Most of the ones listed below do not require leashes, and the rule is not observed in the two that do say "leash required."

[http://www.sfdogparks.com/All\\_Parks.html](http://www.sfdogparks.com/All_Parks.html)

McLaren Park

Approximate size: Under 10 acres

Leash rule: Off leash.

Bernal Heights (Read Review)

Approximate size: 39 acres

Leash rule: Off leash

St. Marys Park

Approximate size: 10-35 acres.

Leash rule: Off leash.

Corona Heights

Approximate size: 10-35 acres

Leash rule: Off leash

Glen Canyon Park (Read Review)

Approximate size: 35 acres

Leash rule: Leashes required.

Buena Vista Park

Approximate size: Over 35 acre

Leash rule: Off leash

Fort Funston (Read Review)

Approximate size: 35 acres

Leash rule: Leashes required.

Lake Merced

Approximate size: 35 acres

Leash rule: Off leash.

Lafayette Park

Approximate size: 10-35 acres

Leash rule: Off leash.

Dolores Park (Read Review)

Approximate size: 10-35 acres

Leash rule: Off leash

Upper Noe Park

Approximate size: Under 10 acres.

Leash rule: Off leash.

Alta Plaza Park

Approximate size: 10-35 acres

Leash rule: Off leash

McKinley Square

Approximate size: Under 10 acres

Leash rule: Off leash

Potrero Hill Mini Park

Approximate size: Under 10 acres.

Leash rule: Off leash.

Mountain Lake Park

Approximate size: 10-35 acres

Leash rule: Off leash in east end of park.

Golden Gate Park (Read Review)

Approximate size: 35 acres

Leash rule: Off leash in above areas.

Stern Grove

Approximate size: 10-35 acres

Leash rule: Off leash in north side of park.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5047	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Granada, CA 94018				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:00:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To the GGRNA General Superintendent				

Having visited with you at several GGNRA meetings re. Dog Management Plan, herewith i am reiterating as a long term resident of the coast, walking my dogs in the area for decades, my concerns and opposition to the GGNRA 'preferred alternative' dog management draft.

The area has provided RECREATIONAL, energizing and healthy activities in conjunction with our dogs, horses, bickers and the community in general for many years. Thus, coinciding with the fundamental values for which the GGNRA was established, ie. natural, historic, scenic and RECREATIONAL values.

The threatening and restrictive scope of the GGNRA plan would prevent us inhabitants from the privileges the area has traditionally benefited us, reversing fundamentally the recreational character of our territory.

Therefore, i respectfully ask you to take our citizen request into account, maintaining the GGNRA values, including RECREATION, in force, as opposed to the severe planed restriction to our traditionally dog friendly areas.

Confident in your understanding,  
Respectfully, Michail

Consequently, again i manifest

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5048	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:00:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. It also will significantly impact, in a very negative way, the remaining off-leash parks in San Francisco.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Radu Raduta

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5049	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:01:37				

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The changes in the 2013 seis are not founded by any data nor addressing the criticism expressed in 2011. These proposed changes will achieve nothing. Banning off leash areas and further restricting where dogs are allowed will do nothing to prevent damage to nature or the environment. The only thing it will create are unhappy unbalanced dog, who are never permitted to run, and unhappy dog owners. I urge those reading this to maintain the 1979 pet policy as it allows an outlet for healthy animals and healthy owners. It promotes physical exercise for both and allows the dogs to learn to socialize with each other. By isolating dogs in their houses you are doing no one good and everyone harm.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5050    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Lagunitas, CA 94938  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:02:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I have lived in Marin County for 45 plus years, mostly in West Marin. I live here because of the open areas available for hiking, biking and walking my dog. Over the years I have noticed more and more places I can no longer bring my dog. I am a responsible dog owner, I have always trained my dogs so they are sociable and always under voice command if needed. In areas where a leash must be used, I have no problem using a leash. However, there are places that are meant for people and dogs to run free, playing ball, throwing sticks or frisbees and just enjoying life.

There should always be places within Marin County (GGNRA & State Parks), besides only the few fenced in county dog parks, where dogs have a chance to run and play and socialize with other dogs/people. There are already so many areas of open space between the Federal and the State parks where dogs are not allowed at all....There is an abundance of open space and wilderness,there is enough open space for the birds, the wildlife, as well as our abundant sea life that is all protected by the Federal and State rules. We, the taxpayers of this County should have some say into how OUR land is being used and how we want to enjoy OUR land. There is plenty of space for everyone!! I am not asking for MORE space to be open to dogs, I just want the open dog areas we currently have to stay the same. After all these years, why NOW is the GGNRA looking to no longer allow dogs to visit the same areas that have been open for years?? I have seen NO reason to change things. This on-going study of the GGNRA dog planning that has cost our TAXPAYERS millions of dollars is a waste of time and money. The monies that have been spent over these past years could have been better well spent on our open GGNRA areas, with visitor education about protecting wildlife inhabitants and why it is so important to protect these special areas. Use the funds to educate!!! If needed put in additional trash collection for people to use to dispose of dog bags, and human trash, etc. There are many dog lovers and people who love the outdoors, we (the people)should be able to come up with a plan that will work for all.

Aside from all the above, over the years, the people who I have met who walk their dogs on trails, beach's and open space are those people who have a special appreciation of their surroundings, they all realize how lucky we are to live in one of the best places in the world and enjoy time with "man's best friend" their dog. Most of the people with dogs have a special appreciation for the outdoors and tend to stay healthy physically and mentally; scientific studies back up the wonderful relationships between people and their pets.

So please keep the dog areas that are currently open,as is,it has worked all these years and with continued

education of our citizens, we can all share this land and take care of it responsibly while enjoying our pets, families and friends. Please keep the Alternative A Plan!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5051    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:02:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Vera Weiler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5052    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Los Osos, CA 93402  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:03:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose this plan as a dog owner and a responsible one, I find it harder and harder to find spaces for families who travel and recreate with their pets to find natural spaces. Teaching our children to appreciate and preserve open spaces is vital. Please drop the plan to prohibit dogs on trails that have given us all great pleasure

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5053    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:04:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am an animal lover and nature lover too. I enjoy open spaces on a weekly basis- I hike, bike and lead groups of people on nature outings. Please do NOT add more dog-friendly trails and

---

keep/enforce on-leash rules. I also think confined dog areas would be fine in areas of high foot traffic/low wildlife populations. These areas should be fenced.

Dogs, as much as I love them, disrupt wildlife resulting in unbalanced ecosystems. We need trails free of domestic dogs. And when dogs are permitted on trail they should be on leash always. Allowing dogs to scare and chase wildlife, and poop all over (or leave plastic bags all over) takes a big toll on our wild lands and wildlife. Too many times I have witnessed dogs running after deer, squirrels, birds and other animals. Many of our bird species are migratory. Every time they fly off the water or nest takes energy- the energy they are should be storing up for their migration which can be 1000s of miles. I've had dogs run up and jump on me and the adults/children I am with which can be very scary too.

Again, please keep dogs on-leash and limit the number of dog-friendly trails. Do this in the name of the voiceless, our wildlife.

Thank you,

Sharon Barnett

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5054	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94608 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Oakland Dog Owners Group Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:05:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please DO NOT further restrict offleash access for dogs and owners in the GGNRA. Dogs belong in the parks like everyone else. This is very important to me and my family. Thank you.				

Laura Ingram

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5055	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94608 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:07:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not restrict further off-leash access.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5056	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:10:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	What is it hurting to allow animals to enjoy the parks as people do. For the most part, I've seen responsible dog owners who clean up after their animal and it's necessary for these animals to have the ability to run for exercise and mental fitness. I haven't seen too much about the reasons behind this potential law but would like to understand who is driving this. Let sleeping dogs lie and let running dogs run!				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5057    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:12:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to come out strongly in favor of permitting dogs unrestricted access in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I live less than a block away from the trail head at Dias Ridge Spur Trail (intersection of Lattie Lane & Waterview in Mill Valley) and I walk my dog or ride my MTN bike on the trails there almost every day for the last 10 years. I have yet to see a single problem regarding interaction with dogs, humans, or wildlife, either on the trails or at Muir Beach where I take my dog once a week. For that reason I suggest that the GGNRA to retain its longstanding 1979 pet policy and take the "No Action Alternative" for the SEIS area in Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

thanks for your consideration,

Sam McMillan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5058    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:14:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please respect the wishes of the SF community and do not enforce such ludicrous and narrow-minded restrictions on our park spaces. These areas should be available to a diverse range of interests and uses that mimic the diversity of our area. Please keep these spaces open to a range of activities - including off leash walking by responsible dog owners - so that all citizens can get outside, be healthy, and enjoy our public resources!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5059    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Santa Clara, CA 95051

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Jim Carrington

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5060	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin Counties and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Responsible and humane stewardship of caring for a dog includes a healthy amount of off-leash exercise and play. San Francisco has a large population of pet dogs, and these dogs and their families deserve the right to use the GGNRA lands for recreation just as do other citizens. I am a self-supporting SF resident and dog guardian. I pay many thousands of dollars per year in property taxes, including school tax ,even though I have no children. I should have the right to bring my dog to run with me off leash in GGNRA recreation areas. I truly appreciate your consideration in making an equitable decision about who gets to have meaningful recreation and why. Thank you,

Sincerely,

Karen Berlin  
1324 York St  
San Francisco, CA 94110

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5061	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:16:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Brandon Romer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5062    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94606  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:16:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't restrict these important off leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5063    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Pablo, CA 94806  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:18:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is very scary to hear about restricting off leash dog areas! We are dog owners and value all the wonderful places our dogs can go off leash. We are very responsible with our dogs and they deserve fun places to run! Please do not take away the off leash areas in the parks. It will only cause overcrowding at other parks and difficult situations between dogs.  
Thank you for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5064    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Mike Karls

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5065    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:22:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello. As responsible home & dog owner,I am urge you to keep open space for dogs & people. we are different than any other city because we are open mined. do not punish the majority of people & dogs because few bad apple. there are so many other element for destroying nature i don't think it's the dogs walking few leash free areas. please let us have few open space to walk & exercise without leash.Please let us be different than other city. please let us be proud Sanfranciscan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5066    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:22:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA (and have for over 30 years), I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have and currently do on GGNRA properties.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you in advance for your help and consideration in this matter.  
Janet Bertoloni

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5067    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:22:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

On behalf of my family, I want to support the strictest controls over loose dogs on the trails above Marin City, especially Alta Fire Road and Oakwood Valley.

We have reviewed your plan, and our preferred solution is Map 4-F.

Our family has lived near the trailhead since 1999, and my wife has never felt safe to walk the trail either alone or with our two young children. There are just too many dog walkers (including professionals), who let their dogs off leash.

I have been bitten while jogging the trail, and I can attest to feeling fear every time I am approached by a random dog there. I would hate for something to happen to my 2 year-old daughter, or 11 year-old son. And there's just no way a dog walker can control 10 dogs with voice alone.

Please create a safe haven for hikers along the Marin Headlands by enforcing and strengthening the leash laws.

Sincerely,

David Swope  
Jennifer Diessel  
Ethan Swope (11)  
Audrey Swope (2)

85 Buckelew Street  
Sausalito, CA 94965

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5068    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Los Altos, CA 94022  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:23:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly urge the GGNRA to keep and even expand the areas open for off-leash dog walking. In my experience, dogs and people mingle much more safely and happily in off-leash areas. When dogs are on leash they are much more likely to be protective of their owner and not friendly with other people or dogs. We have enjoyed Fort Funsten many times over the years, and hope to in the years to come.

I would be very concerned about crowding at other city and county parks that do allow dogs if these GGNRA areas were closed to dogs. The other parks are much smaller and could be easily overwhelmed. I feel that GGNRA is an important RECREATION area for all, including dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5069    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mountain View, CA 94040  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Tianyu Li. I live in Mountain View. I have an 8 year-old Jack Russell Terrier, who is still not showing any sign of slowing down and require a lot of activities daily. I try to take him to the Fort Funston beach every weekend because even though it's a long drive it is the only place that he gets to run so freely. Regardless of the weather, I've always enjoyed the beach because all dogs big and small walk, run, and play with no leash in such an open space and I've never seen anyone having any issue with any dog in any way. The beach always reminded me how peaceful life can be where humans and animals can indeed coexist.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5070    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Papacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:23:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If there is no enforcement of dogs being off leash in specified leashed areas what point is all this?

Every time I go for a walk/hike where dogs are supposed to be on a lease , there are dog owners who think that since there is no ranger giving them a ticket, it is OK to have their dogs off leash. Often I see folks with more than two dogs off lease, running in restricted areas, 40 Ft away from the owner. The owners cannot see what there dogs are doing and if they poo'ed the owners do not even know, or most times do not care. I've had dogs off lease run up to me and jump on me, and I am afraid of big dogs. Why do people who just want to go and take a hike/walk in a park , have to put up with this?

I say, "No enforcement do? Then do not bother with rules about where leashed or unleashed dogs can or cannot go".

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5071    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:24:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Patrick Barringer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5072    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:27:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi,

Please do not ban these ares of dogs - this is where many people to spend quality time with their beloved furry friends and to take this away just isn't fair. As a dog owner for most of my life (14 years) and I am only 26 years old, I have been going to Fort Funston with my dogs for years. I moved away for school and moving back this May and am definitely looking forward to taking my animals there. PLease do not take this opportunity away for many dog lovers who enjoy this with their pals with the beach view and way to get adequate exercise within the city. Please reconsider and think about how many animals and people you would be affecting

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5073    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose , CA 95117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:29:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Took my dogs to fort fonston for the first time Saturday and loved it such a beautiful place and made a ton of plans on coming back during the year loved it because offleash everyone was so friendly and the view was just amazing I would love to continue coming with my dogs off leash is the

---

best thing there is not a lot of parks like this and it would be tree able to takeaway the parks that do allow it

Thanks you and please keep the parks sincerely . marqus betancourt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5074    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:30:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5075    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:31:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs bring such peace and joy to people! They are truly our best friends. Enjoying nature with them is such a wonderful treat that makes San Francisco just a rare and amazing place.

Please don't change that!!!

If dogs are restricted from running and socializing and getting their energy out, they can go stir crazy and their frustration can make everyone around them sad and frustrated too. I think that the risk is great that the issues some people have with dogs will get worse if they are unable to get the proper exercise they need.

Please keep the dog areas as is.

Thanks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5076    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:32:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The "Preferred" alternative is MUCH TOO RESTRICTIVE. I strongly support, recommend that you adopt, and will fight for, Alternative A.

Off leash dog walking is not causing problems. I do not usually walk with a dog, but do walk on Ocean Beach and Ft. Funston quite often. I find that dogs and their walkers are caring and responsible users of the GGNRA. I am happy to meet dogs and their owners. It just makes no sense to require dogs to be on a leash on a walk. It makes the walk worse for the human and the dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5077    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Menlo Park, CA 94025  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Deb Kenkel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5078    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Golden, CO 80401  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5079    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your proposed, preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I have lived on Mt. Tamalpais for 43 years and was relieved when the lands, now the GGNRA, were protected; however, over time the use of the lands has become increasingly restricted. Early on I could run with my dog almost anywhere. I still am able to and do regularly take my current dog to the Four Corners area and to Muir Beach. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the GGNRA. I can see no compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. There have not been any peer-reviewed, site specific studies conducted that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate national Recreation Area was established to provide access for recreational activities to local residents in a densely populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents, adults, children and dogs, rely on this open space. It requires a management plan different from that for a national park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs, was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. ADOPT ALTERNATIVE A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5080    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Granada, CA 94018  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:35:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean  
I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, particularly the proposed restrictions for dog walking in the newly created Rancho Corral de Tierra in San Mateo County. My wife and I have lived in both San Francisco and San Mateo counties since 1994 and have enjoyed the recreational benefits of the GGNRA. However, the proposed new restrictions on dog walking throughout

---

the GGNRA contradict the very reason why the GGNRA was created in 1972- to provide recreational opportunities for the people of the bay area. We have enjoyed walking our dogs in both Fort Funston and Crissy Field precisely because no other similar areas are available in a dense, urban area such as San Francisco. We then moved to the coast side for the specific purpose of finding areas where we could walk our dogs off leash. Dogs have been walked off leash in the Rancho Corral de Tierra for decades by locals without incident. In fact, the SEIS even notes that dog walking is the primary use of Rancho. It is one of the many reasons we cherish the coast side. Now we are told ( without any evidence) that off leash dogs are a menace and our long history of this uneventful activity must be curtailed or even prohibited. Continuing the "No action alternative" which was put in place in 2011 and allows for both off leash and on leash walking is the option that makes the most sense. Again, GGNRA has presented no evidence why this alternative is now unacceptable.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was created to protect land from development and to provide recreational opportunities for the people of the bay area. It would be a shame that, in the interest of "protecting" the land for the "public", the GGNRA now seeks to prohibit the very public that uses that land. Please reconsider this ill advised Draft Dog Management Plan and create a plan that allows for all of the public, both dog walkers and non dog walkers alike, to enjoy the wonderful treasures of the GGNRA.

John Skerry

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5081	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:35:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, I would like to comment on the proposed changes of dog use in GGNRA. I understand the reasoning behind limiting dog use in the park but I feel like these proposed restrictions are too confining for dogs. I have a dog and I am out at Oakwood trail, Rodeo Beach, and Muir Beach often. My impression is that vast majority of dogs and dog caretakers are very respectful and and really benefit from using these areas, specifically off leash. The bay area is a dog friendly place to live and many dogs need to run around off leash to truly have a high quality of life (not to mention helping their people have a higher quality of life). Please consider keeping Oakwood trail, which most people consider a dog trail anyway, off leash okay, and Muir Beach, and Rodeo Beach as well. Thanks very much from my canine friend and my family!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5082	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Washington, DC 20007				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:35:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs are people too!! Keep the park dog friendly and off-leash!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5083	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94108				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

Sincerely,

P Stevenson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5084	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:38:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sheng Hsu

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5085	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95125 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

As a long time Bay Area resident and an ardent supporter of the NPS and nature in general, I am frankly appalled that you are in effect forcing out a significant body of supporters in the many recreational users of the GGNRA. This area is truly a gem in the bay area, and makes it a much nicer place to live. I fail to understand the rationale of these plans that would turn many ardent users of this treasure into adversaries of the NPS. The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. The location very much dictates the use of this facility. To ignore the fact that this facility is in the midst of a densely populated urban area is non-sensical. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Regards,

Jonathon Simmons

San Jose, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5086    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:39:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



Sincerely,  
Leah Gagne  
San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5087    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Lake Bluff, IL 60044

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

â—¼I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â—¼I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

â—¼The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Sue B. Ulrey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5088    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:41:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

As a native San Franciscan, I feel that we need to keep Fort Funston leash free.

Thank you,

Sandra Berger

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5089    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The review provided by NPS for GGNRA is very complete and educational. As a dog owner and supporter of environmental protection, I am happy that the analyses have been as expansive as they have been. Of all the sites considered in the in-depth document, Fort Funston is the one that concerns me most. It is a joy to walk along the water with my small dog, who leaps and runs along the surf with great enthusiasm.

---

I would hope that maximum (responsible) beach accessibility continue to be allowed for persons with 3 or fewer dogs. It is hard to imagine how walkers with 6 dogs could adequately monitor dog behavior in a way that respects the environment and other users.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this discussion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5090    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:45:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The review provided by NPS for GGNRA is very complete and educational. As a dog owner and supporter of environmental protection, I am happy that the analyses have been as expansive as they have been. Of all the sites considered in the in-depth document, Fort Funston is the one that concerns me most. It is a joy to walk along the water with our small dog, who leaps and runs along the surf with great enthusiasm.

I would hope that maximum (responsible) beach accessibility continue to be allowed for persons with 3 or fewer dogs. It is hard to imagine how walkers with 6 dogs could adequately monitor dog behavior in a way that respects the environment and other users.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this discussion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5091    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:45:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5092    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:45:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not eliminate the off leash dog parks that currently exist. Having a place to play off leash is very important to help dogs socialize. If you take away these areas, dogs in California will become leash aggressive and unfriendly as is fairly common in Washington, DC where we have lived. We have noticed that most dogs in California are much friendlier than the dogs on the East Coast and it is probably because they have many more opportunities to socialize off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5093    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:46:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

Walker along Crissy Field trail must be reserved for walker only - No Dogs.

The sandy beach, next to the main parking lot must require that all dogs be on leash.

Sincerely,

Joel Bauman. (SF resident since 1969)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5094    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is David. I was born and raised in San Francisco. I visit Fort Funston on a weekly basis with my dog Kato and I see how happy he is while playing there. Not only does he thrive while visiting the off leash areas, I benefit from it too. As a young combat Veteran, I fought to maintain the freedoms and rights of people and animals of the United States. Kato has helped me through some tough times and I admit it, sometimes I speak to my dog and wish he could speak back to me. As a responsible dog owner, citizen, and Veteran I have to be an advocate for him so I need to oppose the potential changes. I know my dog would feel just as strongly as I do about the restricted access to the current off leash areas, therefore, I opposed the following:

1. Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. And,

2. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. And,

3. I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Remember the focus is about encouraging recreation on GGNRA land, not limiting or restricting it.

I appreciate the opportunity to address my concerns and my dog's concerns.

Respectfully,  
David Yip & Kato

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5095	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:48:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please be more reasonable, I need a place to enjoy the outdoors with my dog! If you are concerend about the environmental impacts, limit the PEOPLE, dogs are a small portion of this issue, and I can't understand why you would regulate dogs further without regulating people.				

Its

A

Free

Country.

I thought we hired you folks to keep it that way.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5096	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:52:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Linda Larson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5097	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:54:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern:				

As it states in the SEIS, most of the current Rancho Corral de Tierra park users are local. My spouse and I, like many people in our community moved to the area because of the opportunity to walk our dog in open space areas such as Rancho. Given that local communities are the primary users of Rancho and the local communities have a demonstrated history of responsible off-leash dog walking, I am writing as a citizen of this community to urge GGNRA to continue off-leash dog walking in the Rancho Corral de Tierra in Montara & El Granada.

In Montara we have a Dog Group, which has more than 400 members, has provided dog waste bins and bags, as well as promoted responsible dog guardianship. In spite of this history of strong community commitment, the GGNRA's preferred alternative does not provide any off-leash opportunities for dog walking in Rancho - something that has responsibly existed for years! On top of that, San Mateo County is the only county where GGNRA is proposing to completely ban off-leash walking. We do not understand the rationale for this proposal.

We strongly ask that the current policy/no Action Alternative be continued but with the additional provision that GGNRA allow off-leash dog walking in the the areas near Montara and El Granada where the practice has been going on for decades.

Sincerely,  
Susan Andrews

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5098	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Marin County, Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 19:55:49				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I write this comment in support of Alternative A, which offers owners control of their dogs by leash and voice. I have hiked the many trails of Marin County with my dogs and enjoy living here because of access to open space, with an abundance of trails and wildlife that is not available in most of California and elsewhere. I read and heed the signage regarding accessibility to dogs and preservation of wildlife and it seems that Alternative A presents the best approach to preserving our natural surroundings and accommodating owners and their pets. Rather than placing more constraints on accessibility, the strategy should be to educate and inform owners about the impact dogs left unattended or uncontrolled may have on the wildlife and the native growth. I would favor such methods as having owners of dogs attend an awareness of wildlife and native habitat class that would inform them about the detrimental effects that GGNRA is experiencing and how people can modify their habits to curtail these. Perhaps this class could be a requisite of getting a dog license; or it could be part of a trails access card that owners could carry to certify that they are aware of the impact their use of GGNRA is having. Education of owners should include local scenarios that cite the damage done by owners who are not adhering to the leash laws or who do not have their dogs under voice control. Education should include examples of what damage can be done if a dog enters a restricted area. In addition, foot patrol by the rangers and volunteers can help to educate hikers and their dogs about the wildlife and native habitat. I love being in GGNRA and other open space areas and it is made even more enjoyable when I can share that experience with my pets. I am not going to intentionally do anything to harm the beautiful natural surroundings we live by. So, I support a more informative approach that clearly defines accessibility and the impact skirting the current restrictions may have on our precious resources.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5099 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 19:59:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a responsible dog owner, and someone who cares very much about wild life and endangered plants and animals, I believe we can exist peacefully together. I do not wish to see changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5100 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:00:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the Upper Mori Trail and Mori Bluff Trail open. I use that loop with my two small, friendly dogs nearly every day. Please don't take it away :-(

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5101 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:01:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jim Rose

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5102	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:05:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Katrina Southard

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5103	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:06:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I walk my dog regularly off leash via voice command in the GGNRA and I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft Dog Management Plan. For me, this plan is too restrictive and will prevent me from exercising with my dog, impacting not only my health, but the health of my dog. I frequent the following GGNRAs on a daily/weekly basis - Crissy Field's

---

Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, and Fort Funston.

In reading the most recent plan, it has not been modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections from the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the initial plan. There also doesn't appear to be one single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (isn't this required by law?) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I staunchly oppose the addition of fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and are unwelcoming to visitors. My experience in many current dog parks in San Francisco is that provide dog owners who lack control of their dogs the false perception that they can now bring their dog to the GGNRA off leash because the "fence" will supply a barrier. I think this will cause more problems because now ill behaved dogs will be brought off leash to the GGNRA and will cause problems for those owners that have their dog under voice command.

I noticed the plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, but without any site-specific evidence or examples that any of these supposed "impacts" occur now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan even admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies of the GGNRA sites that document the "impacts" from dogs on the environment.

I am also deeply concerned about overcrowding. The plan also lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas - how will dispersion affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and other dog recreation areas? I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

The GGNRA was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be finalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and even new areas that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Amy Puffer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5104    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:07:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
EXPERIENCE YOUR AMERICA!

As long as you do not own a dog.

If you do own a dog: GET LOST AMERICA!

NPS = NO PUPS, SORRY!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5105    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:10:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ms. Sommatino

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5106    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:10:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern:

I've lived in San Francisco for 9 years, 4 of which i have been a dog-owner, and i am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

I live and work in the city and I give back to our community both through working at a local non-profit organization and through volunteer activities. So many people are already fleeing the city because of soaring rent prices, unfair evictions, and other city policies that are not conducive to engaging and nurturing people, families, and communities. I vote here, I live here, I pay a shit-ton of money in taxes every year here, and I would like to be able to enjoy time- - in a respectful and responsible manner- - with the dog i rescued from a local shelter.

the impact of this law will not only impact the overall happiness and well-being of many bay area citizens, but it will also put undue stress on local parks and other areas that dog-owners will have no choice but to rely on for recreation. these areas were designed and intended for recreation- - for families- - and, yes, that does include the 4-legged members.

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong

---

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

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Tara Medve

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5107	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Sincerely,

Jeanne Blamey

P.S. I am a taxpayer, and I vote.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5108	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:11:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

Please help me understand why the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. Additionally, there was not a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study, incidentally required by law, supporting such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose. It was created to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. This policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Catherina Paolino

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5109    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:13:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I implore you to keep a significant number of areas in the GGNRA off-leash. This is not about dogs, but about the citizens of this area that own these dogs. These areas exist for our enjoyment, and I find it truly enjoyable to allow my dog to go for a walk with me while he is off of a leash. The current proposed plan is simply to restrictive to dog owners.

Thank you for your consideration in this important matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5110    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:16:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This plan punishes all dogs and dog-owners for no reason whatsoever. In an urban environment, we need open spaces even more, and the spaces managed by GGNRA are our only outlet.

There are no reasons to ban off-leash usage of these areas. Where there are environmental rules, enforce them. Where there are clean-up rules, enforce them.

Please, please, please abandon the proposed unreasonable plans to deny most San Franciscans use of the majority of recreational land within this city, and replace them with reasonable plans that serve the people of San Francisco and the surrounding area.

The GGNRA controls nearly all of San Francisco's recreational waterfront, leaving the city powerless to act on behalf of its citizens. In the two proposal drafts submitted to date, the GGNRA has completely ignored the wishes of the people of San Francisco and our local government, which is fighting the current plan.

Without these areas, San Francisco dog guardians and their canine companions will be limited to city parks. While some have dog-play areas, they are small, cramped, poorly maintained, and very unfriendly to the many dogs who thrive in open areas. This is not a reasonable option.

The majority of San Francisco households have canine family members - more than have human children. Confining those households to small, dangerous areas in remote corners of the city simply fails to serve

the needs of people.

Small, fenced dog runs are very dangerous for most dogs, and only open park areas - where dogs can easily be distant from dangerous people (and other hazards) are safe. Removing the ONLY open parkland from use by families with dogs puts all San Franciscans - human and canine - in danger.

Off-leash dogs in these areas pose no danger; a tiny minority of irresponsible guardians is to blame for any issues that arise. Deal with them, and you will eliminate any safety issue.

A large plurality of San Franciscans use these areas with their dogs. People and dogs enjoy the freedom of playing on the beach, hikes in nature and the grass of Crissy Field. We do so with few incidents of trouble, and fewer incidents than between non-dog-related people in city parks.

Please change the plan. I suggest that you focus the plan entirely on using highly knowledgeable (about dogs) enforcement, and far stricter enforcement, of good, civil behavior of all PEOPLE within the GGNRA.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5111	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:16:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Michael Gibbons

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5112	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	clayton, CA 94517 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:18:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 17, 2014

Golden Gate National Recreation Area Committee:

I am writing this letter to comment on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's proposed plans to limit both off leash and on leash access for dogs in GGNRA lands. I am not a resident of San Francisco or San Mateo counties (current Contra Costa County resident) but am a frequent visitor to the areas that would be impacted by the plan. I enjoy the use of the National Recreation area for hiking, bike riding and touring. I have just learned of the proposed plans (Monday 2/17/14) and am happy that I have the chance to comment even though I have not had much time to prepare.

As I understand the proposal, both on and off leash dog walking would be severely limited in the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas. When I visit GGNRA, I enjoy seeing the responsible dogs and owners that frequent these areas and take the time to get their dogs out for exercise and socialization. I have had positive experiences with the pets and owners. These restrictive proposals would push too many dogs into neighborhood parks or limited on leash areas within the GGNRA.

I am also concerned that if I or my children should move to San Francisco or Marin or bring dogs with when we visit, we would not be able to enjoy these areas with our pets. As a hiker, biker and outdoor enthusiast, I have not had negative experiences with dogs in the GGNRA and would like to see the off leash access preserved for ourselves as well as future residents and visitors at these recreation areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5113    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94605  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:22:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am an avid outdoorsman. I utilize the GGNRA for recreation on a daily basis and have for over 20 years. I surf and run at Ocean Beach.. I Kite-board at Crissy Field. I Hike/Bike the trails in Marin. I do not own a dog. But, I feel compelled to weigh in on the GGRNA Dog draft proposal as I think it has been blown out of proportion to the situation.

I love Crissy Beach on a busy Saturday morning. Folks visiting from far away places - seeing the Golden Gate for the first time. Kids splashing in the water. Dogs Running Off-Leash with their owners or digging in the sand with other dogs, chasing Frisbees and making friends. Kiteboarders launching their kites. I enjoy the Beauty, the sense of freedom and diversity of activities and visitors. I love how proximity creates new relationships, new ways to balance our needs. It is an essential skill for all creatures - Both human and canine.

The Bay Area is a unique place. We have dense population centers connected to beautiful open spaces. And in San Francisco we also have a population where the number of dogs is Greater than the number of children. It is essential that that they have a place to recreate - Owners AND Dogs. There is not enough room now. You would propose ½ of the current arrangement; with far too many leash restrictions. This is not acceptable. We need open spaces and freedom to move in it!

The impact this policy will have on the city parks and surrounding communities will be catastrophic. Our City Parks are overcrowded already. There are simply not enough dog-friendly areas in the city to handle

---

the canine population. We don't have the infrastructure or the space to expand. Simply put.... they have nowhere to go.

I think it is important to reiterate the fact that the GGNRA is NOT a "National Park". It IS a recreation area. This is not Yosemite. Crissy Field is a beautiful stretch of land with incredible wildlife that provides a much-needed outlet for a city filled with people - Tourists and Locals alike AND dogs. I believe the balance is here already. We need to fight to protect that.

I think the barriers and signs send a clear message as to where dogs belong or not.  
I really hope we don't need to revisit this in court.  
Let's save the tax dollars for the important fights!

Regards,

Michael Moore

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5114	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	fremont, CA 94551 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	none Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:26:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I love going to Ft. Funston often and being around the dogs with their owners or caretakers. EVERYONE is always happy and respectful and CLEAN. I think its another asset that represents the SF.area. A healthy place that cares about its people and pets. Please let our pets enjoy the freedom to be supervised off leash in our great SF. bay area.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5115	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:27:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs need a place to recreate and exercise! Don't take away the already limited space dog owners have to bring their beloved pets. It is cruel to limit space for dogs to run and play. This space is needed. San Francisco/Bay Area is a dog friendly area, lets keep it this way!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5116	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:33:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

---

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

---

health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Diana

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5117	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael , CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:34:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am opposed to leash laws and no dog zones on federal public lands. I regularly hike the national and state public lands and have a well trained dog with me whenever possible, thank you				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5118	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:38:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Michelle

**Correspondence ID:** 5119    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:40:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Myth Srsic

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5120    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:40:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



Sincerely,  
gladys stone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5121    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I also oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I also oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5122    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Kentfield, CA 94904  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:43:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not restrict dogs by making dog leash rules where they can be allowed off leash now. Dog owners should be responsible and if not then law can take over but to make such restrictions takes away some freedom from dog owners. Stiff penalties for violations could be enforced but dogs should be allowed to run. I very much oppose this GGNRA Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5123    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94402  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

PLEASE LISTEN TO THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE HERE, AND LOVE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS, DOGS AND THE LITTLE FREEDOM THEY HAVE! Our pets are only allotted a MEASLY 1% o the entire GGNRA - and you want to take away more? Seriously?

---

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Jake Celaya

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5124	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Castro Valley, CA 94546 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:45:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please continue to allow off leash parks such as Fort Funston. Good, clean, flea free parks such as Fort Funston is an extreme rarity in the Bay Area; this park allows both dog and owner to enjoy its fresh air, space, and beautiful views in an extremely relaxing and leisurely manner. Owners here pick up after their dogs and are courteous of others, again fairly rare in the bay area. It would be absolutely tragic to make it illegal off leash parks such as doggie heaven aka Fort Funston.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5125	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My name is Anthony Brown and I have lived in Mill Valley, CA with my dog Lexi for the past 5.5 years. As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA throughout the Bay Area, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I believe it is too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. My dog and I use the GGNRA lands and practice voice control methods. We have never been involved in or seen any negative incidents with dogs, people or wildlife.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Anthony Brown

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5126	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:46:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	One of the greatest things about living in the Bay Area and so near to San Francisco is how dog-friendly so many places are. If you take these places where we and our pets can roam and exercise together, I feel that you're taking away what makes San Francisco so great.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5127	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:47:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lui Velez

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5128	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94402 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am outraged that you want to take more of the measly one percent of the GGNRA that is currently allotted to dogs to run free. We live here, we are citizens who PAY TAXES and deserve to enjoy OUR PARKS - UNRESTRICTED like everyone else. We are given so little space, you have a nerve trying to take away more.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Petey Celaya

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5129    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pleasanton, CA 94588  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:48:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Our dog loves Fort Funston so as we. We have been there for many times and see that dogs being off leashes raises any environment concerns. Dogs are part of the nature why can't they enjoy the nature as we and other animals do. We would love our dog to continue having the freedom in Fort Funston and other similar places. They are people's best companions and why can't we show some appreciation to them by having them enjoy running around freely.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5130    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:49:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose GGNRA's proposed dog plan and support off leash dog walking!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5131    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Letter #2  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Walking my dog in these areas is a privilege I value and respect. I would like to honor it for many more years.

Sincerely,

Stacey and Yogi Herrera

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5132    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:52:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a proud San Francisco homeowner of two years at 361 29th St. in Noe Valley. At least once a week, despite having a fenced dog run around the corner from my home, I take my papillon mix Daphne to Fort Funston for off-leash recreation; that dog run and Fort Funston are the only two places she goes off leash. SF is a lovely city, but Fort Funston is the place here that I love the most, because of these trips. Daphne is normally a shy, reserved dog, but her intrepid side comes out as we explore the dunes and the beach. We both get so much exercise, and I find it to be a terrific stress reducer at the end of a work week. I have met more than one new friend while dog walking at Fort Funston, and having such a tremendous off-leash resource is a jewel in the city's crown. I should add that Daphne is always under my voice control and I always clean up after her.

I strongly oppose any alternative plan that would restrict off-leash voice control access to Fort Funston. Putting up fences would not only detract from the natural beauty of the site, but it would also defeat the purpose of our trips. The park would cease to be a useful recreational area to me and my dog. I have plenty of places where I can already walk her on-leash, and more convenient, albeit less enjoyable and

---

more cramped, off-leash areas. My quality of life would be noticeably diminished if restrictions were put into place, and as someone who plans to live and vote in San Francisco for the next few decades, I will be paying close attention to GGNRA's response to the concerns of responsible dog owners like myself.

Chris Fleitas  
361 29th St.  
SF, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5133	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:55:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Suzy Goldsmith

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5134	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:57:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Alison Gathright

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5135	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:57:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a registered voter of SF and I STRONGLY DISAGREE AND OBJECT to the Draft Dog Mgmt Plan. Dog owners should be allowed to walk their dogs off leash in the GGNRA. I will vote against any politician that does not support off leash dog walking in the GGNRA and SF parks.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5136	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 20:58:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Christopher Gathright

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5137	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 20:58:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Re: Golden Gate National Recreation Area Dog Management Plan

We support the preferred alternative proposed by the National Park Service to bring some level of control to dogs in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

As it is now, there is no area of the park where one can go and not expect to find off leash dogs, quite frequently running out of control and with all too much frequency threatening wildlife and people while doing extensive damage to vegetation and the terrain. That simply must be rectified. Leashed dogs, though much less prevalent, are a matter of concern. With extension leashes these dogs pose a similar threat to people and park resources. A standard 6 to 8 foot leash should be adequate for dogs in areas where the resource permits dog walking.

There are two areas of GGNA in which I have a considerable amount of experience, so I will limit my comments to those areas and the problems they face now.

FORT FUNSTON is an area I started visiting in the 60's when I ran the sand hills there. In the early 70's I started birding there, and by 1978 I knew the site very well. I wrote an article about it which appeared in a number of publications, most recently "Birding the San Francisco Peninsula", published by Sequoia Audubon Society. It was then an excellent place to bird. It was the only place left in western San Francisco where jackrabbits could be found. It was around then dog walkers discovered it and started letting their animals run off leash. One acquaintance I made took great joy in letting his German shepherd chase the jackrabbits and brush rabbits. At that time there was a healthy population of California Quail, Spotted Towhees, Bewick's Wrens and other birds that nested on or near the ground. Around the groves of trees, shrubs provide cover and sustenance for many birds, particularly fall migrants. One such shrub stands out, the largest coffeeberry I've ever seen. It was at the north edge of the Y grove. When the berries ripened it was not unusual to see 20 or 30 migrating Western Tanagers in it. They joined large numbers of sparrows and finches that used that single food source to fuel part of their migration. I watched over the course of a few years as more and more dogs trampled that huge coffeeberry into oblivion. The Park Service stood by and did nothing to save the plant or even to collect berries so the gene pool of that remarkable plant could be preserved. Too late now. Not only is that plant gone, so too are most of the shrubs that provided habitat around the Y grove, Battery Davis and the Skyline grove. The smaller shrubs were stomped down, the larger ones seem to have succumbed to the constant flow of dog urine inflicted upon them. The ground dwelling animals are gone too. Jackrabbits, California Quail and Spotted Towhees are all gone. It is likely they were chased to the point they could no longer reproduce, so either left for other places or just lived out their lives until their species were extirpated. I do not know the fate of the brush rabbits, but I haven't seen any in many years. I've stopped using Fort Funston except for an occasional visit to the hang glider observation deck, to bird from the north parking lot across from the Westside Sewage Plant or to check the Bank Swallow colony from the beach.

During the 70's we brought our children for walks at Fort Funston every week or two. As they grew up, more and more dogs were running around and sometimes threatened the children. We stopped taking them there and eventually stopped going ourselves. Now that we have a grandchild we wouldn't think of bringing her there. Through the 1980's I continued to lead field trips and bird there, but the presence of dogs posed a danger to the people in the groups I led, so I felt it necessary to stop that activity as well. That is not the intent of a National Park. Areas of National Parks that are easily accessible, like Fort



Funston, are supposed to be available to all visitors, not just a single special interest group. Clearly that is not the case at Fort Funston.

OCEAN BEACH is the other area with which I have extensive knowledge. I survey Snowy Plovers there every week or two between late July and the end of April. I bird the north and south ends of it frequently and walk there regularly. Dogs on the beach are an absolute hazard to all wildlife. Off leash dogs are the primary offenders. Though some owners intentionally sic their dogs on flocks of birds, more often they allow them to run through bird flocks, or they throw a ball which sends their dog running into the birds. Even dog walkers with controlled dogs pose a problem. The birds have no way of knowing whether a given dog will go after them or not. A dog is a predator, so any close approach is very likely going to result in the birds flying off. The problem with this is that is a gross violation of Federal regulations upheld in every other National Park. Dogs simply cannot be permitted to destroy the natural resource. But in GGNRA that is exactly what they do. They chase huge numbers of migrating birds off the beach and send them on their way north or south at a stage when they should be resting on the beach or feeding along the tide line. They do the same thing to gulls, terns, Snowy Plovers, Sanderlings and other shorebirds that reside here during some part of the year.

If we are to preserve this resource, or any other in the National Park System for future generations, we must continue to prevent special interest groups from destroying the resource in this generation. Time and time again, in virtually all of our National Parks, the Park Service has upheld the standard that cattle grazers, miners, loggers and developers to name only a few may not consume parks' resources for their person use. That is the standard that must be met in Golden Gate National Recreation Area. This park, in all its component parts with the possible exception of Alcatraz and Muir Woods, has been hijacked by a special interest group, dog owners. They destroy the park with abandon and without personal consequence. The parklands have diminished habitat value than when the park was established and they will provide much less still if dogs and their owners are not limited in their use of the park. Adopt the preferred dog management alternative, strictly enforce it and begin to regain this park for the future generations who will surely wonder why we wasted it for dogs if we don't do something now.

Joan and Dan Murphy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5138	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:02:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My name is Kate Gruen and I have lived in Mill Valley, California for 24 years. I walk at Crissy Field frequently and walk on the Miwok Trail several times a week. I have a dog and sometimes walk with my dog.				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive and I do not believe that there should be major changes in the dog management plan.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them.

THE PLAN WILL NOT ALLOW OFF-LEASH DOG WALKING ON ANY TRAIL ANYWHERE INT HE GGNRA. There is no evidence that off-leash dog walking has any negative impacts, yet this plan is a major restriction of off-leash dog walking that has existed for decades.

I walk on the Miwok Trail several times a week. The impacts of horses on the trail is significant and awful and I find it ridiculous that you can ban off leash dog walking based on dog poop when the piles of horse manure on the trails are offensive and massive.

My husband and I have given \$1,000 to the GGNRA for the past 20 years because we love this beautiful place. But if you change the rules so that we cannot enjoy it anywhere with our dog off-leash we will find a better use for our money.

Please keep the existing plan in place.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5139	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115-2947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:03:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would likely to strongly voice my approval of the Dog Management Plan.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5140	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:03:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kim Conley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5141	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:03:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** After reviewing the supplemental document I have two issues of concern:

1) Political persuasion- It appears Jackie Spear and other Politicians (both local and federal) are starting to put pressure on the park to stop the management plan or perhaps to choose the "No Action Alternative". The Park has spent over a million dollars in tax payer money putting together this plan. NPS has complied with the judge's court order and followed NEPA. There is a reason that the "No Action Alternative will not work and has not been selected as the "Preferred". The dog situation in GGNRA has gotten out of control and new management of this particular type of recreation needs to be implemented.

2) Implementation- A big part of seeing this plan be successful is the implementation process. I don't think it has been clearly spelled out how the plan will be implemented. Will each area have to do an implementation level plan of their own and environmental review? For example, will Fort Funston itself have an implementation level plan which will detail how the off leash and on leash areas will be contained? For example, if the Preferred Alt is chosen there is a ROLA on the beach which butts up against private property to the south, followed by state beach which is on-leash only ...will signs be posted to to tell people with dogs that they are leaving a ROLA and entering an area that is on-leash?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5142    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. Sometime I don't want to walk with people, but I don't want to walk alone, and we both get more exercise without a leash attached all the time.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ann-Marie Odling

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5143    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:05:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Shahid Said

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5144    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Castro Valley, CA 94546  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:06:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not punish the many for the errors of the few. I know that there are many irresponsible dog owners and dog walkers out there (trust me....I do), but it's not fair to punish all of us who are responsible (clean up after our pets, keep our dogs on leash, stay on trails, etc) for the behavior of the few who don't. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5145    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from

recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. This is one of the pertinent reasons I have chosen to live, work and spend my time and \$\$ in Marin and the San Francisco Bay Area for 20 years.

My dog is a valued and loved family member. She is under voice control and requires time off-leash to obtain the exercise she needs to support her physical and mental health. I would compare it to a child taking ballet, playing a sport, or a family going out for a hike or kayaking on the bay.

We enjoy places like Stinson Beach, Rodeo Beach, Coastal Trail, Loop Trail, Wolf Ridge Loop Trail, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, and Ocean Beach because they are beautiful and coveted places. They are extra special because everyone in my family get the exercise we need, can spend time enjoying each other while enjoying this incredible place we call home.

A dog park or fenced in area does not work. Our dog does not get the exercise she needs in a fenced in area or pen. Being so friendly, she says hello to all the dogs and people at the park, and unless the "right" dog is there, she will stand around and not get any exercise. Also a dog park does not give us, my family, the opportunity to experience and exercise in a beautiful environment, one of the pertinent reasons we chose to live and work in Marin and the San Francisco Bay Area, together.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Dogs are family members, and need to be respected as such.

Sincerely,

Jill Brown

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5146	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	whitefish, MT 59937 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Being able to let dogs run free is good for their mental health and to that of those who watch them! National recreation areas are one of the things that make our country so special.

Thank you for your consideration.

Katie Callahan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5147	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:09:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5148	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:09:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Save off leash areas of GGNRA. We love taking our dog out to Fort Funston, Crissy field and all over GGNRA.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5149	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Half Moon Bay, CA 94019 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Ofer Amir.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5150	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94618 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am very surprised by the actions of the GGNRA. I urge you to find an equitable solution to allow dogs and their people access to the beaches and trails that our tax dollars support.

Sincerely,  
Dona Turner  
Oakland, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5151	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	International Urban Estuary Network/Save the Bay Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:12:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am a frequent user of GGNRA in San Francisco, a volunteer for five years at Crissy Field's restoration, and an ardent national park supporter.

Having reviewed the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) Preferred Alternative F, I welcome the opportunity to offer the following comments:

The Preferred Alternative does not specify how the ROLAs will be achieved.  
The Preferred Alternative does not describe how park visitors will be adequately informed of the ROLA boundaries for the six sites in the Preferred Alternative F.  
Nor does it state that ROLAs will be fully enclosed, to guarantee that off-leash dogs are contained.

The NPS rationale for not specifying fencing was its claim that such enclosures are undesirable aesthetically; an enclosure of "sufficient construction" would "hinder or prevent wildlife movement. This justification by the Park Service is ill-founded and should not preclude an alternative for enclosing all ROLAs from consideration under the SEIS alternatives section.

There are attractive designs which adequately restrain dogs while allowing wildlife free access and protecting park visitors from bumping into a ROLA.

Even the off-leash advocacy group SFDOG endorses the creation of barriers to prevent potential conflicts between dogs, vehicles, and other park users.

The establishment of an enclosed ROLA was the only point of consensus of the Negotiated Rulemaking effort. Its astonishing that the Park Service would choose to ignore the one thing ALL constituents agree on: Fence the ROLAs

Commercial dog walking is an inappropriate activity for National Park lands.  
Commercial dog walking has never been legally permitted on any of our National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of parklands strictly for private financial gain.

Commercial dog walking will not provide any service or benefit to park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public. The GGNRA is probably the least desirable Park in the National system in which to allow commercial dog walking, heavily used as it is, in a densely populated urban setting where open space is at a premium.

Permitting commercial dog walking contravenes the NPS Criteria for appropriate park use: it fails to provide for visitor safety, disrupts the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, subtracts from public understanding and enjoyment of the park, and undermines a sense of ownership and stewardship for the park



The SEIS fails to provide evidence that voice control is an effective off-leash dog management option. While the SEIS does loosely describe and discuss the concept of voice control, it fails to evaluate its degree of effectiveness. The Park Service has provided no evidence that off-leash dogs respond to voice control.

Even the best trained dog can become uncontrollable in the presence of wildlife.

To account for this problem, off-leash dogs must only be allowed in an area that is fully enclosed, either by a fence or natural boundary.

Voice control should not be considered as an option for use in any area of the GGNRA that is open to multiple visitor uses.

A simple and effective violation reporting system should be established. The dog management plan should include a method by which park visitors can easily and effectively report non-compliant behavior.

Perhaps a smart phone app that directly connects to the Park Police or to a reporting system could be devised.

At a minimum signs could be posted at entrance points, (ie., Ocean Beach) with a phone number to call and report forms/information.

The SEIS fails to adequately state the impact of off leash dogs on wildlife. There have been many incidences in the GGNRA of wildlife killed by dogs. Countless studies, at least one by the GGNRA itself, have documented the adverse effects off leash dogs have on wildlife. I myself have never been to Ocean Beach without witnessing the harassment of shorebirds by a series of dogs. Yet these impacts on natural resources is given too scant attention in the SEIS and not enough weight put on preventing stress to wildlife.

After weighing the above noted reservations about the Preferred Alternative, I believe the only reasonable solution is for GGNRA to ban off leash dog walking. The cost of management and enforcement as proposed for scenarios in the SEIS are too onerous.

GGNRA is too rich in endangered species, its trails too heavily used and the demand for more outdoor recreation in the Bay Area growing too fast, for off leash dogs to be a sustainable usage.

Sincerely,

Arlene Gemmill  
861 Clayton Street  
San Francisco, CA 94117

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5152    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:14:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm a homeowner in the Bernal Heights neighborhood of San Francisco. I walk my dogs off-leash and under voice control at Fort Funston 2-3 times a month. Having direct access to the beach and the permitted trails increases my quality of life because I get to exercise myself and my dogs in this beautiful environment. In addition, my dogs go to Fort Funston almost every weekday with their dogwalker while I am at work, which gives me peace of mind because their need for physical activity is fulfilled. There is no other nearby park in San Francisco which offers the same off-leash space and access to the beach.

I absolutely oppose the NPS Preferred Alternative outlined in the SEIS, including the massive reduction of off-leash areas, fences enclosing the remaining off-leash areas and implementing the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy. There is no valid justification in the SEIS for these major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5153 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Pablo, CA 94806  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:15:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I know that many dog owners feel that being able to have their dogs off leash everywhere in the GGNRA should be sacrosanct. However, there are other users of the park who do not want to encounter loose dogs. Dog owners complain that there are not enough places to let their dogs run, but there are plants and animals, some of them endangered, that don't have ANYWHERE else to go. They should have priority.

I support your proposal with the caviot that off leash dog areas should be enclosed in some way..

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5154 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:16:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't change the leash laws at Crissy Field or Ocean Beach. Crissy Field is my favorite place in the entire universe and my dog, when she was live, ran and jumped and played at Crissy Field. When I moved to SF in 2005, Crissy Field was the first place I went with my dog after a five-day trip across the country. THE first place. My dog loved running off leash; it was her favorite place too. My husband and I were married in 2007 at Crissy Field; it is an extremely special place to me and to change the rules would change the character of it for the worse. Please do not change the leash laws.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5155    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Vallejo, CA 94590  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:16:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've been going to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for my mental health for the entire 22 years I've lived in the Bay Area. My dog is 12. I've been taking him to Limantour Beach and other locations for his entire life. This is one of the highlights of our life.

Golden Gate National Recreation Area is one of the jewels in the Bay Area. How is it possible that you would consider reducing the "recreation" factor of the area? People love those areas, and so do their dogs.

Dogs keep people healthy. They get people out walking and exercising in other ways too, and going to undeveloped areas with fresh air keeps the dogs keeping their people healthy.

In the Bay Area, we have the great good fortune of having beautiful open national park recreation areas, where we can take our dogs and keep them healthy by walking and exercising. Many of us go to undeveloped areas with fresh air to get our dogs out.

With the high cost of living and the extreme stress many of us have, this is extremely important for us humans. Our dogs get to go along for the ride. They run and have fun, go home and crash. It gets and keeps them healthy, and decreases aggression in the dogs and their people. Doing this gets and keeps us healthy.

I can only think that anyone who could come up with a plan to limit humans as well as dogs in these areas doesn't get out in fresh air with his/her own dog or anyone else's, and must live in a small place and work in a small office, and doesn't get the importance of exercise in fresh air for him/herself or any dogs.

We AND our dogs need those open spaces and the accompanying fresh air. We pay taxes, and as such, federal lands are ours. There are already areas where dogs are allowed, and people who don't like dogs already have plenty of other places to go for fresh air and open space. Please do not further limit the spaces we can take our dogs to.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5156    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:16:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am against the banning of off leash dog parks. Those of us living in highly efficient multi family buildings need areas for our dogs to play offleash. Banning this amenity would do a disservice to us and our pets.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5157    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:17:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Steve Austin from Pacifica here. I would like to say that I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5158    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:18:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please allow more spaces for dogs to run off leash!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5159    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:20:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lola

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5160    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San , CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:22:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

I.L.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5161	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san Francisco, CA 94159 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Don't waste my time for these issues come back over and over again. Stop it. I and my Dog want to and get to support formalization of the 1979 pet Policy plus in San Mateo County, San Francisco County, Marin County and on new lands that GGNRA acquires in the future.

Shiufan Lee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5162	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:28:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Vaughan Woodson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5163	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san Francisco, CA 94159 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Why we oppose the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Dog Plan

Areas where our dogs have been welcome to walk or play off-leash for decades could be severely cut or banned outright under the revised GGNRA dog plan. The new rules would affect off-leash as well as on-leash access at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Muir Beach, Rancho Corral de Tierra on the slopes of Montara, and many other parklands.

The San Francisco City Council recently unanimously passed a resolution objecting to the GGNRA plan, which prompted the head of the Sierra Club to say that SF is pandering to a small group of dog extremists.

However, we believe that as responsible citizens, we must be realistic and fore-thinking about how to accommodate more than 100,000 local dogs in a city with limited space.

There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

We are not suggesting unlimited dog walking access, and we advocate responsible dog ownership in all GGNRA lands. But there is no credible reason to deny fair and reasonable access for both on- and off-leash dog walking that has taken place on GGNRA land for more than 50 years.

I can't believe that you are creating hardships to dogs' owners but at the same time you are completely protecting wild animals in your dreams.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5164    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** moss beach, CA 94038  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:30:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please direct the below comments to GGNRA General Superintendent Frank Dean:

Dear General Superintendent Dean-

I live on Eltheldore St in Moss Beach, just down the street from Seton Medical Center. Rancho Coral Del Tierra is a short walk right up the hill from us. We have been walking dogs on those trails for as long as I can remember. I was extremely disappointed to see that this area, which is now GGNRA land, is being proposed as off-limits to dogs.

As you know the coast is becoming more crowded and often times we find ourselves prisoners in our own town due to the extreme automobile traffic in the area. It is essential that we maintain the option of not using a car as a means to get to a place to exercise ourselves and our dogs.

Please keep the area above the town accessible for ALL of us who live here, hikers with dogs, mountain bikers and horses.

Thank you,

Charles Holman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5165    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94159  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

---

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5166    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:34:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Justin Brownell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5167    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94159  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:34:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why we oppose the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Dog Plan

Areas where our dogs have been welcome to walk or play off-leash for decades could be severely cut or banned outright under the revised GGNRA dog plan. The new rules would affect off-leash as well as on-leash access at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Muir Beach, Rancho Corral de Tierra on the slopes of Montara, and many other parklands.

The San Francisco City Council recently unanimously passed a resolution objecting to the GGNRA plan,

---



which prompted the head of the Sierra Club to say that SF is pandering to a small group of dog extremists.

However, we believe that as responsible citizens, we must be realistic and fore-thinking about how to accommodate more than 100,000 local dogs in a city with limited space.

There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

We are not suggesting unlimited dog walking access, and we advocate responsible dog ownership in all GGNRA lands. But there is no credible reason to deny fair and reasonable access for both on- and off-leash dog walking that has taken place on GGNRA land for more than 50 years.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5168	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I live in the heart of San Francisco, in the Lower Haight. I very much enjoy that I can take my dog to the beach at either Fort Funston, Chrissy Field or Ocean Beach north of Gate 20 and let Akeena run as she pleases. It's good for her and allows her the freedom to explore without being attached to me by a leash. I think this is very important for a dog. it also allows me to practice control commands with her from a reasonable distance, also important for both my dog and me. We go FREQUENTLY to these areas, sometimes daily. It would be heartbreaking not to be able to do this.				

## 2) Essential Points to Make:

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5169	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:36:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Eva Radke

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5170	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:37:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the proposed Dog Management Plan and strongly believe that off-leash dog walking in Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Chrissy Field & Marin Headlands should continue.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5171	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:38:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Fang

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5172    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:42:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing because I care deeply about how the GGNRA is made available to the public. I have been a San Francisco resident for the last few years and a Bay Area resident my whole life. My wife and I take our dog and our daughter to Fort Funston every few weeks - it is an essential part of our lives. The beaches at Fort Funston are one of the few places where our dog can roam and explore a wide open space while also being under our watchful care and command. We really enjoy seeing her so happy running in the sand and dodging the waves, knowing that while she is exploring we can always call her to us if needed. It is a fantastic experience for our whole family.

I vehemently oppose the current preferred alternative. It is far too restrictive and it completely ignores the value residents currently derive from the park. I also vehemently oppose fenced in off-leash areas as opposed to the current open spaces. Fenced in areas are simply not the same experience for my dog or my family, and their presence would reduce Fort Funston to being just another dog park, instead of the unique joyful experience that it currently is.

I urge you to formalize the previously established 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and to also apply it to any lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. The current proposal ignores the many advantages we derive from the park as it exists today; should it go into effect, I would be extremely unlikely to patronize the park in the future - as it would have no advantages over my neighborhood dog park at that point.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5173    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, Lincoln, and Stockton, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dogs in the GGNRA since the late 80s, Im writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dogs for my own health and my dogs health the way I have on GGNRA properties for 30 years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am a federal employee, working for DoD. I chose to work for the US government, because I believe it is important as a citizen to help my country and keep it free. As a federal employee our job is to serve the citizens of the United States of America. It is clear that many, many citizens of the USA enjoy the freedom to take their dogs, off lease and on, to a small part of the GGNRA. I respectfully request you keep the current areas dogs are allowed to stay as they have been since 1979.

Sincerely,  
Mark W Holm

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5174	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:43:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Christine Brenneman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5175	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I take my kids and dogs to that beach often and can't believe this might be

put to an end. The alternative is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
David Wagonfeld

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5176	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:47:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent,				

In 1979 San Francisco entrusted GGNRA to provide an urban recreation. There are more dogs than children. This park is our home and should be managed accordingly, not like Yosemite.

I'm a frequently user of Crissy Fields and Fort Funston. Current maintenance is poor. The Crissy Fields protected area for the Snowy Plovers is sand with dried and or dead plants. Why is there a need to restrict off leash while current maintenance falters? Your report stated the snowy plovers have decreased due to mercury. That is an ocean problem, not dog.

The walkways at Fort Funston have cracks, crumbling, and collective sand dunes .

Please review and perform current responsibilities. First things first.

The conflict is a small area 1% leash access. The preferred alternative plan is too restrictive!  
What is the role and responsibilities of the rest of the land, 99% isn't 99% accurate?  
Are the protected wildlife and birds thriving? What are the restrictions in the 99% area.

Regards,  
Shirley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5177	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I live by 8th ave and Balbao ave in Inner Richmond and am 2 blocks from Golden Gate Park, where I frequent on a daily basis with my pet where I either a) run through the park with him, as well as play Frisbee/fetch. Not only do I get great exercise for both myself and my dog, but this is usually one of the highlights of my day.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

I hope the GGNRA will reconsider this ban for our pets, who for some of us, are part of the family like children are.

Sincerely  
Angie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5178	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:49:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ricky Johnson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5179	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:50:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** This is about as corrupt as SF politics gets. There is no basis or rational for restricting dogs. Beaches like Fort Funston are beaches for dogs and the dog community. Dog owners are responsible and clean up after their dogs and it is incredulous that the City is trying to pass this measure without fully taking into account the opinions of dog owners. Dog owners are generally upper class individuals with disposable income and these are the people we want in SF. Additionally, why are we restricting dogs but allowing homeless to take over our city and our parks. Why don't we enforce that all of our tourists that barely know how to ride a bike, ride the bike on the bike path along Crissy Field and the road and not on the sandy walking path where children and walkers, runners and dogs interact. Why don't we also focus on the tourists that have no idea how to ride a bike over the Golden Gate bridge and put everyone in danger by not riding single file, lying down bikes in the middle of the path and basically not skilled bikers, or what about focusing on all the traffic caused by tourists lining up in cars and backing up the GG bridge to park in the very limited parking on the Marin side of the bridge. Why don't we focus on what is really broken in our public land which is the extreme congestion and abuse caused by tourists

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5180	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:51:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Marin county is a wonderful and special place to live. We all appreciate and value our access to nature - the mountains and hills, trails, ocean and beaches. Enjoying it all w/our loyal and trusted friends, our dogs, is a quality of life bonus. PLEASE - do not take that away. We all want to maintain and preserve our most treasured nature as our back yard - we are on the same side. Please consider our point of view. Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5181	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:53:11				

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

Keep it simple: Off leash or On leash area or areas only; no need for designated verbal control area(s) because an animal that is off leash should be under verbal control or the animal is not under control by the responsible owner and the owner is ultimately responsible for the animal or animals behavior. Even though some owners believe the animal or animals can actually understand them when they attempt have a two way conversation with an animal which is often demonstrated by the verbal demeanor of the owner and the way they speak to an animal. Verbal control might work in a controlled environment such as a dog show but in the natural environment with numerous distractions and long distances it is impossible for one person to control six or eight animals or even one animal via voice control or for that matter even if the dogs are on leash.

No matter what an area is designated have professional or even non professionals that have more than one dog should pay a concession use licensing fee to use an area. Have them register, license, and pay the fee with NPS and in return NPS supplies the permit. This would aid in conflicts, dog incidents, and even assist in identifying owners if necessary for enforcement.

Not everybody likes dogs or animals and everybody has a right to utilize public lands without infringement or disturbance of a dog or animal sniffing, barking, running up, digging up, chasing the wildlife, or leaving fecal or urine matter and residual smells upon areas that are for the preservation of our future generations. Even if a dog or animal lover picks up after their pets or service animals there is still a very distinctive and noticeable stench that is left behind in areas that experience highly concentrated dog or animal use. Just move the sand and dirt around the garbage cans, watering areas, and in high use areas and the stench will stimulate your senses.

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

All rules, regulations, policies, and directives are useless unless they are enforced, by committed enforcement personnel who have the equipment, personnel, and support of their actions by the agency and legal system. Empower the right authorized personnel with the tools and support to do the job and the issues that have last over numerous years would become a moot issue.

Keep our pristine public lands pristine by allowing dog and animals lovers areas away from concentrated high use areas. Let them run free and wild in designated dog use areas such as Funston or Muir Beach away from densely populated areas such as East Beach, the Coastal Trail, Stinson Beach, Ocean Beach, Muir Woods, and Crissy Field. This would eliminate the off leash or on leash debate and allow everyone the opportunity to verbally control their animals in these areas and to have the owners interact with similar like minded population.

Sincerely,

John Q. Public

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5182    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dogs in various parts of the GGNRA, Im writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dogs for my own health and my dogs health the way I have on GGNRA properties for the past dozen years.

As it stands today, off leash is only allowed on roughly 1% o the entire GGNRA, which is incredibly low already given the size of the GGNRA, and the number of dogs that live in the bay area.

The new plan was NOT MODIFIED IN ANY SIGNIFICANT WAY to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

if these new rules are implemented, hundreds more dogs will flood into already crowded city parks, and the results will not be good for SF or any other area.

Leave us the tiny amount of free leash space that we have - in all these years i have barely witnessed any confrontations or issues certainly far less than what I witness regularly on city streets.

thank you and Sincerely,  
Val Ornoy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5183    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:54:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the proposed Dog Management Plan and firmly support off-leash dog walking at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Chrissy Field & Marin Headlands.

I am a responsible dog owner and rely on the GGNRA to provide a comfortable place to walk and run my

---

dog. Fort Funston (& the other locations) are happily enjoyed by many persons & their dogs, and are highly functional and rewarding in their current form. It is important to have a safe (away from traffic) and spacious area for dogs to run, interact, socialize and enjoy. San Francisco has many city parks - but which are unfortunately too small to properly accommodate the needs of its canine residents in the long term. Small spaces = aggravated dogs. Closing off GGNRA areas that are traditionally off-leash will lead to overcrowding at MacLaren (which is not easily accessible for everyone); Douglas Park is (still!) not open and also limited in its scope. Not every resident in this city is fortunate enough to own a spacious garden of their own - the GGNRA is an essential open space for us.

Responsible dog owners know when to keep their dogs on leash and off leash, and well trained dogs behave well when walking alongside their owners. More restrictive leash laws will not turn irresponsible dog owners into better owners, nor will their make badly trained dogs behave better - it would increase leash aggression instead, in my view.

I frequently enjoy walking at GGNRA with my dog and letting her run freely at Fort Funston or Ocean Beach - and I would not have reason come and enjoy the GGNRA without her as often. I do not think that limiting off-leash dogs will increase visitors to these areas - a large part of the GGNRA is already on-leash (or without dogs), so I do not see how limiting the historically off-leash areas materially affects the choices for those without dogs.

San Francisco has more dogs and fewer children than other, similarly sized cities - off-leash dog walking for our canine companions is a very important issue for local residents, one that will impact us disproportionately.

I will close with something I observed at Fort Funston the other day: a small child (about 5 years old) exclaimed joyously: "this place is magical!" when surrounded by dogs passing by. Have you ever raced down a sand dune with your dog? Don't take that wonder away from kids, or from adults.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5184	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sunnyvale, CA 94086 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

A policy allowing dog walking should be formalized and supported, including off-leash areas, in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in future,

Sincerely,

Mr. J.D.Withington

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5185    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 21:56:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 15, 2014  
Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Re: Comments on Draft Dog Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Dean,

I am writing to request that the Draft Dog Management Plan be modified to make dog use in the GGNRA more, rather than less, accessible.

Personal:

I have lived in the Bay Area since 1972, and currently reside in San Rafael. I have made extensive use of GGNRA lands since the inception of the park. I am seventy-one years old and now retired. I am also a dog owner, spending much of my time with a wonderful twelve year old rescue dog, an Australian-Shepherd/Border Collie mix. We do frequent/daily walks, at least ten to twenty hours weekly. I make extensive use of GGNRA lands, especially in Marin County. Walking is an essential part of both my dog's health and my own. Off-leash exercise is critical to my dog's health and happiness.

The Draft Proposal:

I read the GGNRA analysis in the Draft Dog Management Plan with interest and concern. I believe the fundamental flaw in the analysis is the failure to consider dogs as part of the urban environment in which the GGNRA was created.

The GGNRA was never a pristine natural environment such as that found in Yosemite, Glacier, or Capitol Reef National Parks - all of which I love and enjoy. The GGNRA is a unique urban open space, the historical product of lands preserved from residential and commercial development as a result of military use and political will in the Bay Area. It was created to serve the outdoor recreational needs of a large metropolitan area and contains a significant portion - and some of the best - of the open space in the Bay Area.

There are valid reasons why the dog policy in the GGNRA has always differed from the policy in other national parks. Dogs and dog-walking, both on and off leash, existed in the lands now controlled by the GGNRA before the GGNRA was created. Dogs should be regarded not as something foreign from which the environment must be protected, but as part of the urban environment which can co-exist in harmony with the the other parts of that environment.

The GGNRA was not created to "offer a National Park experience". It resulted from a legislative mandate

---

to "preserve for public use and enjoyment" and "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" in this unique urban environment. This mandate for public recreational use must surely include appropriate provision for traditional dog-walking activities that predated the creation of the GGNRA.

Recommendations for more extensive dog use:

I have been privileged to enjoy many areas within the current GGNRA jurisdiction for many years, and to share that enjoyment with my dog. In particular, we have made extensive use of Stinson Beach, Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, as well as the Marin Headlands trails, and the trails above Sausalito, including Alta Trail and Oakwood Valley. My dog is well-trained and not a problem for other hikers or animals. To prohibit our long-standing use of these areas, or to limit that use to on-leash walking only, would be tragic. I believe it would also be a distortion of the mission of the GGNRA.

A multi-use policy is appropriate for the GGNRA, including an adequate balance of dog-friendly and non-dog areas. The vast majority of GGNRA lands are already closed to dogs. The GGNRA should continue to allow a significant portion of its lands for both on-leash and off-leash use. In fact, I believe that the GGNRA policy should be made more, rather than less, dog friendly. Because of its unique position as the primary open space provider in this magnificent Bay Area, the GGNRA would do well to expand dog use areas to allow even more responsible dog ownership enjoyment.

Sincerely yours,

steve gimber  
39 Crestview Drive  
San Rafael, CA 94903  
sgimber@yahoo.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5186	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mountain View, CA 94043 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:59:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There are too few areas where dogs are allowed to roam freely. Fort Funston is a treasure and a phenomenal place to meet both two and four legged creatures. Our dogs love running and playing on the beach. There's so few places to do this anymore. Please don't punish our dogs for no reason!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5187	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Individual Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:59:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern;				

I am a 12 year resident of San Francisco. I have, in my 59 years, traveled extensively, visiting many great cities and living in a few of them. None has the combination of attributes of San Francisco - perfect weather, unique culture, vibrant arts, creative community and unsurpassed location. Most importantly,

accessibility to all of the above, if one chooses to afford it! I do. I pay half of my monthly income, at the expense of savings for retirement, to live in a city where I can be urban yet have access to assets as natural as one could possibly hope to find without getting into a car, driving 2 hours, and creating negative impact to the environment. And I enjoy these natural assets, specifically the GGRA, with my family - my wife and our 3 very small dogs. Mostly we go to Fort Funston, occasionally to Crissy Field. We mix with other users of these assets, people running, on roller blades and bicycles, people in wheelchairs, people with crazy children. Some days those parks I've mentioned are as busy as downtown, but they're not downtown, the built environment is minimalized. We don't go to those places looking for a wilderness experience, we go for a recreational experience based on access to the ocean, the beach, the stands of eucalyptus, and the paved walking paths, public toilets, food concessions, and easy parking. Central Park in New York City is beautiful but it doesn't hold a candle to Fort Funston.

I'm a pretty hardcore environmentalist. My title at work is 'Developer, Global Sustainability Systems'. I don't own a car. I swim in San Francisco Bay. I am a member of the Sierra Club, Greenpeace, NRDC, and a couple of others. And I FIRMLY believe that if we want to protect our natural environment, our wilderness, we have to densify our urban centers. But the residents of those densified urban centers need access to natural environments like Crissy Field and Fort Funston. And they need that access for their entire families, which includes the non-human members of their families. Their dogs. And the dogs need to be free, just like children, and cyclists, and skateboarders and whoever else might want to use the asset.

Any model of the natural environment that fails to recognize humans, with their pets as part of the equation, is flawed. Humans with pets is the natural order and has been for thousands of years. So that condition needs to be recognized and reflected in setting policy.

People who pay outrageous premiums to live in San Francisco do so to be able to enjoy access to an urban version of the natural environment - NOT WILDERNESS. The natural environment we have access to is not "wilderness" and nobody expects or desires that. What we ALL want is recreational areas. And for the vast majority that includes our dogs, OFF LEASH.

Please do not make the mistake that we want the areas concerned to be natural preserves. For that we would go to Yosemite. What we want in San Francisco is "recreational areas". We don't want change. We want what we have, what we pay so much to enjoy, what makes this the greatest city in the world to live in and enjoy. Do NOT take that away from us.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5188	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 21:59:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, the main proposed dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

My house is located approximately two lots from the GGNRA in the unincorporated area of Mill Valley. I have lived here and enjoyed walking in the GGNRA for 18 years, and I depend on these walks to keep fit and active. My dogs have kept me company and motivated to walk daily for the last 16 years. To deprive ANY dog from walking, running and playing on the fire trails is inconsistent with the original planned use of the area, and violates the long established norms of our community to regularly enjoy the outdoors with our well-behaved and voice-controlled pets. The original charter and 1979 pet policy are more than

adequate to protect this beautiful area, and there is NO NEED to inhibit our enjoyment and use of these trails. We purchased our house so we could easily access this resource, and strongly object to your proposed restrictions which will negatively impact our quality of life, and also our property values.

We also regularly take our dog to Muir Beach, where he enjoys being able to swim- he recently had knee surgery, and his recovery includes exercising the knee by swimming without the stress of climbing in and out of a steep entry. Muir Beach is perfect for this therapy, and is one of the few spots available in Marin where he can engage in this important off-leash activity for his recovery.

I am particularly distressed that this plan did not conduct any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that provide support for this excessive restriction of public use on OUR public lands. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

Limiting beach off-leash access to the remote Rodeo Beach is ridiculous- and shows how truly insensitive your plan is to the environment- residents will have to drive their cars to this remote location- adding to carbon emissions, pollution and wasted time and energy. When now we can just step out our door for a quick or long enjoyment of open space- why should you have the right to alter our enjoyment of this beautiful spot where we purchased our home, and force us to defile the environment and spend additional money and time to fully exercise our dog? The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

YOU MUST consider the RIGHTS of LOCAL home owners and LEAVE the ORIGINAL CHARTER INTACT- Access was and should be for ALL USERS- including dogs and their people!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5189	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mountain View, CA 94040 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:00:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I just heard some very disturbing news on the radio that Fort Funston and other dog friendly areas may soon be off limits to dogs. Please reconsider this position. I love taking my dog out to Fort Funston for walks on the beach. Even though we don't live that close by its worth the drive to us because there are so few dog friendly area's around. I feel that this would be a great dis-service to the bay area to make this change.				

Regards,

Scott

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5190	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have lived in San Francisco for 22 years and have regularly walked with a dog in the GGNRA throughout that time period. I mostly use the Crissy Field area, but also recreate with my dog in the Presidio, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Rodeo Beach and on hiking trails throughout the area. I am writing today to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's most recent Dog Management Plan. The preferred alternative does not significantly reflect the substantive concerns and objections that I and thousands of other people submitted in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that the supports the drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas that the preferred alternative would impose.

The preferred alternative of the Dog Management Plan is too restrictive. It will prevent me and the thousands of other responsible people who enjoy recreating with their dogs in the GGNRA from doing so, thus negatively impacting our own mental and physical health and the health of our dogs. This valuable aspect of RECREATION should be retained as outlined in the 1979 pet policy. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Living in San Francisco requires all citizens and visitors to comprise and understand that a wide variety of people use the GGNRA in different ways and all of these uses can co-exist as they have for decades, long before the Presidio and other areas became part of the GGNRA. Off leash dog walking is a positive and does not interfere with other people's use or enjoyment of the park, especially when compared to the never ending foot races held in the park, bicycle riders and picnickers who leave trash in the park. Dog walkers are the most frequent users of the beaches in all types of weather and thereby make it safer for others due to their constant presence. Having access to GGNRA with our dogs makes city living more enjoyable and possible.

Of course there are other voices that support a different position than mine, but the "scientific" and real evidence of the impact of dogs in the GGNRA just doesn't hold up. In the 22 years that I have used the GGNRA spaces with my dogs, the wild flora and fauna of the parklands has thrived. With proper signage and enforcement by the National Park Service, conflicts can be minimized. The preferred alternative is a recipe for disaster, as more people recreating with their dogs will be forced into smaller spaces. The small percentage of the GGNRA that is available to people with their dogs needs to be retained and protected. Please keep the RECREATION in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for all of us.

Regards,

Brian Kerester

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5191	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Angela Flynn

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5192	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:09:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please save off leash locales. All dogs deserve to get the exercise they need. Ours for one is best served & cared for when she gets the physical exercise she needs. (running off leash!) This contributes to her being more relaxed, balanced & feeling safe. Thank you for your consideration				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5193	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	muir beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	- Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My family and I live in Muir Beach. We moved here with our children and our dog hoping to enjoy the environment as well as be caretakers of it. We often hike in the Marin Headlands and on the local beach, with our dog. We respect the paths that are marked for our use and pick up poop and use a leash, where required. Of course, we value the open spaces where we can all run and play together and hope these could continue to be available. We therefore oppose the Preferred Alternative as it restricts such recreation. Apparently, there is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. We support the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in Marin, SF, San Mateo County and on new GGNRA lands. We also oppose fences which take time and money and only serve to remind us that we are unwelcome, where we could rather be embracing the great outdoors and celebrating the area in which we pay taxes to live and find a moment to be able to walk together with our families, our friends and our pets. We oppose the Monitoring Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it believes that not enough people are complying with leash restrictions. As a resident in Muir Beach, I would be willing to volunteer to help pet owners "do the right thing" and respect the areas that are designated as restoration recovery zones. Our dog and I would happily hike and be ambassadors of the trails. In addition, I would like to add that not only does our dog not adversely impact the trails, she positively enhances them. Hikers, runners and sightseers always pet her and - in addition - she is more than company, she is a loyal and reliable safety harness for the family, even without a leash.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5194	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:11:02**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
David Wright

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5195 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the entire GGNRA Dog Management Policy because I disagree with its premise that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. By their own admission, the GGNRA had no data or studies to support these claims and they are relying upon these claims to initiate a process whereby access for people with dogs will be severely limited or completely banned. Even now, with this SEIS, the GGNRA admits they have no site-specific peer reviewed studies (required by Federal law) to substantiate their claims that dogs are a problem for wildlife, water quality or vegetation in the GGNRA. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence and baseless assumptions to claim dogs have the potential to damage this Recreation Area.

Additionally, in the SEIS the GGNRA asserts they have the right to redefine the term "recreation" as utilized in its enabling legislation and in the promises made to the voters of San Francisco back in 1972 by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI and the GGNRA's first Superintendent, the Honorable William J. Whalen, in order to secure various properties then owned by the City and County of San Francisco. These promises, most importantly, stated that this National Recreation Area would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should the citizens vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA. These promises, along with the conventional definition of the term "recreation", do not comport with GGNRA's current philosophy exemplified by Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management and Science for the GGNRA, who in 2007 was quoted as saying "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." The GGNRA does not have the legal authority to rewrite history or its enabling legislation to their own design. Once again, buried deep within the SEIS is the GGNRA's poison pill. Only the name has changed; it is

now the Monitoring-based Management Strategy. The GGNRA gets to decide whether we are in compliance, and the measures of compliance are subjective. Under this SEIS the GGNRA may decide to impose short-term or long-term closures of areas. These short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which dog guardians have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston could be their reason to ban dogs entirely from these beaches. This is unacceptable.

The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. All properties added subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy and in the future should have historical off-leash recreational usage allowed. This would accurately reflect the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area which GGNRA management has held in disregard for quite some time.

If the GGNRA does not want to manage these properties as a Recreation Area, then they should transfer the Recreation Area to another entity better able to manage it, e.g. the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management. Alternatively, for sites heavily utilized by dogs and their guardians, such as Ocean Beach and Fort Funston, these properties should be reverted back to San Francisco.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5196	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Orinda, CA 94563 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:14:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to see the record of documented objections to dogs at GGNLR sites, a record that substantiates/supports the GGNLR's changes in policy.				

Your prompt and thoughtful response, accompanied with relevant documents, will be greatly appreciated.

Patricia King Sokalski

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5197	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to many of the GGNRA areas that you are trying to close to dogs. I believe that it is for the good of everyone to have their dogs receive off leash time and get exercise that makes them better doggie citizens!.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. The residents rely upon this open space for the health of their pets. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. I utilize those parks as well and it's a completely different use system and not one size fits all!

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5198    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:23:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, please reconsider the draft on dogs being on leash or no dogs at all in places. At least hold the draft for a bit longer or talk to me directly. Would love to attend your meetings. The no dogs at all includes places like Coyote Ridge. Dogs being on leash includes the beaches: Muir, Stinson, and others. What is a beach, hikes, without dogs? Won't go to any beaches or hikes without dogs. It is lonely without your friendly furry buddy! Dogs are animals too and know more what their doing than children. Children can be destructive too? Why not make leash laws for children as well? What you are doing seems selfish thinking only on humans side not dogs. Dogs have done so much for us, loyalty, friendship, family member, find people who are lost, guide people, protect, and there is so much more. They do not put us down, betray, cause wars, do not cause needless harm. We need to return the favor by given dogs more rights change the policies for dogs. Even take down breed discrimination for German shepherds, Dobermans, and even Pit Bulls who are on high liability lists. Someday I will change the world for animals giving them rights that they deserve. You may destroy freedom for our beloved dogs who will enjoy life a lot less. Life is short we can't do what you say. You know what if you continue these leash laws/ no dogs allowed, perhaps we could still go to those no dogs allowed and let are dogs go off leash going against the leash laws. If rangers come we will refuse to obey just like Rosa Parks did on that buss in 1958. I swear on my word that we will get the rights for our dogs back or just reconsider your campaign of the Draft Dog Management Plan. Want to talk? Talk to me directly I double dare you in a meeting or something.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5199    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:26:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Karen Palmer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5200	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:26:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the draft Dog Management Plan for GGNRA.				

I fully support the National Park Service's efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Invaluable wildlife, such as the snowy plover (and all other native species), must be protected from off-leash dogs. Off-leash dog running should not be permitted anywhere in GGNRA, but if, for political reasons, it is, it should be restricted to areas of no habitat value where native wildlife will not be harmed.

I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity for a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

Commercial dog walking is NOT an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking would provide no service or benefit to any park users, would adversely impact park resources and values, and would serve private profit at the expense of the public resources. Nearly all national parks strictly control the presence of dogs; it would be an extraordinarily bad precedent for the Park Service to sanction commercial dog walking in GGNRA, essentially turning a resource that belongs to all Americans over to a commercial enterprise that would damage park resources and make GGNRA a less desirable (and, for some, frightening) place to visit.

As one who has long observed the irresponsible behavior of many dog owners who seem to believe that they are entitled to run their dogs off leash wherever and whenever they please, I urge the Park Service to restrict off-leash activity anywhere it could have a negative effect on native wildlife and plants and to rigorously enforce leash regulations. As recently as this afternoon, I observed 2 hikers in a county park in Marin County on a leash-only trail with a large dog off leash. When another dog walker warned them that a ranger was ticketing hikers for off-leash dogs ahead, they (with much shouting at the dog before they could get it to come to them) leashed it. Once they'd passed the ranger on the trail (we were walking a short distance behind them) and he was out of sight, off came the leash. Only consistent enforcement with fines large enough to be a deterrent will bring these folk to heel.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Trent W. Orr  
San Francisco, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5201	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:26:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dogs in various parts of the GGNRA, Im writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

As it stands today, off leash is only allowed on roughly 1% of the entire GGNRA, which is incredibly low already given the size of the GGNRA, and the number of dogs that live in the bay area. If these new rules are implemented, hundreds more dogs will flood into already crowded city parks, and the results will not be good for SF or any other area.

Further, the new plan was NOT MODIFIED IN ANY SIGNIFICANT WAY to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please leave us the tiny amount of free leash space that we have - in all these years I have barely witnessed any confrontations or issues, and certainly far less than what I witness regularly on city streets.

Sincerely,

Alexis Stricker

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5202	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley unincorporated, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:27:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I live near the Homestead trail, and value the opportunity to walk my dog in this area, and allow my dog to run on the beach at Muir Beach. The GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL				

---

RECREATION AREA was established to give outdoor RECREATIONAL opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite. It is hard to imagine, even after reading the SEIS, how dogs could be significantly problematic for wildlife over and above the impact of the human impact in these areas. It is hard for big dogs in particular when they do not have places to get exercise, and the more difficult it is for people to find opportunities to let them run, the more strain it is on these animals. The dogs play an important role in many people's lives. The changes in policy would adversely impact many individuals who have chosen to reside near these public recreational areas. The SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, and the Marin Headlands. Please retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy.

Thanks for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5203	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Richmond, CA 94804 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely, Jesse Freeman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5204	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:31:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5205	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:31:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** This plan is a facist take over of our public lands. Never did the park service do any research on use. Had they done so they would realize that the majority of daily users are dog owners. I have walked on either Chrissy field, fort Funston, ocean beach, Muir beach, oak valley or alta trail every single day with my dog since 1996. This is my life style you are trying to ban. You may as well try to take surf boards away from surfers.

This is not Yosemite. The urban Area around the park land was here before NPS.  
Dog owners are a huge percentage if the Bay Area. If you pass this we will continue to walk our dogs.  
The rangers who will be ticketing will be foreigners on our land. College grads from Michigan etc.  
This is not right.

You will have to ticket, taze, arrest on repeat because we will continue our life style. The flag of Mill Valley has a paw print on it for fucks sake. You will be fighting one of the wealthiest counties in the country. You will lose. How much money do you want to waste?

Go to hell if you pass this.

Sincerely,

Kristin Van Til

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5206	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Carlos, CA 94070 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:33:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My husband and I frequently walk our dog, Tundra in the GGNRA. Most frequently, we visit Fort Funston, but we have also enjoyed days at Ocean Beach and Chrissy Field. The three of us have spent



many happy weekend mornings along the beach together - - it's something we look forward to mid-week when we're up to our ears in meetings and responsibilities. The walks are like mini-vacations since we drive up from San Carlos. It feels like a different world when we breathe the fresh water and play on the beach. To be honest, if we couldn't bring Tundra with us, we wouldn't take advantage of the beautiful parks of the GGNRA because the appeal for us is that we can enjoy the land as a family. Tundra loves to sniff in the sand, charge at the ocean, and greet other dogs. My husband and I take time to catch up with each other, chase Tundra, enjoy the fresh air, and meet other dog walkers. The whole experience is rejuvenating for people and dogs alike, and provides us with great exercise and mental relaxation after a long week at work.

I have been so impressed by the dog owners that we have personally encountered on the trail; they are careful to clean up their dogs' messes, keep control of their dogs, and respect the beautiful land that is currently open to off-leash dog walking. People seem to be respectful towards boundaries when they are clearly marked and help educate new dog walkers about the policies for off-leash areas.

We were so sad to learn about the potential changes to the off-leash laws. We have heard that new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, we have read that there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

One quick anecdote about the success of an off-leash dog experience in San Mateo county: in San Carlos, there was no centralized location for dogs to play off-leash as recently as 2012. In response to the call for a dog park, City officials began a pilot program at Burton Park on Brittan Ave. During the trial period, dog owners were allowed to bring dogs to the park to play off-leash during certain hours. In exchange, we were asked to clean up the park and respect the boundaries for dogs. When the City of San Carlos reviewed the program during a public Parks & Recreation meeting a year later, studies indicated that the park was actually cleaner since the off-leash area had been established because owners so much appreciated having a designated area for dogs to play and they took pride in cleaning up after the dogs and being responsible for their behavior. I truly believe that dog owners understand how lucky they are to have parks and areas to play with their four-legged friends, and given the chance to behave well or loose that privilege, they will go above and beyond to take care of the land being offered to them. There is real potential for mutual benefit between dogs, dog owners, and those wanting to protect GGNRA in working together to keep the land clean and beautiful.

We are a young couple and we plan to remain in the bay area for years to come and to raise kids here. We sincerely hope that we can take our kids to the wonderful areas in the GGNRA that are open to dog walkers and spend days as a family taking advantage of the wonderful recreation areas in the beautiful SF Bay with Tundra.

Sincerely,  
Noelle (and Kevin) Gibbs

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5207	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Lydia Kim

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5208	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:34:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	National Park Service,				

I am writing regarding your proposal regarding the GGNRA in the San Francisco Bay Area. A beloved park system used by EVERYONE. Now you find the need to restrict the usage. I am 65 years old. I have used Ft Funston and Crissy Field for parent walking as well as dog walking. In fact it's always been so wonderful to take my parents, their dog and my dog out for a walk at either location. How disappointing if your proposal goes thru. How harmful for so many people and their pets. I am a member of the Audabon Society, Nature Conservancy and am a bird watcher. I appreciate the need to protect habitat for the bird community but I do believe there is plenty protection. What about the well being I for the residents of San Francisco , the Bay Area and their family members, pets included. I'm curious, will horseback riders continue to be allowed at Ft. Funston as well?

I hope you make the right decision. A decision that will allow all peoples to enjoy the GGNRA with their family members whether they be two legged or four legged.

Respectfully,  
Robin Blackstone

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5209	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Bruno, CA 94066 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:34:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner, I believe that removing access to dog-friendly beaches and trails as part of this plan will have a decidedly negative impact on the well-being of pets and their owners in our community. We believe that there is already a dearth of open spaces where dogs can have healthy, stimulating exercise. We would like to continue to have access to these great areas for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5210    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner.

If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my dog and I will be losing one of the many great reasons as to why we live here in the San Francisco Bay Area.

There is an estimated 120,000 dogs in the Bay Area. It's been stated since 2007, that dogs outnumber the amount of children in our community. This fact alone is reason enough to not deplete our use of the dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA.

Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on my dog and I, but our entire community. Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.

We've been coexisting fine all these years. Let's keep the 1979 Pet Policy. The policy's backbone is recreational and nature based. Nature and recreation are two things the Bay Area is made up of and should continue to be made up of.

Yours,  
Barbi Lazarow  
Hillsborough, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5211    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:40:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** One of our favorite family pastimes is walking down to Ocean Beach and running our dog. He gets to run full speed through the surf, fetch the ball and play with his friends. How sad we would all be to have this taken away! Please reconsider your ban... Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5212    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Albany, CA 94706  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:40:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've taken my dogs to Beaches in San Francisco and Albany California. Both of these areas provide a natural saltwater environment and waves which my water loving dogs enjoy. In addition to the exercise (without joint load) the swimming provides, the saltwater eventually evaporating in their fur facilitates a healthy (flea free) dog. I've never seen the dogs defecate in the water, although I've had to clean-up after them on the beach. None of the parasites that are common in dogs present a hazard to life in the ocean or beach flora & fauna.

Please continue to allow responsible dog owners to continue their use in restricted beach areas as you have been.

Janis Cary BS Zoology UCB

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5213    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:41:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog parents. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my dog and I will be losing one of the many great reasons as to why we live here in the San Francisco Bay Area.

There is an estimated 120,000 dogs in the Bay Area. It's been stated since 2007, that dogs outnumber the amount of children in our community. This fact alone is reason enough to not deplete our use of the dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA.

Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on my dog and I, but our entire community. Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.

We've been coexisting fine all these years. Let's keep the 1979 Pet Policy. The policy's backbone is recreational and nature based. Nature and recreation are two things the Bay Area is made up of and should continue to be made up of.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5214    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:44:13

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the huge changes proposed to the GGNRA. These lands were intended to be for recreational use for urban members of the bay area. For many years I & members of my community have enjoyed the currently limited options for off leash recreation with our beloved dogs and our families. It is unfair and hard to even imagine the type of restrictions at the GGNRA is proposing. I am strongly opposed to everything I've heard and seen and hope you will consider that the vast majority of Bay area residents value these lands as recreational areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5215 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:44:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please allow the digs to remain leash free in fort fun atom  
Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5216 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog owning parents with children. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that one of my family's favorite activities will be swiped off our "Fun to-do List".

We are an active family with an active lifestyle and much of our lifestyle includes our dog. Our household is happy hugely in part to our dog and limiting access to our dog's favorite playgrounds (I.E. Fort Funston, Muir Beach and Ocean Beach) will be devastating to us all. Especially to our English Shepherd Toby.

The points brought up in the SEIS are completely unjust for such a radical change to be made. My family and our dog won't be able to have the bonding time and exercise like we do on the GGNRA lands at our local, fenced-in dog park. Nothing is quite as fulfilling as having my family together, Toby included, out for a day of hiking, observing and learning about the great environment around us.

Please consider keeping the 1979 Pet Policy - it keeps all points of nature and recreation in harmony. It ensures my dog and any other future dogs my family has; will have their space now and for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5217 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:46:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Sarah Symcox

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5218	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94619 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:47:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi There,				

I am both a dog owner and a nature lover and want very much to see habitat preserved for both native plants and animals. If the closing of off leash areas is for the restoration of habitat I understand and appreciate the need. However, I do not see why both off leash areas and habitat restoration cannot coexist. Why not corden off areas-more parts of these areas you propose to take off leash for habitat restoration, compromise for both dog folks, & wildlife.

Sincerely,

Lisa Cohen

Ps I heard about this from a poster at Fetch cafe

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5219	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:47:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong

---

opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Anne Fleming

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5220	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:48:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Wiley Laufman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5221	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:49:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 15, 2014

Superintendent Dean

My name is Laura Pandapas and I am a resident of Muir Beach.

I am writing to express my opposition to the 2013 Dog Management Plan SEIS.

-The SEIS does not adequately address the concerns of the public comments filed in 2011 that were overwhelmingly opposed to the alternatives of the DEIS.

-The 2013 SEIS continues to shun real data. Instead it is a veritable stew of "might", "could", and "may". There are no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies included in the SEIS for Muir Beach and the Headlands. The SEIS admits that there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that even show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However, these anecdotal claims have no context-how frequent were they, how serious, etc-and cannot be used to set policy! The SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the best professional judgment of NPS staff to determine impacts from dogs. NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for proof that impacts from dogs are currently occurring. The SEIS does not differentiate human caused impacts from alleged dog impacts. And the SEIS just asserts as fact that which is not.

-The 2013 SEIS also disregards and does not consider a single impact to the surrounding communities that are adjacent the GGNRA. Nor does it consider the severe impacts to the actual users of the GGNRA who've relied upon and cherished these lands since their inception as a park.

-I oppose the Monitoring Based Management Strategy. It is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Even though the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws, and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

The GGNRA was established as an urban recreation area, tightly interwoven with urban cityscapes and communities, to provide much needed out-door recreational opportunities to a densely populated urban area. The 1979 Pet Policy thoughtfully balanced the needs of all visitors throughout the GGNRA's 80,000 acres, with a meager 1% mde accessible to people with their dogs. Attempts to further reduce that access by an additional 90% pts a heavy burden of proof directly on the NPS to demonstrate factual justification for such a profound taking away of access to our public lands. The SEIS does not pass that threshold, even remotely.

I support the "No Action" Alternative "A" for the trails of the Marin Headlands. First, I want to go on the record as saying that your maps conveniently don't show the Coastal Fire Road from Muir Beach. It's easy to miss that ALL your alternatives ban dogs completely on this trail. I use the Coastal Fire Road and Trail almost every day with my well-behaved leashed dog. I hike alone, for exercise before work, and take my



dog along for my own safety and security. We walk from our house, along the beach and up the Coastal Fire Road to the Coastal Trail and then back to my office in Muir Beach. If we have time, we go to Pirate's Cove. I would never be comfortable taking this hike alone if not for my dog. And, the Coastal Fire Road and Trail is the ONLY GGNRA trail from Muir Beach accessible to a person with a dog, and is therefor the ONLY option for people in Muir Beach to use without getting in a car and driving over the hill and out of area completely. Having to leave Muir Beach and get in to a car just to walk a dog is UNREASONABLE. Tam Valley doesn't need more cars, and neither does Mill Valley. Traffic is already a nightmare, and leaving Muir Beach via car on a busy weekend is just not practical or wise.

I also use the Miwok Fire Road above Muir Beach as a spot to meet friends who live in Mill Valley. It's a natural meeting spot in between Muir and Mill Valley, and it's the ONLY other GGNRA trail in the area that allows for access with even a leashed dog. And it's the only through access to Tennessee Valley.

The newly minted Muir Beach Trail is not a trail. Its an access path. And its now a heavily beaten path with large intrusive signs. It used to be lovely, quiet and bucolic. Now, the parking lot is never out of site. The path goes .2 mile to the sand from the parking lot, and .4 mile to the gate of Green Gulch. No trails are available up from Green Gulch, and the path then deposits a person with their dog out on the busy roadway or makes one turn around. Its UNACCEPTABLE, and insulting that these are being called trails. They dont go anywhere, and they are not for hiking.

Only Alternative A allows for true hiking trails to remain accessible to people with a dog, even for leashed access. I do not support any other alternative for the Headlands, as they are too restrictive, unsubstantiated by any data or studies, and would leave Muir Beach surrounded by GGNRA lands with not a single dog-accessible trail! The result of such a drastic restriction would mean that I, and many women like me, would no longer be able to enjoy hiking alone in the Headlands that surround Muir Beach. I would effectively be prohibited from using them, even with my dog leashed! Ideally, the GGNRA should be ADDING dog-friendly trail access from the Miwok, down Coyote Ridge to the Coastal Fire Road, so that people can come and go between Mill Valley and Muir Beach without using a car! This is just common sense, and better for the environment, and would truly serve the needs of communities adjacent to the GGNRA!

I also support the No Action Alternative for Muir Beach, or "A".

First of all, I reject that Muir Beach is some sort of pristine environment and sensitive area. Muir Beach is comprised of not just the beach itself, but also of a community of approximately 160 multi-million dollar homes. All those homes are on septic. All those homes have cars. All those households have laundry, and dishwashers and FAMILIES living in them. Then theres the busy Pelican Inn, with its newly expanded septic system, and many visitors. Add to that the hordes of tourists that the NPS is trying to shove in to Muir Woods (and suggesting to them to also check out Muir Beach) and the new GIANT parking lot and the many more people than ever that are coming to Muir Beach by car and you've got about as far from "sensitive" as you can get. To suggest that Muir is somehow a remote wilderness is ridiculous. And to suggest that there aren't more birds or otters or salmon because of the dogs is disingenuous at best. The beach is covered with people! The NPS can't just gaze out on Muir Beach and pretend that the thriving community that has been here for over a century doesn't exist. And lets not forget that this thriving community is a true partner to the NPS. We provide first responder fire and emergency support with our volunteer fire department. Our dog-loving and dog-owning fire fighters are the first on the scene for Muir Woods, on Muir Beach and in the Headlands trails around Muir Beach. Muir Beach the community couldnt be a better, more supportive park partner. I am proud to sit on the board of our Volunteer Fire Association.

As a Muir Beach resident, I am personally offended that the National Parks Conservancy has come in and

done their pet project with private dollars, and now they are advocating such a change in how we use and live with OUR beach. The National Parks Conservancy doesn't own Muir Beach. The public does. And the National Parks Conservancy isn't the greater public. I was shocked to hear a volunteer in the new lot tell a group of kids who were volunteering to do plantings, "Welcome to your Golden Gate National Park!" Wow! How dare the Parks Conservancy use their own made-up name for Muir Beach or the GGNRA. Nancy Pelosi tried to change the name in 2008, and it was so controversial that she had to withdraw HR 6305 and it didn't even make it out of subcommittee. To hear a Parks Conservancy volunteer dis-informing visitors made my blood boil. And the National Parks Conservancy likes to do this on their website and in their printed material as well. It's a pattern of dis-information meant to change public opinion about Muir Beach and the GGNRA, and an attempt to get the GGNRA to remove RECREATION from its mission. Its unacceptable.

The alleged impacts to Muir Beach that the SEIS say "could" be caused by dogs are NOT. I live and work right over the beach. I see the real offenders EVERY SINGLE DAY, and they aren't dogs. I see people jumping over the new fence, without dogs. I see people walking around the fence and up the creek leading their children in to the bushes to relieve themselves because the parking lot bathrooms seem too far away. Both these things I witnessed today, and many other days. I've found dirty diapers in the sand. And dirty underwear. My friend's 3 year old son got 3rd degree burns on the soles of his feet because he accidentally stepped on a partially buried smoldering fire that some humans decided to have outside of the established fire rings. My neighbors and I pick up trash on our daily walks across the beach. It's amazing what beach goers leave behind! I've watched kids kick and stab starfish and smash tide pools with rocks. I've watched kids climb up eroding hillsides and kick the dirt with their feet to INTENTIONALLY further erode the hill for fun. I've seen entire cases of beer bottles left on the beach. I've had a fisherman's hook go in to my clothing on an errant cast. I've gotten snagged in the invisible fishing lines that drag across the surf at the water's edge. I've cut my feet on broken glass because I had the audacity to take my shoes off at the beach! I've seen entire Webber bbq's abandoned in the sand! And then there's the lagoon.....I've seen a lot with the lagoon. I grew up swimming in the lagoon as a toddler. The water was warm and shallow and "safe". It's where we who grew up in or near Muir Beach played. And today (even post restoration) is no different. I see parents pushing their kids on boogie boards. I see parents wading and walking up the lagoon in to the wetland with children because it's a fun adventure. I've seen, and just witnessed yesterday, an entire family trying to shortcut back to the parking lot by crossing over the newly restored wetland. NONE of these things involved dogs. NOT A SINGLE ONE.

Alternative "A" is the only acceptable alternative for Muir Beach. "E" could also work, but the GGNRA has dismissed this in your own SEIS, as supposedly unworkable because Muir Beach is too small for a ROLA. But then on page 113 of the SEIS, park visitors seeking off-leash opportunities are actually instructed to just head to Little Beach, which in the GGNRA's alternative "F" becomes a de facto ROLA! The SEIS doesn't tell visitors that they will be crawling across private property to get to Little Beach unless the tide is low. Simply outrageous and unacceptable!! I've brought this up to park staff repeatedly, since 2011. No fewer than 3 times. And I was and continue to be told that it will be removed. But it doesn't matter. I've got the printed copy and I've given it to a lawyer, so even if you remove it from the next version of the plan, it's clear and undeniable that its inclusion was definitely part of your planning PROCESS and presented to the public all through that process.

Little Beach doesn't belong to the GGNRA, so how can you cite it and establish a use for it in your SEIS??? How can you suggest something so impactful on our community and beach without any consideration of impacts on the surrounding communities??? Without a single impact study??? I'm pretty sure you can't, and so are the lawyers I've spoken to. So is the County of Marin. And so is the Muir Beach Community Services District. The SEIS has no impact studies for turning Little Beach in to a de facto ROLA, and it also has no impact studies for an outright ban of dogs on Muir Beach, which would force all people with dogs in to a tiny neighborhood beach that has no parking, no bathrooms, no trash and no

maintenance by the County in any way. The street that accesses Little Beach, Sunset Way, is not even County-maintained! Therefore, any alternative that either requires leashes for Muir Beach, or outright bans dogs on Muir Beach will have a dramatic impact on Little Beach and the surrounding community. You can probably count on the fact that the GGNRA will incur a lawsuit over this issue.

In the SEIS, the only alternatives are A, "No Action", or to establish a ROLA at the South end of Muir Beach or consider allowing off-leash access at the surf line and on wet sand, and require leashes on the dry sand.

The GGNRA could actually try to be a partner to the beach itself and the surrounding community, instead of to the Parks Conservancy and Audubon Society, by coming up with solutions that help all users coexist. Try putting actual dog waste bags in the empty dispenser in the lot. And try making better signage letting people know all the rules. Inform and educate people, and then enforce the rules. The NPS has not provided a single ranger or staffer on the beach to make sure the restored wetland is properly cared for since the beach re-opened. I just witnessed, not more than a few hours ago, a family of three, without any dog, marching over all three fences to use the bushes as a latrine. The GGNRA should try and make things work, not spend so much money and drama pretending to prove that things aren't working. You can't not enforce laws, and then say that we need stricter ones. Enforce the laws from the 1979 Pet Policy!!

Muir Beach is a vibrant community and beloved beach and hiking area. It is a favorite portion of the GGNRA for many. It is HOME for many. It is NOT a National Park by definition. It's an extremely accessible beach used by many people- -locals, travelers and weekenders alike. It's not remote, nor is it a wilderness. We are 20 minutes from the Golden Gate Bridge! The NPS needs to come up with better alternatives, that respect the surrounding community and the needs of the people who rely on the GGNRA for what it was established for: OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES. The SEIS tries pretty hard to remove the "recreation" part of the mission, and that makes it a non-starter. And that is why I support only the "No Action" alternatives for Muir Beach and the Marin Headlands.

Sincerely,

Laura Pandapas  
Muir Beach CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5222	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:50:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello, and thank you for providing this website for comments on this important project.				

I would like to begin by saying that I am an animal lover and advocate. I am a former cat and dog owner. I do not have an issue with dogs: I am not afraid of them (in general), and in fact would have my own if I had time in the day to devote to a dog's care.

That being said, I am also a DAILY visitor to Ocean Beach, and am dismayed by what I very frequently

see there. I live in the Outer Sunset, (Judah/44th Ave) and going to walk along the beach in the morning or evening (or both) is routine for me. And despite the signage at the entrance to Ocean Beach (where Judah St. would terminate) re: the Snowy Plover habitat, dogs on leash at this part of Ocean Beach are the exception and not the rule.

Dogs absolutely love the beach: they are often not under voice control because they are so excited to be running in the dunes and along or in the water. And many, many times, I have seen dogs chasing the birds at the edge of the water, while the dog owners do nothing to control the dog's behavior. And many times, I have politely asked the dog owners to control or leash their dog, and am met with indifference, or "this is the first time he's ever done this" (followed by inaction), or occasional, grudging leashing of the dog.

I am not a cop. I don't want to tell people what to do especially when they are enjoying themselves. But the flagrant disregard for the needs of both people and wildlife, not to mention other dogs, is shocking to me. It really seems that the fact that there is an endangered species that needs protection has absolutely no bearing on the "needs" of the dogs and their owners.

Here's what I have regularly observed: Dogs chase birds. Off-leash dogs menace other dogs. They defecate and urinate wherever they choose, often while the owner isn't watching. The owner then doesn't pick up the waste. Dogs chase the occasional horse and rider. They bother people who aren't fond of dogs, as well as small children, who then learn to be afraid of all dogs.

It is NOT a crime to not love dogs, or not want them disturbing you. But many dog owners act as though the only thing that matters to anyone is the "right" of their dog to "run free". But we live in a civilized society. There are rules and regulations we all must follow in order for society to function properly. Consideration for the world around us is a crucial component of a functional, engaged society and citizenry. We all deserve to be treated with respect. It is, in the end, disrespectful toward our fellow citizens, toward nature, and toward our beloved pets to allow dogs to roam at will. Because the will of a dog is unpredictable, despite the protestations to the contrary by its civilized owner.

I do not know how the Park Service intends to police the Beach, but I wish that there was more enforcement of already existing regulations. I'm tired of having to speak up for the Plover, only to be met with scorn. And as San Francisco's population density increases, the number of off-leash dogs grows, and the enjoyment of the Beach for many is diminished.

Again, thank you for opening up comments to the public. I know that the Park Service wants to do the right thing by everyone concerned, and I hope they will especially consider all those that cannot protect themselves, or voice their needs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5223	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	DALY CITY, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:51:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Letter #2				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5224	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127-1918				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:51:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

My dog takes me to the park. For over 20 years, I have enjoyed the off-leash areas at Fort Funston almost daily, with occasional visits to Crissy Field, Lands End and beaches and trails in the Marin Headlands. (I used to walk at Ocean Beach before the ban.) Without off-leash recreation, I probably wouldn't have visited these parks more than 3-4 times a year. The opportunity to walk and enjoy nature with my dog is keeping this senior citizen fit and socially connected hundreds of other people who come to the park for off-leash recreation. I'm glad my tax dollars provide for recreation in the GGNRA.

I am strongly against the Preferred Alternative. Please support the 1979 Pet Policy, and traditional off-leash areas in San Mateo GGNRA. If anything, areas for off-leash recreation should be expanded rather than reduced if more and more people are enjoying it.

I almost feel it is useless to submit any public comment on the SDEIS, since the GGNRA failed to address the previous substantive comments submitted in favor of off-leash, in favor by an overwhelming majority. The well-researched submission from Crissy Field Dog, SFDOG and others were brushed off. So much of the GGNRA's DEIS response referred back to their faulty errors in the original document, and only a few insignificant changes were made.

(And please stop saying "the GGNRA is the only national park that permits off-leash dogs," and imply that we should feel privileged to have a crumb of acreage. Howard Levitt has already been corrected on this error. Unless things have changed in the last 2 years, there are several national parks which have off-leash areas for hunting dogs. I don't think anyone is advocating for hunting in the GGNRA. We just want to walk. )

Is there ANY amount of public comment or presentation of fact that would change the preference of the GGNRA? I haven't seen evidence of this. However, since any lack of comment on the SDEIS might be considered as support for the minor/insignificant modification made, I'm submitting comment....again.

Below are some of the reasons I oppose the Preferred Alternative and support expanded off-leash

recreational access.

- -Packing off-leash recreation into small spaces will create unpleasant, crowded "dog runs." Many people, me included, will simply stop going to legal off-leash areas. Will people simply stop walking their dog off-leash? Some may, but many others will probably crowd into city parks. And some will simply walk in areas of the GGNRA where they are not likely to encounter a ranger/citation.

- -Off-leash recreation is currently enjoyed by a diversity of people, e.g. young & old, rich and poor, able-bodied and differently-abled. Additionally, unlike many other GGNRA/NPS activities, dog walkers include many people of color. Spend weekend at Fort Funston and you'll see a wide variety of folks. One might contrast this to the demographic of some other outdoor recreational activities. (Do not count student "volunteers" who are in weeding the park for community service credits.) Although some opponents of off-leash dog walking will say "\*seniors & children & various ethnicities, etc. are afraid/avoid dogs," note there are hundreds of seniors & children and people of color who LIKE off-leash dogs. The NPS doesn't even have to advertise or do outreach to get hundreds of people to Fort Funston, a typically cold, windswept park.

(\*Sometimes opponents of off-leash say that people don't go to the park because there are so many dogs; implying people would go to the parks if dogs weren't there. However, there are many parks with outstanding flora and fauna that do not allow dogs, e.g. in San Mateo County there is San Bruno Mountain, and Edgewood Park. And most of the time, these parks are empty. I visit these parks during "high season" e.g. wildflower blooms, but I always go with other people because I don't feel safe in these empty parks. Where are all the dog-avoidant people?)

- -The GGNRA is an urban park and one of its purposes is to provide recreational access. The Preferred Alternative needs to give weight to recreational needs of the SF Bay Area. This is not Yosemite.

- -The GGNRA has failed to support its Preferred Alternative with facts. There is a glaring lack of scientific studies measuring the impact of off-leash recreation on wildlife. The GGNRA's fight against off-leash recreation has been going on for more than a decade, i.e. plenty of time to do scientific site-specific studies. Instead of vague nightmarish fears about what dogs MIGHT do, there needs to be facts documenting the impact of off-leash recreation as well as a variety of strategies to minimize any unacceptable impacts, if found. For example, there needs to be a study documenting the population of snowy plovers, whether there has been a decline relative to other sites. Did the Ocean Beach population of plover increase when off-leash was banned 11 out of 12 months? Are plover populations at non-dog beaches (Half Moon Bay) thriving compared to Ocean Beach? Or note, the Audubon representative said there are no longer quail at Fort Funston because of the dogs. Are there quail in no-dogs-allowed sites in San Francisco? The quail at the Botanical Garden have disappeared, in spite of having no dogs (and even being provided with a California Native Plants habitat.). Dogs are a convenient scapegoat.

I believe the GGNRA rep stated that it will cost two million a year to enforce the Preferred Alternative. If there is money, why not use it to do study or to design strategies that won't turn away thousands of people from supporting the NPS? The GGNRA might use some money to administer a program to educate dog walkers about responsible off-leash recreation. Additionally, the money could be used to enforce the current laws about littering, lack of voice control, etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5225    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Sanfrancisco , CA 94108  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:52:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5226    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:52:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5227    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:54:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly disagree with the proposed Draft Dog Management Plan, as defined in the Fall 2013 Plan / EIS. The NPS does not demonstrate a need for action. In the Plans pre-amble, the Plan argues for action because the parks resources and values, as defined by the parks enabling legislation, could be compromised without action. NPS does not make a compelling case that the existing 1979 Pet Policy is at odds with the recreational mandate of the GGNRA. The 1,504 page Plan presents general surveys and highlights what could and might happen. It does not make a reasonable case for change. In the Alternative F presented in the GGNRA, the Plan is applying a more restrictive Dog policy to each and every site within the recreation area. This is not a balanced approach to dog management; it represents a heavy handed rollback of the recreational mandate of the GGNRA uniformly across the park.

GGNRA is a recreation area, and not a park. The 1975 agreement for the lands transfer from the city of SF to the GGNRA explicitly called out for the need to utilize the resources of the GGNRA in a manner that will provide for recreational and educational opportunities. The Plan argues that recreation was not explicitly defined with the transfer of the lands from San Francisco to the GGNRA. Yet the GGNRA Citizens Advisory Commission issued a detailed Pet Policy in 1979 that very clearly codified the recreational purpose of the GGNRA with respect to dog use. The 1979 Policy is a balanced dog management plan that is already in place and proven to have been effective. Over 95% of the GGNRA is off limits to dogs. In the areas that allow dogs and off-leash dog activity, humans, dogs and the environment have successfully co-existed for nearly forty years.

The proposed Alternative F represents a heavy handed unilateral rollback of the recreational mandate that created the GGNRA and the need for the plan is not supported by the data. There is no compelling need for action, and no ability to force action without countering the recreation mandate of the GGNRA.

I personally invite those of you that are reviewing Alternative F to come to San Francisco, visit each individual site covered by the plan, and make an assessment as to whether the nearly 40 years of precedent in the GGNRA requires change. I think when you evaluate each site individually, you will find that the status quo is quite successful and delivers on the recreational mandate of the GGNRA, especially given its urban location.

A few comments on the Plans specifics:

The NPS cites a very general survey of public opinion on restricting dogs at the GGNRA conducted in 2002 by Northern Arizona University as support for its Plan. In the survey, 53% of respondents stated that they opposed allowing off-leash walking in GGNRA sites, while 40% were in favor. The survey is too general to be of use. The GGNRA spans 117 square miles and contains 24 defined sites with dog walking / off-leash dog walking. This is the equivalent to asking if survey participants like Democrats in general, and then inferring that their response applies to each Democratic member of Congress equally. The Plan uses this faulty logic as a justification to make very specific changes to each of the 24 sites with the GGNRA.

The NPS cites Environmental Justice as a reason for implementing the Plan, but the survey data presented by the NPS indicates that this rationale is not based in fact. Within the flawed 2002 phone survey, African-Americans, Asians, Caucasians, and Hispanics all show the same general support for off-leash walking (37-44%, with African-Americans showing the most support). A separate NPS visitor survey cited later in the report shows no measurable difference in the opinion between Caucasians and Asians on dogs, and no issues cited by Black/African Americans:

Visitors were asked during the survey if they had any suggestions on how their experience at the park site could be improved, allowing for open-ended answers. Of the respondents, 3.3 percent noted that dogs should be kept on leash, visitors should be cited for off-leash dogs, or that there should be no dogs (Tierney et al. 2009, 69). White respondents suggested that dogs be kept on leash 3.4 percent of the time,



and Asian respondents suggested this 3.2 percent of the time (Tierney et al. 2009, 75). This concern was not cited by Black/African American, Native Hawaiian, or American Indian respondents who were asked for suggestions on how to improve the park experience (Tierney et al. 2009, 75).

More importantly, only 3.3% of all survey respondents cited an issue with dogs at the GGNRA, or 96.3% did not.

The GGNRA cannot proceed with its broad based plan without conducting a survey on each of the 24 sites under review.

To recap, the NPS 2002 survey is too general to be applied to 24 different sites at the GGNRA. No strong racial differences are found within surveys, and over 96% of surveyed visitors on site indicate no issue with dogs at the GGNRA. The survey data does not support the claim of a need for action.

Instead of reviewing survey data, let's look at reported dog incidents. If there is a problem with dogs within the GGNRA, the NPS dog incident data should contain a record of the issues. Between 2001 and 2011, the GGNRA recorded 4,932 dog-related incidents, or 448/year or less than two per day across all 80,000 acres and 24 dog sites in the GGNRA. The GGNRA sees over 13,000,000 visitors per year and yet only records 448 incidents per year. This is hardly indicative of a problem, and in fact proves that the 1979 Pet Policy works. Further, the NPS recorded 45,700 total incidents over the same 11 year period. Dog-related incidents only make-up approximately 10% of the total. The GGNRA is not recommending limiting camping or hiking, even though these activities generated several times the number of incidents as dog and their owners.

Over the 2008-2011 period, the NPS recorded a total of three incidents of dogs damaging vegetation and fifteen incidents of dogs disturbing wildlife. These numbers are recorded in a period of over 40,000,000 visitors to the GGNRA, again hardly indicative of an issue.

Looking at specific sites in the Plan:

#### Muir Beach

From 2008-2011 (four years), the NPS recorded 24 total incidents (averaging 6 per year, or one every two months). Over this period, the NPS recorded only 1 wildlife disturbance and only 6 violations of possessing a pet in the closed areas nearby the beach (or less than 2 per year). These figures indicate that the current policy is working and that there is no need to implement a more restrictive policy to address perceived wildlife issues at the site.

#### Rodeo Beach

From 2008-2011 (four years), the NPS recorded 30 total incidents (averaging about 7 per year, or one every month and a half). Over this period, the NPS recorded only 2 wildlife disturbances and only 7 violations of possessing a pet in the closed areas nearby the beach (or about 2 per year). These figures indicate that the current policy is working and that there is no need to implement a more restrictive policy to address perceived issues at the site.

#### Baker Beach

From 2008-2011 (four years), the NPS recorded 86 total incidents (averaging about 21 per year, or two per month). Over this period, the NPS recorded only 48 off-leash violations and 19 incidents of dogs in closed areas, totally 67 incidents. Since the beach is open to off-leash dogs, by definition these incidents did not occur on the beach. Removing the off-leash/closed area incidents, only 19 incidents occurred that could have taken place on the beach (less than 5 per year, or less than one every two months). Alternative F proposes to close the beach to off-leash dogs, but the incident data suggests that there is no issue on site.

#### Lands End

From 2008-2011 (four years), the NPS recorded 10 total incidents (averaging about 2.5 per year, or one every five or so months). Alternative F will take what is currently a voice control area and severely limit access to dogs. The data suggests that there is no measurable issue with dogs within the site, and no change is required.

Ocean Beach:

The NPS Plan states that Compliance with the current dog walking regulation at Ocean Beach is low. The NPS own data shows that this is not true. Ocean Beach is one of the most frequently visited sites within the GGNRA, and the incident rate is low given the number of visitors to the site.

From the NPS plan:

During the GGNRA Dog Walking Satisfaction Visitor Study (NPS 2012a), when dog walkers were asked which site at GGNRA they visit most, 5.7 percent indicated Ocean Beach, making it the fourth most frequently visited GGNRA site by dog walkers (NPS 2012a, Appendix A: 6). Ocean Beach was also indicated as the second most frequently visited GGNRA site by non dog walkers during the survey (18 percent) (NPS 2012a, Appendix A: 69).

Despite these usage levels, from 2008-2011 (four years), the NPS only recorded 729 violations of the SPPA leash restrictions (averaging about 180 per year, or 15 per month, or less than one per day). Thus, the second most visited site in the GGNRA is creating one incident every two days. This is hardly indicative of a problem.

In summary, the NPS own data shows that dog incidents are rare, especially in the context of total usage levels. Human related incidents far outnumber (9 to 1) Dog related incidents. The NPS needs to consider the data on a site by site level as it evaluates the new plan.

I wanted to add a couple of comments on usage at two sites: the Coastal Trail and Baker Beach.

Alternative F proposes closing the Coastal Trail to dogs and closing Baker Beach to off-leash dogs. The incident data cited above shows that no measurably problem exists. Further, the NPS own assessment indicates that dog usage is low. On the Marin Headlands Trails, Park staff estimate that the Coastal Trail is used by about 10 dog walking visitors per week, and use of the Miwok Trail section varies from 1 dog walking visitor per day on weekdays to 25 per day on the weekend. At Baker Beach, Park Staff states that Baker Beach receives low to moderate visitor use by dog walkers and low to moderate visitor use by beachgoers and picnickers on weekends and holidays. I am one of the dog walking users at both sites. Alternative F seeks to curtail dog activity at both sites, but it is already limited and generates no measurable issues. There is no compelling reason to make changes to the policy at these sites. I encourage the commission to take a closer look at these two areas and maintain access consistent with the recreation mandate behind the creation of the park.

I dont see how the NPS can, with Alternative F, conclude in all cases at all sites to reduce access and reduce recreation opportunities. It seems strange that in no case at any of the 24 sites did the NPS conclude that it made sense to increase access and increase dog-related recreation opportunities. To me, this shows a bias in the process.

With Alternative F, the NPS is ignoring 40 years of successful precedent, backtracking against the recreational mandate of the GGNRA and the conditions of the land transfer from San Francisco to the NPS, and implementing a heavy handed policy that is uniformly reducing access at all 24 sites in every case. Site level data at Baker Beach, Muir Beach, and Lands End show that there is no dog issue. Site level data at Ocean Beach shows that the current policy works.

There is no need for action, no crisis captured in the data across all sites, and no major issue raised in public surveys. The 1979 Pet Policy has proven to be effective and captures the original recreation mandate of the area. My family, and many families in the Bay Area, utilize the GGNRA with our dogs in a safe and responsible manner. I encourage you to keep this recreational opportunity open to all. I encourage you to make the reasonable decision on each site, evaluated on an individual basis in the context of recorded data. I encourage you to personally visit each site and see how well the status quo is functioning today, especially at Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Muir Beach, Lands End, and on the Coastal Trail.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5228	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:54:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco. This City is known for its high quality public open spaces that integrate the urban area and its residents with nature. There are many examples of such spaces in the City, but the GGNRA is perhaps the most emblematic. The GGNRA is a huge asset to the City as a place for humans (as well as their four-legged companions) to experience the outdoors in a variety of ways.

The current draft plan is far too restrictive and would negatively impact many residents who currently enjoy access to the GGNRA. Recreation is a vital component of a vibrant urban area and we should preserve and expand recreation opportunities, not limit them, if we hope to create a more livable City. I recommend that the plan maintain the access that is permitted today for humans and dogs alike. A critical component is the preservation of off-lease areas in Crissy Field. The vast majority of people try to be responsible in park areas and treat them with respect; the Park Service should come up with a plan that uses effective tools like education, signage and well-designed trails and areas, so recreation is preserved and conflicts are minimized.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Lily Gray

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5229    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:54:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Shana Abell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5230    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:55:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I harshly dis-agree with the Recent proposed GGNRA much too strict dog access. The vast majority of us Dog owners are extremely responsible and bring our dogs to to enjoy the GGNRA areas allowed for dogs in Marin County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5231    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley , CA 94706  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:55:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On January 23, 2014, a gloriously sunny day, I took an afternoon walk from Divisadero St. in SF, west along Crissy Field and the Golden Gate Promenade to Fort Point and back again. During this walk, I got to see some of the problems with the GGNRA's current dog management policy. I have not had time to read most of the proposed Dog Management Plan, but I provide my comments based on this walk. The observations and experiences during this walk are similar to many other walks taken at this location and others covered by the proposal.

In the parts of the walk closest to parking, there appeared to be many commercial dog-walkers, almost all of whom had 6 dogs, so that, in the vicinity of many of these groups of dogs, especially along the water, the barking was so loud, it was like being in a kennel. This racket was not at all what I was looking for when I took this walk.

I saw many dogs with leashes attached to their collars, but no one holding the leashes. These dogs were running around dragging their leashes. This is hardly "on leash." The other thing I observed was the use of very long retractable leashes so that the walkers appeared to be as much as 20 feet from the dog. This is a problem for a person whose strategy for dealing with unknown dogs is to give them wide berth. With a leash of this length, I end off the path, even if it is wide.

As is often the case in an area frequented by dogs and their walkers, there were many plastic bags containing dog poop, presumably waiting to be retrieved on the return walk. But the rest of us don't want to look at these brightly colored plastic bags along the beach. Dog walkers should be required to immediately put these deposits into some container that they carry so that they don't trash up this beautiful natural area, even temporarily.

In my experience, voice and sight control is not a form of control that a person, such as myself, who doesn't like to be approached, jumped on, barked at in very close range, or otherwise harassed by unknown dogs can count on. A person walking on the beach has no way of knowing which dogs on voice control are really on voice control and which are simply running around without leashes. As an example, while I was walking, an unleashed dog, which appeared to be part pit bull, ran out of the dunes, coming to a halt about 2 feet from me. For about a minute, it stood there, barking and growling and looking at me in a threatening manner. I froze, my heart racing, looking in vain for someone whose voice would control this dog and get it away from me, but there was no one in the vicinity. Eventually the dog ran beyond me toward the ocean and I was able to continue on. In a minute, two people, who appeared to be looking for and calling a dog by name, came out of the dunes. I asked them if they were looking for a dog of this

dog's description. When they said they were, and I told them about the encounter I had with this dog, they told me that was impossible, that their dog had never threatened anyone, etc. and they accused me of threatening their dog! I do not support the use of voice control in any of the areas under discussion in the Dog Management Plan. Dogs should be leashed at all times, except in a "Dog Park." I don't believe the National Park Service should be in the business of providing dog parks.

Dog owners consistently maintain that they get a bum rap as a result of a very small proportion of them who are irresponsible. That may be, but there is a lack of resources for sufficient enforcement of the large population of dogs and their walkers that are drawn to some of our national parks, especially those in the San Francisco Bay Area (e.g., the Presidio, Marin Headlands, Muir Beach, and others). Furthermore, the irresponsible owners know that there are insufficient enforcement resources and that the probability of enforcement action is very remote. Given inadequate resources and the commonly stated view that the irresponsible owners are a distinct minority, it is surprising that I have never seen a dog owner step in when a dog owner or other person's dog is misbehaving. Given the inadequate resources for enforcement of dog regulations, other people are on their own to deal with whatever comes up. Sometimes, I choose to avoid certain areas with a significant canine population. But I, and others who simply want a peaceful walk in a beautiful natural setting, should not have to manage problems with dogs and their owners by giving the space over to them.

Finally, the need to limit dogs in these areas is often stated in terms of their effect on wildlife, which can be considerable. What this analysis seems to miss is the effects of dogs on other people who are drawn to these areas for peace and quiet, to take in the incredible vistas, to watch birds, and to commune with nature. For example, if there's a bird or birds in the vicinity of a dog or group of dogs, the latter are often chasing the former, which is a hardly what you're after if you come to the park in order to observe birds and other wildlife in nature.

The NPS is to be commended for soliciting comments and inviting community participation in developing this plan over many years. Thank you for the incredible stamina and perseverance you have demonstrated in crafting a plan that is consistent with the mission of the National Park Service and that accommodates the needs of wildlife, these special natural environments, and park users. I look forward to the resulting plan and its implementation at last.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5232	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94158 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 22:56:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Fort Funston is so precious. Please don't change it. The dog park by my house is like a big litter box surrounded by cyclone fencing. It is such a treat to go to Fort Funston and hang with all the happy hounds. It is such a happy place - please don't take it away.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5233	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5234    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:58:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Claire Musngi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5235    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 22:59:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA was set up for recreation of Bay Area residents, not as a National Park and certainly not for conservation. As such, National Park rules such as dogs in parking lots do not apply. Furthermore there is legal precedent for off-leash recreation, especially up to the high-tide line on beaches where the land belong to all Californians. The historical use of these lands has been for military purposes for several centuries, so continued human and pet use is consistent with historical use.

---

Considering the commercial use of the Presidio in particular, it is inconsistent to declare current non-commercial areas as natural areas when they would be converted to commercial use should the opportunity arise. Either declare the entire area to be natural lands and turn the GGNRA into a museum, or open it up for development of recreation like significant parts of the Presidio.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5236    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94401

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5237    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:01:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To: GGNRA Regarding Dog Management Plan

I am writing to express my disappointment with the latest GGNRA Supplemental Dog Management Plan that does not allow for any off leash dog walking areas in San Mateo County.

I live in Montara and have been walking my dog in the open space next to Montara and Farallone View School for many years. It is a wonderful community of hikers/walkers, mountain bikers, equestrians and dogs who for decades have shared the land and treated each other with respect and courtesy.

I agree with Jackie Speiers comment at her community forum in Stern Grove that in this area of innovators, creators and entrepreneurs, we can do a better job developing a plan that allows for, and balances, recreation and preservation in the vast GGNRA lands.

I did not see evidence presented of the need to remove dogs from the Rancho or evidence to ban off leash areas. I also would expect any evidence of detrimental effect to be considered alongside evidence of the benefits of recreation and outdoor enjoyment for families with dogs. The GGNRA purpose is for recreation in this urban setting as much as for preservation. Dogs and their families are already restricted to 1% of the GGNRA lands. It is not equitable to further restrict and target dog walkers.

There have been many suggestions on how to keep dog access while protecting sensitive habitat and these suggestions should actually be evaluated. I hope GGNRA will seriously work with the community on the

proposals being suggested in numerous forums and letters, so that dog access and identified off leash areas on the Rancho and in San Mateo County GGRNA will be allowed.

Regards,  
ShellySmith Montara, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5238    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:01:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog owning parents with children. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that one of my family's favorite activities will be swiped off our "Fun to-do List".

We are an active family with an active lifestyle and much of our lifestyle includes our dog. Our household is happy hugely in part to our dog and limiting access to our dog's favorite playgrounds (Fort Funston and Ocean Beach) will be devastating to us all. Especially to our Jack Russell mix, Hank.

If radical changes are made- my family and our dog won't be able to have the bonding time and exercise like we do on the GGNRA lands at our local, fenced-in dog park. Nothing is quite as fulfilling as having my family together, Hank included, out for a day of hiking, observing and learning about the great environment around us.

Please consider keeping the 1979 Pet Policy - it keeps all points of nature and recreation in harmony. It ensures my dog and any other future dogs my family has; will have their space now and for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5239    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:04:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The current changes to the dog management plan undermine the ability of the GGNRA to meet its goals and objectives. Parks are not a place for pets, and the GGNRA, with all the sensitive habitats found therein, should not allow any dog walking, on leash or not.

I am well aware that the GGNRA is under extreme pressure to bow to the requests of dog owners and dog walkers, but I see no reason why the public must suffer because of the unreasonable and irrational demands of dog owners and dog walkers. These lands are fragile, and at much effort and cost, the GGNRA is trying to restore and maintain these habitats and historic areas. Allowing dogs anywhere in the GGNRA completely undermines the ability of the GGNRA to do its job or meets its objectives.

Moreover, personally, the presence of dogs completely destroys my ability to enjoy the potential beauty and serenity that I seek in the GGNRA. I frequently walk and hike at Lands End, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Crissy Field, and other areas within the GGNRA. I am never able to enjoy any of these walks and hikes for long, because I always encounter dogs, very frequently off leash. No matter how prominent the



signs are stating dogs can be on leash only, there are always people who let their dogs off leash. I have never taken a hike or walk anywhere within the GGNRA in which I didn't encounter off leash dogs. This breaks my heart, and causes me much personal stress. People simply do not obey the rules.

And dogs on leash, though better than off leash, are still extremely problematic. Their waste pollutes the environment, and they walk on plants and soil near trail edges. These are not minor problems for the environment. In addition, their very presence destroys the character of the environment and undermines my ability to enjoy the GGNRA.

Because of the presence of dogs, everyone is forced interact with them or to take in their behavior as part of the environment. Dogs are dogs, and they always interact with other dogs, other animals, and humans. And often they bark, fight other dogs, sniff or approach people. Visitors to the GGNRA should not be forced to have these experiences.

Dogs do not belong in park lands. They are not a form of recreation. Dogs are pets, and though I am aware that dog owners have responsibilities to care for their animals, public money should not have to be spent to support their care of their animals. And the public should not be forced to encounter their pets in park lands. I am very angry and extremely sad that the current changes to the Dog Management Plan have resulted in the allowance of any dogs anywhere within the GGNRA.

I would ask that the NPS and GGNRA reconsider the changes to the plan, have courage, and forbid any dogs within the GGNRA so that they can focus their time and money on taking care of the area and fulfilling their objectives and responsibilities.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5240	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94111 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Self Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:05:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Look, I'm all for preserving the environment but the draft proposed is currently way too restrictive on dog walking.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5241	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:08:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog owner in SF, I place a high value on the open beaches which allow for open human and canine enjoyment along side and in awe of nature. As a strong environmentalist, I understand the environmental concerns the new plans endeavor to address, however I feel the current system is highly functional and should not change. I vote in favor of option A and believe better enforcement and education around highly sensitive habitats will achieve all goals while still allowing the city's dogs to have a safe place to romp. I fear closure of the most frequented spaces would create a backlash elsewhere in a city which has long been friendly to man and beast, either packing smaller parks or making the city less desirable for those who want to live here. Please help the city's dogs and dog owners continue to enjoy GGNRA without further restrictions.				

---

Thank you,  
Amanda Serenyi, CPA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5242    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:10:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog parents. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my dog and I will be losing one of the many great reasons as to why we live here in the San Francisco Bay Area.

There is an estimated 120,000 dogs in the Bay Area. It's been stated since 2007, that dogs outnumber the amount of children in our community. This fact alone is reason enough to not deplete our use of the dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA.

Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on my dog and I, but our entire community. Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.

We've been coexisting fine all these years. Let's keep the 1979 Pet Policy. The policy's backbone is recreational and nature based. Nature and recreation are two things the Bay Area is made up of and should continue to be made up of.

sincerely,

david pham

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5243    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:11:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog owning parents with children. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that one of my family's favorite activities will be swiped off our "Fun to-do List".

We are an active family with an active lifestyle and much of our lifestyle includes our dog. Our household is happy hugely in part to our dog and limiting access to our dog's favorite playgrounds (I.E. Fort Funston, Muir Beach and Ocean Beach) will be devastating to us all. Especially to our (breed of dog) (name).

The points brought up in the SEIS are completely unjust for such a radical change to be made. My family and our dog won't be able to have the bonding time and exercise like we do on the GGNRA lands at our local, fenced-in dog park. Nothing is quite as fulfilling as having my family together, (your dog's name here) included, out for a day of hiking, observing and learning about the great environment around us.

Please consider keeping the 1979 Pet Policy - it keeps all points of nature and recreation in harmony. It ensures my dog and any other future dogs my family has; will have their space now and for years to come.

sincerely,

kimberly liao

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5244	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame , CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:11:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We need a safe environment where we can take our dogs to run and play off leash. Every dog parent needs to be responsible for their dogs behavior and clean up after their pet. Please don't take this away.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5245	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston for many years.				

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

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fenced-in areas are MORE likely to generate dog fights. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Frederick Leach

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5246	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:12:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Please don't ban the dogs. Marin county residents are doing an outstanding and much needed job in adopting unwanted dogs that the government shelters are currently killing, up to 6 million a year, which of course costs a bundle of cash, not to mention this and the toll on our sense of good. They need the beaches and trails to exercise their dogs, they are being environmentally considerate by adopting these dogs in the first place. This will take away the tools they need to care for the animals that our society has thrown away like trash. please consider allowing us to give them the exercise they need, whilst adhering to the wildlife issues, there has to be a compromise don't you agree??

Sincerely,

Deborah Birmingham

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5247	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:13:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I'm commenting on behalf of the non-dog owning parents with children. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my small, neighborhood parks (I.E. Insert park names here) will be over-run with people and their dogs.

Dog owners out of desperation will fill up already crowded dog parks if places like Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Rancho Corral de Tierra are cut off. I do not doubt that dog owners will not only fill the neighborhood parks, but also the baseball fields and school yards because of the lack of exercise space for their dogs.

From a parent's point of view, I find this plan unfair and biased. If my child's favorite playground was at risk of being torn down for unsupported scientific reasons, I too, would react much the same as the dog owners are.

This proposed plan poses many risks to not only dog folks but to all folks in my county.

I don't want to stop having to frequent my favorite parks with my children because of this drastic change proposed for GGNRA properties. Please consider keeping the 1979 Pet Policy - it's one of recreation, nature and comradery of all species. It ensures dogs will have their space and my children will have theirs now and for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5248    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Mark Pandapas and I have been a resident of Muir Beach for over 7 years. Our house sits directly above the beach, and we interact with the beach and witness the activity on the beach daily. In addition, we regularly hike with our dog on many of the Marin Headlands Trails mainly on the Coastal and Miwok Trails. My wife hikes the more remote trails alone and takes our dog along for her own security and safety.

I am writing to share my comments for the 2013 SEIS specifically pertaining to Muir Beach and the Marin Headlands Trails (Coastal Trail/fire road to Hill 88). I am deeply concerned that the preferred

---

alternative F will have devastating impact on the residents of Muir Beach and my family as we rely on the open space of the GGNRA everyday for exercise in the natural environment as this is literally both our front and backyard!

Comments to the 2011 DEIS were not adequately addressed and most criticisms and concerns expressed in all comments filed in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Our isolated Muir Beach community of some 150 houses is home to about 60 dogs, and is completely surrounded by a State Park and the GGNRA, with the nearest town a 20-minute drive on the twisty rural 2-lane coastal highway 1.

I strongly oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative F for Muir Beach and The Marin Headlands. I support Alternative A, the no-action alternative, or a revision to provide more access to GGNRA for people with dogs in Marin County. The current plan alternatives are too restrictive on dog walking in the areas that affect our small community and it does not protect and preserve the fundamental values for which the GGNRA was established in terms of recreational values. This plan ought to be about stewardship of a park that is situated within an urban environment. The SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

It is key note that the both the Marin County Board of Supervisors as well as our own Muir Beach Community Services District have passed resolutions opposing and recommending modifications to the GGNRA's SEIS, as they recognize that these lands are intertwined with vibrant communities such as Muir Beach.

I am concerned about direct impacts to the community of Muir Beach.

Page 1104, 'Limiting dog walking areas would reduce these (Muir Beach residents) visitors enjoyment of this site. Some visitors in this user group may prefer to find a different park in which to exercise their dogs off leash. This is no easy proposition for residents of Muir Beach, and this dismissive statement undermines the credibility of the SEIS.

The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force our community into their cars to drive a minimum of 20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to Muir Beach is already choked and congested on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA. Since the new parking lot opened this year, a large portion of that traffic and user group is now descending upon Muir Beach. The plan further suggests that those who want an off-leash beach experience for their dog can go to Rodeo Beach. This change would force Muir Beach residents into cars to drive 45 minutes on the congested 2-lane highway, then the freeway and then another 2-lane rural road for an off-leash experience that currently exists literally steps in front of their homes. The 45 minute drive is assuming that there is no traffic congestion. On a crowded day when visitorship to Muir Woods tops 5,000 people, it takes residents nearly double the time to travel out of the community. It will be devastating to our community of 60 dogs and the environment!

On Page 114, the document calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as there have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the 'off-limits creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

There are not any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies (as required by law) included in the plan to support such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA has the burden of proof to justify this drastic reduction in access to public land before making any changes.

These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. The estimated 60,000 dogs in Marin County will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves - it passes the buck to neighborhoods, towns, cities and the county.

The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ from other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day! In fact as I write this letter, there are 7 people wondering around the dunes!

Regarding Visitor Use and Experience, on pages 1090 -1091 it states that 'The practice by local residents of allowing their dogs to roam the beach unsupervised would be addressed by law enforcement staff; allowing a dog to be off-leash would be citable. Adverse impacts would be expected for visitors and local residents who enjoy seeing and playing with dogs off leash. Dog owners may also feel that their pets are not receiving adequate exercise when restrained on a 6-foot leash. In addition, it would be difficult for some visitors, particularly those that are disabled or elderly with mobility issues, to adequately control their dogs on-leash. Having dogs on-leash also limits the exercise dogs can obtain to the exercise abilities of their owners, which may not be sufficient. Some visitors in this user group may find a different park to exercise their dogs off leash.

This misleading paragraph implies that all local residents allow their dogs to roam the beach unsupervised. This is a false and unsupported statement. Residents legally allow their dogs off-leash, and these dogs are supervised. Off-leash does not mean unsupervised.

In addition, Muir Beach is home to several elderly residents, most of whom own dogs and walk them on the Beach. The requirement to have a dog on-leash may diminish their ability to adequately exercise their pets and themselves. The same with residents with mobility issues. This is unjust.

On page 113 there is discussion regarding the planned changes to Muir Beach including the new footpath to the beach and fencing along the dunes. These have been installed. It is interesting to note that the report states that 'The fencing would act as a visible barrier, but would not completely exclude dogs from the area, as this type of fencing would be inappropriate at Muir Beach and not sustainable due to tidal action. Allowing on leash dog walking on the beach and installing visual barriers would enable the park to manage the area in order to restore, protect, and sustain the wetlands, creeks, dunes and lagoon. Allowing 'on-leash dog walking on the beach would protect visitor experience and enhance visitor safety.

The dune fences have been installed and block access to the dunes and wetland area for dogs, unless the dog enters the creek to cross to the county beach on the other side (as the SEIS directs dog owners to do (page 114) , or an owner is in the area with their dog. On most days, I watch from my living room window as people without dogs disregard the fence and signage and enter the areas behind the fence anyway.

Regarding safety, the plan states that the cumulative impacts for Alternative A are the same as for

Alternative F: Negligible. Page 315, Table 14 indicates a total of only 24 dog-related incidents in Muir Beach over a 4-year period from 2008 - 2011. We have hundreds of visitors visiting the beach each weekend. On holidays and warm days the beach is packed and cars park along the highway and along community roads. On page 1253, Muir Beach Alternative A, Conclusion Table the language states 'Therefore, the cumulative impacts to the health and safety of park staff and visitors under this alternative are expected to be negligible.

To conclude, page 1085, 'Muir Beach receives heavy visitation by beachgoers and walkers on the weekends and moderate to high use on the weekdays. Overall, the number of leash law violations is low for this site, with only nine occurring in 2008 through 2011; no dog bites or attacks were reported during this period (table 9).

So why the concern over safety?

I have concern over my wife being on trails without our dog and feeling unsafe due to predators, both animal and human.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Educational signage and enforcement be used to change behavior with respect to sensitive habitat, refuse and visitor and staff interaction.

The plan calls out a budget to educate and enforce. Why not utilize this budget to educate and enforce the current rules and regulations that are currently not adequately enforced.

I watch each day as people traipse through the newly restored and fenced delicate dune and riparian areas. Children play in the lagoon and creek. Bonfires burn after hours. People camp in the dunes. Litter is strewn across the beach and left at the bridge entrance on the beach. I carry home an armful of trash each morning when I walk the dog. Where is the park maintenance staff to clean up the litter every day? The dispenser by the footbridge should have signage notifying owners and be filled with plastic bags, and in addition a disposal bin could be placed for pet waste.

Trail/Fire road access from Muir Beach to nearest town

Residents and their dogs need access on foot out of Muir Beach to Mill Valley (the nearest town) for recreation and safety. Two trail suggestions:

A) Muir Beach - Coastal trail & Coastal Fire Road - Coyote Ridge  
Fire Road - Miwok Fire Road.

B) Muir Beach - Diaz Ridge - Miwok Fire Road.

Both would connect to Homestead trails and allow access to Mill Valley.

Create On-leash Loop Trail

Provide a loop trail as opposed to dead end trails to allow for a recreational experience for the user. We desperately need a loop from Muir Beach and a suggested loop is:

Muir Beach - Coastal - Coyote Ridge - Middle Green Gulch or

Green Gulch Fire Road - Muir Beach

This loop is about 3 miles and would provide excellent exercise for both owner and dogs. Green Gulch fire road or middle Green Gulch trail would be the link required to make the loop.

Fire Road Access



The GGNRA fire roads are on average 12 feet wide allowing for a variety of users, including those with dogs, to safely share the road and are accessible from many neighborhoods and locations outside the GGNRA, encouraging people to walk directly into the recreation area instead of driving to the GGNRA or to other park spaces.

## IN CONCLUSION

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the GGNRA. There are many trails and areas that currently do not allow dogs. These are areas that users who would like a dog-free experience can access. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. The GGNRA SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. To remove recreational access to these lands is not substantiated.

The GGNRA was established by involving communities, communities such as Muir Beach, to provide recreational activities for residents in the densely populated Bay area. This is not a pristine wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. It is a designed landscape with many constructed environments including the new parking lot in Muir Beach and the reconstructed wetlands. The GGNRA requires a different management strategy than a traditional National Park. While a keystone objective for the GGNRA is 'recreation, it does not appear at all in the plan's objectives, nor is it referred to as one of the park's resources and values.

The GGNRA is unique. There is no other National Park quite like it. Its mandate states that the Park possesses 'outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning. This dog plan should support these values and not diminish them.

Marin residents rely upon this open space to enjoy a balance in their lifestyle. It is the very essence of Marin. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mark Pandapas

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5249	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94598 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:17:04
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside
------------------------	--

---

for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
Sincerely, Alexandra

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5250    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:19:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE DO NOT ENACT THE SEVERE RESTRICTIONS ON DOGS IN VARIOUS GGNRA PARKS AND TRAILS.  
Why try to solve a problem that doesn't exist?  
You wasted so much money on your faulty study to no avail.  
We, people with dogs, want and need to use these areas, and do so without any adverse effects.  
If there is one in a thousand whose presence is harmful, well, that's how any population is.  
Frankly, it is rather incomprehensible that responsible and intelligent people would want to enact the proposed restrictions on dogs in the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5251    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Portola Valley, CA 94028  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent, My name is Susan Nightingale and I have been walking my dogs at Fort Funston for 25 years now.  
These regular excursions provide my dogs much needed exercise and myself some much appreciated time in nature with my dogs, who I love dearly. Over all this time I have seen many people enjoy their walks at Fort Funston. Some without dogs and many with dogs. I have never seen a dog fight or any person be harmed by a dog. I have seen families, couples, and professional dog walkers, all enjoying the ocean and the trails. I have never seen a dog digging in the dunes or disturbing the birds nesting in the cliffs. I wrote to you when changes to the dog management within the GGNRA were considered previously. It looks as if my comments and those of many others were completely disregarded by you. Open space is needed by everyone. If you restrict areas that have been used for decades by people walking their dogs off leash, there will be no place for this activity. If you eliminate off leash access for dogs within the GGNRA you will be changing the original intention for these parks.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5252    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:20:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Mori Point: At Mori Point, I think it would be important to be able to have a "loop" trail. At this time, there are only trails that allow for one way in and out when walking dogs. The Mori Headlands trail should be open to leashed dogs as well. The Mori Bluff trail, if possible, could provide a loop trail in the area for leashed dogs. Dogs on leash would not disturb habitat in these areas.

Pedro Point Headlands: The trails that are currently maintained by the Pacifica Land Trust (South Ridge, Middle Ridge and Arroyo Trail) should be considered as on leash areas. The habitat does not include areas of concern for red-legged frogs and SF garter snakes.

The trail by the Sheldance nursery (Sweeney Ridge) ought to be considered for on leash access as well. San Bruno seems to have a lot of trailhead access for dogs, while Pacifica has very little.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5253    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94704  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jill McCullough

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5254    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:21:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I have two dogs and have taken them to Funston and Crissy Field many times. Crissy Field in particular is their favorite place to go in the city. I've never had a bad experience taking my dogs to these places: the dogs, dog owners, and non-dog owners are respectful of each other and the environment. So in my opinion option A, preserving the status quo, is the best path forward.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5255 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mil Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Your proposed policies are in contradiction to the conclusions you draw in one of your studies.

You conclude that dogs have minimal impact on compacted trails. On the south loop of the Oakwood Valley Trail, where the GGNRA plans to mitigate dogs off-leash, the park service built a compacted trail (built by the Conservation Corps.) Also on the Oakwood Valley Trail, your policy indicates that you want to protect the Mission Blue Butterfly habitat. No lupine grows on either the north or south side of the loop.

I know the valley trails intimately and have walked my dog there for 3 years. This is one of the only areas to walk dogs off-leash. Your proposals are out of sync with the needs of the population. My experience is that about 85% of the people on the trails are walking with their own dogs, about 15% are without dogs. The only aggressive dog incident I know about was the falsely reported one submitted by a ranger the last time the GGNRA tried to shut down the trail.

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

1. Require and enforce people to CARRY leashes for their dogs. Monitor for voice control.
2. Require and enforce people to clean up after their dogs.
3. Limit professional dog walkers to three or four dogs per outing in all areas.
4. Add a fee onto dog licensure to pay for these services.
5. Use ticketing fees to deter irresponsible behavior. Put fees towards management.
6. Establish a complaint line.

Those of us who own dogs thrive on the parks and beaches! This is the reason I moved to marin from SF so I could get a dog and take them on hikes etc. I for one pick up after my dog. Always have and always will. Please don't take this away from us or our dogs! You cant play fetch with a leashed dog!!!!

thank you!

Suzy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5256 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Home owner Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:24:03

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not take away access for me and my dogs to responsibly enjoy off leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5257 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:24:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My wife and I have lived in Moss Beach for the last three years. We have a dog called Gus that we regularly walk in Rancho Corral de Tierra.

Since NPS have taken over Rancho we have been very disappointed by the way it has been handled by the park service. The approach seems to be to disenfranchise dog owners by eliminating the very few off-leash dog areas that exist. This is despite the fact that a large proportion of users of Rancho are dog owners. Organizations such as Montara Dog Group have put in large amounts of effort over the years and now dog owners walk in fear on public lands of being tazered by GGNRA peace officers who are zealously enforcing these unpopular rules. The possession of Rancho by the NPS is nothing short of a disaster for the Montara and Moss Beach communities who were very happy when POST owned it.

The SEIS is flawed in its approach in that it regards the GGNRA more like a regular national park than the urban recreation area that it is. Many of the off leash dog areas, like Fort Funston, have already been detrimentally affected by the activities of the federal government and are far from pristine. The GGNRA preferred option is not balanced in its approach, which is not surprising given the GGNRA history of stripping dog owners of their rights. The GGNRA is making these recommendations citing environment reason and user conflict issues. The environmental claims are lacking the backing of peer reviewed scientific studies. Based on my experience walking in Rancho I do not believe the user conflict issues are significant. For the most part dog walkers seem to co-exist quite happily with other users of the park.

My preference is the "no action" option called Alternative A. I believe this best represents the wishes of the majority of the local community here in Montara and Moss Beach with the addition of the two lower areas in Montara and El Grenada that have been traditionally used as off-leash dog walking areas for years. In fact I predict that the community will reject the preferred option, if it is chosen and that GGNRA will have a long and protracted battle with enforcement.

Why is San Mateo the only county where GGNRA are proposing to completely ban off-leash dog walking? San Mateo county already is awash with lots of park land that is hardly used, largely because walking dogs off or on leash has been banned by the county.

Regards,  
James Cowdery

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5258 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:24:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Keith Gibson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5259	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Sincerely,  
Concerned Citizen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5260	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:26:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dogs and their companion humans need they're space to roam freely.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5261	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:28:19**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We moved to Pacifica because of the beautiful dog friendly parks in the city. We only exercise with our dogs, so parks like San Pedro Valley are already off limits for us. Please consider options such as a license (fee) for locals to walk dogs, or possibly limiting use to Monday through Friday. We would very much welcome a compromise to allow limited (rather than no) use. Our favorite park is Mori Point, and we hope to be able to visit the park in the future. Thank-you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5262 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:30:29**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

One of the things I love about living in Marin is the ability to walk my dog in so many beautiful places, including off-leash areas. Sadly there are few off-leash zones where I can train and exercise my dog but luckily there are more than most SF Bay Area counties and other parts of the state. In Marin, we love our open space, we fought personally very hard to save and protect it and we have a right to enjoy the land we helped to set aside. The GGNRA was established with the idea of providing recreational areas for local residents in an increasingly developed world. Access for all users, including people and their dogs is a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I strongly oppose Alternative F restricting off-leash use within the few limited areas that remain accessible. I feel safer when I can hike, bike, exercise in the company of my dog. Women are unfortunately vulnerable on the trail. Within the time I have lived in southern Marin women have been attacked on trails near my home. On the other hand, few dogs have caused any significant problems on the trails, people not dogs are the issue here. Owners will walk their dogs off-leash only if they have reliable recall. As such off-leash dogs are generally the good dogs, the ones that come when called, stay close to their owners, greet other dogs and people in a friendly manner. Why penalize good behavior and limit recreation for Marin citizens and their companions, GGNRA's most neighbors, who also happen to be some of the best stewards of parklands in our backyard. Only 1% of the GGNRA is open to off-leash dogs, is it too much to ask to keep this amount without further restriction?

I went to the open house regarding the proposed rule changes to talk to park staff and learn more about the rule change. I do not think the GGNRA has any evidence to support the rule change. Although dogs are seen by the service as a nuisance or potential threat to other users or wildlife there is no data to support this view. Furthermore, no studies or peer-review have been solicited to determine whether there are any negative effects from dogs. I am appalled by the amount of time, energy and money that has spent on this issue already when there was no real need to change the rules. So many other issues within the park need attention, such as Sudden Oak Death, weed management, and landscape restoration for climate resilience.

I urge you to maintain the 1979 dog rules as they were written, choosing Alternative A, no change. I use many areas of the park within Marin and San Francisco. I am particularly concerned about limits to access on the Oakwood Valley to Alta trails that I use daily, as well as changes to Homestead Valley, Muir Beach and Crissy field.

Please remain true to the overwhelming sentiment of the community within which the park is located and

preserve our off-leash areas for our health and welfare.

Thank you for your time,  
Colleen Lenihan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5263    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:32:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Save Off LEASH!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5264    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:33:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** NOTE: FIRST ATTEMPT "TO SUBMIT" FAILED, SO I'M RE-SENDING,  
BELOW.

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
San Francisco, CA

RE: Draft Dog Management Policy

Dear Superintendent Dean:

I urge you to adopt the proposed Preferred Alternative for managing dogs in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I am a frequent visitor to San Francisco areas of the GGNRA, and a longtime resident of the City.

I would support a stronger management policy in some respects; in particular:

Off-leash dog areas should have physical boundaries of some sort. Unfortunately, "voice control" does not work, as I've repeatedly seen in the GGNRA. The worst case I witnessed was of a young woman who ran into the water off Crissy Field to "rescue" her off-leash dog, then screamed that she couldn't swim. Fortunately, both survived on their own. More often, I see off-leash dogs chasing wildlife, unintentionally intimidating small children on the beach, leaving droppings that are never picked up . . . Enforcement of any new policy would be a problem at the outset. So the Park Service should develop a simple system for the public to report enforcement problems.

But the GGNRA's proposed plan is a thoughtful compromise among competing interests. Above all, its overlying goal should be the preservation of the GGNRA as a unique natural and cultural resource for the Bay Area and the nation.



Sincerely, Nancy Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5265    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:34:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for moving forward with this document for dog management. I spend time at Ocean Beach and unfortunately witness a lot of bird chasing and bad behavior of dogs and their owners. I can offer many, many specific examples if needed.

Please do more public education! The signs about dogs required on leashes from Stairwell 21 to Sloat are almost nonexistent. Also, enforcement is a problem. I have called dispatch twice, but I am not comfortable with the situation: I have to go to the Great Highway, wait for the police to show up and then off he/she marches to the beach with all his/her guns and weapons, like now it's a criminal activity. Can't you have interns and others on the beach educating the dog owners on the rules and their responsibilities?

I understand that humans are often very emotionally attached to their pets, but the reality is that dogs are predators and many do chase and harm wildlife. Yes, they are damaging to ecosystems. (And please pick up the poo!! It's so rude to leave it, particularly in high density urban areas.)

I was disappointed and shocked to hear that politicians like Pelosi and Spieir are supporting dogs running wild in the national park land. During the public forums that I witnessed and heard about, the "no leash required" dog people actually hissed and boo-ed when scientists, naturalists and other defenders of wildlife made comments.

So the bully gets the backing from the elected officials?! What an error. The most aggressive and vocal group is not the democratic majority, particularly in regards to this dog issue.

Thank you for taking my comments.

Deidre Martin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5266    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:34:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Gina Lee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5267	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Adele Christensen, Proud Corgi Owner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5268	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:41:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is imperative that ample off-leash dog spaces be preserved, particularly in the park lands of Northern California. I visit these park lands (Ft. Funston, Crissy Field and Ocean Beach) with my dog several times a week and with a reduced footprint of off-leash access areas will likely not see them again for years. My freedom to enjoy beautiful open spaces with my off-leash, well-behaved dog is a major quality of life issue. The 'research' the GGNRA has gathered erroneously implies that removing dogs from these areas will remove the threat to fragile restored wildlife populations. Unless the GGNRA plans to also ban children, adults, hang-gliders, hawks and radio-controlled planes, then this line of thought is seriously flawed. As a Sierra Club member, I take these issues very seriously, and I also know the value of choosing your				

---

battles. That the GGNRA has chosen to funnel precious resources into this unnecessarily punitive proposal, rather than focus on areas in which it might have a real impact is beyond disappointing. Beyond.

Clearly the people of San Francisco have spoken, simply in their usage patterns. It is important to remember that this is a recreation area created to serve the needs of an entire city. Something like 1/2 the households in San Francisco and Northern California have dogs. To restrict the recreational access of over half the tax paying households in the area is heavy-handed and wrong. The GGNRA has completely lost touch with the mission and intent with which these spaces were created. It's clear that the needs and desires of the citizenry are not fairly being taken into account.

The GGNRA needs better research and to shift its myopic approach to correcting and addressing impacts on these lands that we all pay for and are entitled to enjoy.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5269	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san mateo, CA 94401 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:41:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Katerina Navratilova

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5270	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Moss Beach, CA 94038 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:45:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 17, 2014				

Christine C. Cowdery  
1020 Etheldore Street

Moss Beach, CA 94038

Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Fort Mason(  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Attn: SEIS(

Dear Superintendent Dean,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas (GGNRA) Dog Management Plan SEIS. My name is Christine Corwin Cowdery, and I am a resident of Moss Beach and a long-time parks advocate, environmentalist, and hiker.

Before I delve into my substantive comments on the SEIS, just wanted to share some general thoughts and feelings about what is happening with GGNRA and our local communities. At a time when the National Park Service is struggling with how to make parks more relevant to its constituents, especially in urban areas, the poorly thought out and executed GGNRA Dog Management planning process has created a hostile environment that for the most part has pitted local communities and elected officials against the National Park Service.

When the lands that are now GGNRA were handed over to NPS in 1973, it was with the understanding that the lands would be managed for the recreational needs of our urban population, which includes dog walking. The fact is that GGNRA is not a destination national park such as Yellowstone, Yosemite, or the Grant Canyon-it is an urban national recreation area that needs to be managed for both recreation and natural values.

In October 2013, I attended a meeting on the issue in San Francisco held by San Franciscos Board of Supervisors. It was incredibly eye opening and a shame that NPS refused to attend. Dozens and dozens of citizens of different backgrounds and ages took time off from work to share the reasons why they are opposed to GGNRA's Dog Management Plan. Speakers included an urban planner talking about the benefits of layered uses in an urban environment, people with disabilities and others who rely on these open space areas to properly exercise their dogs, senior citizens who are healthier because they have been hiking with their dogs in GGNRA, to mothers who raised their children going to places such as Fort Funston with their dog, to those who do not own dogs, but value the experience of diverse uses and community in our urban parks.

The fact is that park leadership has dismissed the dog walking needs of the city of San Francisco and local communities such as where I live on the San Mateo Coast claiming that GGNRA is federal land and that local governments have no jurisdiction. While this may be legally true, this goes against the true spirit in which GGNRA was created and is extremely short-sighted given that GGNRA benefits from a wealth of city and county services from police, medical, and fire services to animal control and wildlife rehabilitation services provided by the SPCA.

As long as this insular mentality prevails among park leadership, GGNRA will not be able to fulfill its potential for making national parks more relevant to diverse urban constituencies-constituencies that we need in the environmental and parks movement. I hope that you rethink the current dog management planning process-a process that so far seems to be unfairly discriminating against a diverse user group without the peer-reviewed science to justify GGNRA's significant policy changes around dog walking.

SEIS Comments

As mentioned earlier, I am a resident of Moss Beach, which borders Rancho Corral de Tierra, the newest

addition to GGNRA. My husband and I moved to Moss Beach just over three years ago. We, like so many other local residents, were drawn here because of the areas small town feel, the amazing hiking areas, and the fact that it is a community of dog lovers. We have a seven-year-old black lab mix named Gus. I have always been a hiker. Being able to hike with our dog in the areas of GGNRA that are dog friendly has been one of my greatest joys in life. He is a part of our family. If I could not bring him on trails in GGNRA, I would not visit the park.

After reviewing the SEIS (all 1,500 pages!), I am advocating for Alternative A in the SEIS with the addition of the two historical off-leash areas in Montara and El Granada (the true baseline-please see the enclosed map). Local communities are the primary users of Rancho and have a long history of responsible dog walking, including off leash dog walking in the lower portions of Rancho Corral de Tierra in Montara and El Granada. The Montara Dog Group, which has more than 400 members from Half Moon Bay to Pacifica, has provided dog waste bins and bags, as well as promoted responsible dog guardianship.

Despite this history of responsibility, GGNRA's preferred alternative does not provide any off-leash opportunities for dog walking in Rancho. Why is San Mateo County the only county where GGNRA is proposing to completely ban off-leash dog walking?

In addition, the SEIS fails to link off-leash and on-leash dog walking with documented resource impacts. GGNRA's SEIS has failed to provide actual scientific data about dog walkings impact on natural resources in Rancho, such as wildlife and vegetation. Not only does GGNRA not have any peer-reviewed scientific data about resource impacts, all of the resource impact statements in the SEIS are purely speculative. Off-leash and on-leash dog walking has occurred in Rancho Corral de Tierra for decades, including during the past two years while it has been under the management of GGNRA (as acknowledged in the SEIS). Despite this history, Rancho continues to provide valuable habitat for wildlife. As reported by Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA President, Ken White, in his February 8, 2011 letter to GGNRA: Our professional wildlife rehabilitation staff completed a review/analysis of the site (Rancho) and the proposal (GGNRA's Dog Management Plan) and we believe that there is no observable reason related to the protection of native wildlife which would justify denying access to off-leash dogs in the area. (\*Please see attached a copy of Ken Whites February 8, 2011 letter.)

In general, characterization of dog-related issues in the SEIS is misleading. The SEIS document has failed to provide evidence that dog walking is resulting in conflicts and resource degradation. From 2008 through 2011, a total of 1,537 dog-related incidents associated with natural resources occurred at GGNRA according to Table 6 in the SEIS. However, out of a total of 1,537 dog-related incidents, there were only three incidents of dogs destroying vegetation. Meanwhile, there were only 15 dog-related incidents of dogs disturbing wildlife. 1,519 incidents were related to dogs being off-leash in on-leash areas or dogs being in closed areas-incidents that could be attributed to lack of public education and signage by GGNRA.

Because Rancho Corral de Tierra was just transferred to NPS in December 2011, law enforcement data and statistics are not yet available for this site. I will say that with the exception of the January 2011 incident when an NPS ranger tased a dog walker, that I have never experienced or heard of any negative dog-related incidents in Rancho-just happy people with dogs, bikers, and equestrians who all peacefully coexist and recreate in this part of GGNRA. The Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA also says in their February 8, 2011 letter that they cannot recall ever receiving complaints about off-leash dogs or dogs acting aggressively in the area.

In addition, GGNRA's preferred alternative is proposing to dramatically cut the number of dog-friendly trails in Rancho. Given the fact that Rancho's primary user group is local residents and their dogs, why isn't there an alternative in the SEIS that considers increasing the number of dog-friendly recreational

trails?

Also, the area of Rancho Corral de Tierra in Moss Beach-the area where GGNRA is proposing to completely ban dogs-is not even mentioned in the SEIS. This area has been used by equestrians with dogs and by hikers with dogs for decades without any conflict or resource degradation. The SEIS fails to give any rationale for banning all dog walking from this section of the park. This major policy change should require some sort of justification.

Another impact which the SEIS fails to consider is the impact on the local community culture. San Mateo Countys coastal communities are communities of dog lovers. Rancho is more than just an open space area. It is a community space where people go with their dogs to walk and to catch up with their neighbors and friends. In many ways, Rancho is the heart of our community. If dogs are banned except for on a few trails, GGNRA will be gutting the very thing that makes it enjoyable to live here.

This negative community impact is not unique to Rancho. This community impact is something that is common among all of the 22 areas targeted in GGNRA's dog management plan. Where does GGNRA propose that we all go? Approximately 50% of households in San Francisco have dogs. I would estimate that at least that many households on the coast have dogs. Dogs are a part of our culture, just as they were in 1973 when the park was founded and in 1979 when the 1979 Pet Policy was crafted.

I am whole-heartedly in favor of protecting the environment and wildlife. There are already a number of areas in GGNRA where I am not allowed to go with my dog and I accept that. With that said, GGNRA's current Dog Management Plan/SEIS goes too far. It is a highly restrictive plan that is being proposed without any hard evidence that these restrictions are warranted. The plan's language and Alternatives B-F are highly biased against people who recreate in GGNRA with their dogs. We need a common sense, balanced approach to park management that takes into account the recreational needs of Bay Area residents-as intended by GGNRA's enabling legislation.

Again, I support Alternative A in the SEIS with the addition of the two historical off-leash areas in Montara and El Granada (please see the enclosed map). Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Christine C. Cowdery  
Montara Dog Group Member

cc: Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi  
Congresswoman Jackie Speier  
The Honorable Sally Jewell, Secretary of the Interior  
San Mateo County Supervisor Don Horsley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5271	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:45:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I feel strongly, as a working environmental scientist for the Federal government, that the conclusions in this document are not science based and the SEIS should undergo peer review per the

---

policy of the NPS (Interim Guidance Document Governing Code of Conduct, Peer Review, and Information Quality Correction for National Park Service Cultural and Natural Resource Disciplines, 2008). Please submit the SEIS for peer review.

This document is essentially a programmatic EIS as there is insufficient information and analysis for each site to adequately inform science-based decision-making for such a large geographic area. The NPS should treat this document as a Programmatic EIS and tier off site-specific NEPA documents from it.

Page 920 states that chronic disturbance of snowy plover at Ocean Beach during the nonbreeding season could indirectly affect breeding behavior of the species. Therefore, impacts would result in measurable and/or consequential changes in individuals of a species through frequent disturbance". The SEIS does not define "chronic disturbance" and the data does not reflect recent increases in plover populations. The old data from the 1990's should be discarded. The newer data does not provide an example of anything that could be termed "chronic disturbance". The SEIS should define chronic disturbance for Ocean Beach plover and utilize recent data to defend the conclusion that it is occurring.

The SEIS cites violations as proof of impacts, but violations are given for wildlife disturbance whether or not it was observed. I was once given a violation for disturbing wildlife for simply having my dog off leash while playing ball in the surf, and no wildlife disturbance had occurred. This violations data cannot be a proxy for actual observed wildlife disturbance - it is not sound science.

The FSEIS should include population counts of plover at Ocean Beach during the last 10 years to substantiate the impact that is said to be occurring.

The SEIS does not discuss the impacts occurring to the plover from the marked increase in raven populations, which predate on plover, at Ocean Beach. Ravens, a much larger bird that forage and scavenge closer to the surf, are more likely to be chased by dogs. The SEIS should document the indirect impact on plover predation by ravens and other predators if dogs are banned. Additionally, provide the scientific support that disturbance during the nonbreeding season is affecting breeding behavior. There is much unsupported conclusory statements in the SEIS regarding the impacts to the plover. Decisions that affect so many urban recreationalists should not be made on unsupported conclusory statements of what "could" happen, but on what is actually happening. Restrictions should be commensurate with demonstrated impacts.

In addition, there is no reason to not allow dogs on Ocean Beach when plover are not present from mid-May through June 30.

The SEIS does not demonstrate that dogs in the GGNRA are compromising visitor safety and damaging the resources of the Recreation Area. It states that in the last year, out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher which reveals that these dog-related incidents are negligible and do not support a change in management.

The fencing proposed along with the concentration of dogs that would result from the dog plan will increase conflict between dogs. I noticed this phenomena when the San Bruno Dog Park was replaced with the current much smaller dog park. I was unable to use the new dog park because there were frequent dog fights as a direct result from crowding of dogs in a smaller space. The FSEIS must address the impacts to visitor and recreationalist safety from the NPS's proposals to crowd dogs into smaller spaces surrounded by fences.

I'm very disturbed to see that leashes are still being proposed for the sand ladder at Fort Funston. I raised this serious safety concern at the DEIS stage and it has not been corrected in the SEIS. Footing is very difficult to keep walking down the unmaintained sand ladder, which is sometimes composed of stair logs in the air, with the sand underneath having eroded away. The stair then moves when one steps on it, and having a dog pulling on a leash will surely result in falls and injuries. I have found it hard to keep footing just walking without a leashed dog in this location. With this, and the dog crowded that NPS is proposing, the Dog Management Plan will result in increases in safety hazards. This is based on my experience as a frequent dog walker in GGNRA lands.

It is outrageous that the NPS is not considering and working with the City of San Francisco, which voted unanimously to oppose this plan as too restrictive to its citizens, as did Marin County. There is much lost public trust in the Federal government as a result of this planning effort.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5272    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:46:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

John Gower

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5273    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:47:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** By significantly reducing the off-leash dog areas, we will undoubtedly over time see an increase in aggressive dog behavior. Dogs need to be exercised, and more importantly, well socialized.

---



The off leash dog parks allow for this to occur.

By eliminating 90% of the off-leash areas, all the pet owners, dog walkers, etc will be forced to go to the small local parks., and therefore creating a new problem.

The Bay Area is known for how dog-friendly it is (or at least, was). The government shouldn't take these privileges away from us, or punish us. San Francisco (purportedly has more dogs than children now ....

Where should all these animals go to be exercised or socialized if the 'allowed' areas are cut back by 90%? I will reiterate, we will absolutely see a rise in dog aggression if they don't have a place to 'just be dogs', and run and play freely.

Dog walkers, and Pet Owners should be responsible, and there should be consequences for the individual if he or she (or his or her dog) misbehaves.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive.

Please don't take this away from us!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5274    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:49:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in San Francisco for 40 years, most of that time sharing my home with a dog. I've reviewed the Executive Summary of the Dog Management Plan and believe the proposed regulations go too far. The dramatic restrictions on dog walking in the GGNRA will put an untenable burden on the few areas in San Francisco and Marin left where dog walking, especially off-leash, is permitted. It is not a balanced plan.

San Francisco is an densely populated urban area. There are not national forests and open space nearby to absorb the loss of areas where people can enjoy the outdoors with their dogs. Forcing people with dogs into fewer and smaller spaces will result in a density of use that will make those spaces unfit for their purpose. While the plan makes note of protecting wildlife, habitat, cultural resources and visitors that don't like dogs in the GGNRA, it makes no mention of the protecting tax paying citizens who happen to own dogs.

The plan's preferred alternative punishes the many responsible dog owners for the few who are not. Why not focus on measures that address the few.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5275    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,17,2014 23:51:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sherry Suisman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5276	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Mike W

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5277	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,17,2014 23:57:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I adopted numerous reused dogs from SPCA in the past 7 years and there is nothing that gives me and my dogs more enjoyment in life than to walk my beloved dogs off leach at Fort Funston. I can assure you the higher up authority as well as the general public that the off leach dogs are genuinely grateful for being free from any physical restrictions and they are better behave and responsive than if they were on leach. I would therefore urge that you DO NOT pass any new ordinance/ law to impose any unnecesarry restrictions on limiting the walking off leach of dogs in the National Park Area.				

Sincerely,  
Yvonne Lo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5278	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I am horrified that the GGNRA would even consider the "preferred alternative." It is way too restrictive and will prevent me and countless others from using the public space in the recreational way that best serves the communities of the bay area.

Smart urban planners recognize the value of ample public space designated for recreation for people and for dogs - - for the benefit of human health, pet health, and the public health benefit of reducing the amount of pet waste on public sidewalks in urban areas. Over the years, the benefits of the off-leash recreation areas have been clearly demonstrated, not only in terms of health benefits, but also by the harder-to-measure value added in terms of the cultural richness of the area. Bay area pet owners often cite the dog-friendliness as one of the most-valued attributes of the bay area's offerings.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. If GGNRA is truly concerned about leash restriction compliance, then better enforcement of leash restrictions is a much more appropriate response. (The current preferred alternative would be more like responding to a report of a house on fire by bombing that building - not a proportional or rational response to a perceived problem.)

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you in advance for your careful consideration of this important matter.

Best Regards,

J.L.W.  
San Francisco, CA, 94114

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5279    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:07:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Marc Slutzkin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5280    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:09:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for taking the time to read my comments on the draft dog management plan. I feel strongly that the GGNRA should uphold the policy established in 1979 that provides for off leash dog areas in the park.

I have owned my dog for 6 months, and as she continues her training and has become capable of being off leash in permitted areas, we have both enjoyed Crissy Field and Marin County. Dogs need off leash time to get adequate exercise. People and dogs have been enjoying the GGNRA for this purpose for decades, and off leash areas should be protected in the GGNRA. I am troubled by the proposal that not only seeks to severely reduce the quantity and size of off leash areas, but also provides only for further restrictions in the future. This seems unfair, and I believe there should be an opportunity to expand off leash areas in the future if and when that makes sense.

I am concerned about the impact of off leash restrictions in the GGNRA on San Francisco parks. In addition to enjoying the GGNRA, I also take my dog to Lafayette Park in San Francisco, which has an off leash dog area. Unfortunately, Lafayette Park can barely accommodate the high volume of dogs it receives daily, as evidenced by the grass being completely run down in the off leash dog area. I am certain that the situation at Lafayette Park would worsen if the off leash areas of the GGNRA were further restricted.

I urge you not to restrict the off leash areas in the GGNRA and to maintain the policy adopted in 1979. The GGNRA is a special place enjoyed by so many people and dogs, and the off leash opportunities it affords residents and visitors alike contribute to making the Bay Area a unique place.

Thank you,  
Jane

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5281	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:12:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Karina Venegas

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5282	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	redmond, WA 98052 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:16:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please continue to provide trails and allow on-leash use of the Golden Gate Recreational area for dog walking. Banning or restricting use of the area and parks for leashed dogs would be a hindrance to enjoyment of the parks for pet lovers.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5283	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

They have also made me aware of the importance of open space and natural areas and made me likely to support GGNRA's efforts to preserve these spaces. However, I want to be able to enjoy these spaces with my family - which includes my dog.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sabrina Qutb

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5284    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Los Gatos, CA 95032  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:23:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are fewer and fewer communities in California that allow pets and their owners to enjoy time together. Please keep these areas in and around San Francisco open to pets. The joy that I often feel as a dog owner, getting to see my dog run and play and exercise and just generally love life cannot be replaced. Please.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5285    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
J. Warren

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5286	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:33:41
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	We live right by the Donahue St head of Alta Trail - we take our dog on runs there all the time, and cherish the time we spend there with the dog and kids. We also head to Muir Beach - a place I've been for the last 20 years. And always with a dog. There are so few places left in Marin and SF where we can take our dog off leash and get proper exercise. We live in a very densely populated area, and part of the trade off are the magnificent lands of GGNRA. We depend on the limited space we do access with our dog to get her exercise and play. Please do not ban dogs, and certainly leave the Donahue side of the Alta trail as an off leash area, the same with Muir Beach - dogs are an important part of the landscape and of living in the bay area.
------------------------	--

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5287	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:39:16
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have made comments on this plan at every step along the way, including back before the proposed rule changes were started. I got involved when the GGNRA began restricting dog access in Fort Funston without involving the public. One of the last things I did with my father before he passed away early in 2001 was attending a meeting at the Presidio Officers Club when the GGNRA started putting up signs restricting dogs without public comment.
------------------------	--

The public outcry over the changes without consulting the users forced the GGNRA to come up with a dog plan. I have found this process discouraging. I have spoken in person and in writing of my desire to keep the 1979 plan in place. And that any property added since then should be allowed to continue being used in the same way it has historically been used.

Each new version only makes slight adjustments that really don't come close to what historic users would like to see. I have found this process discouraging. This has been long and drawn out. The 3 dogs my family had at the start of this process have all passed away during the course of this rule making.

I understand the park service's goals are to preserve wild lands but this is not Yellowstone or Yosemite.

This is basically open space in an urban area and it should not be run or forced to follow the same rules and expectations as Yosemite. With Fort Funston in particular it is not remotely natural. It is an old army

battery and is not some wild land that needs protection. When local governments gave control of the properties like Fort Funston to the GGNRA the idea was to preserve open space for generations. Not to create a people free wilderness. My conclusion is that the park service should not be involved in running the GGNRA. I also suggest we change the name to reflect its unique status.

My experience as a San Francisco resident is with Fort Funston. It is a great place and it is one of the first places new residents discover if they have a dog. It is a place where I have met people who I ended up dog sitting for. It is a community.

I feel safe there walking alone. I feel safer there than in my own neighborhood.

I realize there is a process to this rule making but I feel like the park service is trying to wait out the dog lovers.

I have lost some of my faith in government over this. The idea of big government overstepping its welcome in local affairs is real to me now. It has turned me as someone who majored in environmental biology and wanted to be a park ranger when I was a kid into someone who has turned away from the environmental movement.

One of the things I studied when at UC Davis was environmental policy making. Something that stuck in my head was it is hard to make policy work if you don't have the buy in of people involved. Right now you don't have local buy in. There are a few environmental groups trying to protect the birds but they are not the daily users of the GGNRA property.

The GGNRA property could be a great stepping stone into environmental learning for generations of city and suburban kids. Instead we are being fenced out of property without really knowing if we are helping any native plants or animals. We are not allowed to take our dogs with us into these natural areas so that we can enjoy some outdoor time and remember why outdoors are important to us.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5288	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with and without my dog, as well as with and without my children, in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying the GGNRA properties as I have for the past 25 years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Tanya Friedman

---



**Correspondence ID:** 5289    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:41:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendant Dean,

I am a San Francisco native and have lived in this wonderful city for all but 5 of my nearly 50 years. Growing up in the Richmond district, I have happy memories of taking our two cocker spaniels for family outings at Baker Beach. They would run the beach, chase each other and play with their toys. These were some of the days we enjoyed most as a family and the dogs always came home tired and satisfied. If they had been forced to remain on a leash, or even not allowed on more than half of our wonderful Baker Beach, it would have been an exercise of frustration, similar to taking a kid to a candy store and not allowing them any candy.

Now with a husband, two children and two dogs of my own, we enjoy this resource so much, in fact, that we have been members of the William Kent Society for 10 years. Our daily walks with our dogs are often the happiest part of my day. I take them for runs down to Crissy Beach where they get a welcome reward swimming in the Bay, retrieving balls just off shore on East Beach, where we rarely run into very many people (yes, even sometimes on warm weekend days). On the days when I am short on time and they are not able to swim, run and play on East Beach, they look at me with disappointment and we return home feeling largely unsatisfied, sad and even frustrated.

I write now, after having written a letter to the Draft EIS in 2011 which was ignored, in partner with the SF Board of Supervisors, Mayor Ed Lee, Congresswoman Speier, Congresswoman Pelosi, The Crissy Field Dog Group, Animal Care & Control of SF, Peninsula Humane Society, Montara Dog Group, Save Off Leash, and thousands of tax-paying individuals who strongly object to the proposed GGNRA preferred alternative dog plan as far too restrictive, far too limiting in where we can recreate with dog(s), unfair to dog owners, and not fact-based in its planning or findings. This proposal demonstrates a lack of understanding that the Bay Area GGNRA must serve an urban population.

When the GGNRA was created in 1972, dog walking was already a long-standing use of the lands that were turned over to the park. Dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, and as such this specific recreational use and part of the San Francisco Bay culture - and this use must continue indefinitely.

I strongly support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This plan works and if properly enforced, I believe it would strike a balance between many users of this great resource. The Bay Area GGNRA is a unique national recreation area in an urban environment - not an isolated park in the wilderness. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

With more than 120,000 dogs in San Francisco alone, and millions in the greater Bay Area. People who work, who have families like mine, and have dogs need access close to home that allows off-leash dog walking in the mornings, afternoons and evenings. The proposed preferred alternative will results in millions of people being unable to recreate with their dog(s) - in the GGNRA lands these same families support with taxpayer dollars.

The conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed. The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking, only 7 of the 22 areas in the

SEIS allow off-leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties.

In Marin County, it will be disaster if there will only be one beach where all Marin's residents and visitors can recreate with their dogs off leash. The beach has extreme tides, forceful waves, and will be packed with thousands of dogs if this plan is enacted - because it's the only off leash beach that will be preserved for all Marin County in the preferred alternative. Additionally, the SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on or off-leash).

The GGNRA's preferred alternative intentionally proposal sets up the proposed dog policy to fail - by restricting a large dog and urban resident population to use such small areas that over-crowding is inevitable. The overcrowding will result in friction between residents with and without dogs. And the fact that this will cost millions of dollars of our taxpayer money is inexcusable. You are spending our money on a plan that the majority does not want and that will not work.

I understand that part of the rationalization for this overly-restrictive policy is to protect the wildlife, particularly birds. In my many days at Crissy, I have never seen dogs chasing birds. They leave each other alone. There is a large group of geese that visit the big lawn regularly and this provides an environmental concern greater than the very rare and occasional dog (or even human!) poop. When our son was exposed to goose poop, he suffered serious diahrea that required antibiotic treatment.

Here are a few questions regarding my serious objections to this proposal:

- Why does the GGNRA rely on outdated studies and information for the latest environmental impact statement?
- - Why hasn't the GGNRA updated its enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released?
- How is it that the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented? How is it the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis?
- How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply ignore the voices of so many individuals, groups and elected representatives?
- How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply not consider or address a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS?

These unanswered questions lead to the conclusion that the process is only for show and the GGNRA never intended to incorporate public or even elected representatives' views.

I cherish the opportunity to walk with my dogs at Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Land's End, Rodeo Beach, and Fort Mason. Please don't follow through with this seriously flawed plan. Putting an off-leash dog area next to busy Bay Street across from Safeway is only one of the terrible ideas incorporated in this plan.

Your consideration will be greatly appreciated for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Leslie B. Dicke  
William Kent Society Member, 10 years

CC: Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi  
Senator Diane Feinstein

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5290    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:43:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Dog Owner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5291    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:45:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Helloo-

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for over 30 years.

I feel that GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. I understand that our city has evolved since the original guidelines, but the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many concerns and objections of the thousands of citizens who submitted comments in response to the first plan. I moved back to my neighborhood (the marina) in particular because of the close access to off-leash dog walking. I strongly feel that this proposal is too restrictive.

Sincerely,  
Natala Menezes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5292    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:50:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Greetings Members of the GGNRA and NPS,

I live and work in San Francisco with my husband and our dog. I was born and raised in this fair city and if you inflict this intense restriction on parks land it will negatively impact half of the humans living here. I regularly visit Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and many other public recreation areas with my dog- it is a huge benefit to both of us to have access to these beautiful natural resources. If I was unable to take my dog with me on these trips to decompress from city life I would likely stop visiting some of my favorite recreational areas because seeing my dog happy and running free is also a huge stress reliever for me! Please reconsider this drastic and hurtful proposal.

All the best,

Gaelan, Gareth, and Lois.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5293    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:56:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please continue allowing Oak Wood trail to remain off leash. It is a cherished part of my life in Mill Valley. My dog and I walk there multiple times a week. Appropriate off-leash trails are crucial to the health and well being of our dogs, Please don't take this trail away fro us!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5294    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Greetings,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason and Fort Funston for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Anna Hogan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5295	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am opposed to the proposed changes to the GGNRA Pet Policy. I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for all Marin GGNRA lands: including Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. The 1979 Pet Policy was part of the founders vision for the GGNRA and should be respected and retained.				

The GGNRA is primarily an urban RECREATION AREA and requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Using a "One policy for all National Parks" approach is inappropriate, considering the substantial differences between the GGNRA and other National Parks.

Many GGNRA lands in Marin County were once inhabited; with many buildings that included families and ranches with herds of livestock and many sheep and cattle dogs on thousands of acres. If a small percentage of dog owners do not manage their dogs properly, they should be cited, but that should not translate into banning all other responsible dog owners and their well-behaved dogs from the vast majority of the GGNRA. Following this path of logic means that:

>We should ban children from the vast majority of the GGNRA, because a few children chase wildlife,

run excitedly through and damage sensitive habitat, scream at the top of their lungs and throw rocks at birds, or rip branches from trees to use as play swords, or hiking poles.

>We should ban mountain bikers from the vast majority of the GGNRA because some of them erode trails and damage hillsides and wildlife habitat, aggressively confront hikers and horseback riders on single-track trails where they are not allowed, and build illegal and destructive hidden trails for their personal sport.

>There are smokers tossing cigarette butts, litterbugs tossing trash, pot farmers using pesticides and polluting creeks, and parents leaving detritus behind from family beach picnics. Does it thus follow that we ban all humans from the vast majority of the GGNRA?

No, of course not. So why restrict just one category of park user over any other, when all user categories have bad actors among them? Please exercise common sense when making your decision regarding dogs in the GGNRA. Thank you very much.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5296    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the any changes to the GGNRA Pet Policy. I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for all Marin GGNRA lands.

The GGNRA is an urban RECREATION AREA and requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Using a "One policy for all National Parks" approach is inappropriate, considering the substantial differences between the GGNRA and other National Parks.

Many GGNRA lands in Marin County were once inhabited with families and ranches with herds of livestock and many sheep and cattle dogs on thousands of acres. If a small percentage of dog owners do not manage their dogs properly, they should be cited, but that should not translate into banning all other responsible dog owners and their well-behaved dogs from the vast majority of the GGNRA. Following this path of logic means that:

>We should ban children from the vast majority of the GGNRA, because a few children chase wildlife, run excitedly through and damage sensitive habitat, scream at the top of their lungs and throw rocks at birds, or rip branches from trees to use as play swords, or hiking poles.

>We should ban mountain bikers from the vast majority of the GGNRA because some of them erode trails and damage hillsides and wildlife habitat, aggressively confront hikers and horseback riders on single-track trails where they are not allowed, and build illegal and destructive hidden trails for their personal sport.

>There are smokers tossing cigarette butts, litterbugs tossing trash, pot farmers using pesticides and polluting creeks, and parents leaving detritus behind from family beach picnics. Does it thus follow that we ban all humans from the vast majority of the GGNRA?

No, of course not. So why restrict just one category of park user over any other, when all user categories have bad actors among them? Please exercise common sense when making your decision regarding dogs in the GGNRA. The 1979 Pet Policy was part of the founders vision for the GGNRA and should be respected and retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5297    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 01:12:19**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Beverly K.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5298	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 01:14:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I walk my dogs, Skylar & Bella regularly in the GGNRA, most specifically Fort Funston. I am strongly opposed to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from RECREATING with my 2 dogs for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for over 6 years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ray Kang

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5299	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 01:34:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Re: GGNRA Off Leash Areas

I would like to express my opposition to the plan to reduce the size of designated off leash areas in San Francisco's parks operated by GGNRA. These parks are a vital resource for the large community of dog owners in San Francisco, and serve their purpose as recreational spaces for the residents of this city and their pets. Off leash walking is extremely beneficial for both pet owner and pet alike. It provides a sense of freedom that is not attainable on city streets or many of the other existing parks in San Francisco. For me personally, it provides my primary source of exercise on a daily basis to hike at Fort Funston with my dogs. There are hundreds of people and their pets that will be displaced from an activity that is and should be available to them. Please consider the impact that it will have on the current and future dog owners as well as the neighborhoods and city parks that will see a large increase in dog activity. If changes need to be made, please let the users of these areas be a part of that discussion so we can make things work for everyone. We are the people that these parks are supposed to serve and if there are others that are looking for change, let's discuss it. Don't just shut us out. There can be other ways to solve whatever problems need to be addressed.

Regards,  
Adam Damico

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5300    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 01:35:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** do not change the laws!. GGNRA is for RECREATION for people and their beloved animals. How would you feel if you had to walk and get no exercise all your life!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5301    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 01:46:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not further restrict the number of off leash parks for dogs.  
Ann Francis Poletti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5302    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 01:48:53

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off leash play areas are very important to both dog owners and non dog owners. We need big open spaces to enjoy with our mates. The beach is one of those areas that can be enjoyed by both. Please dontvtake this beautigul freedom away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5303 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 02:24:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 1. It is obvious that regardless of the will of the majority of those who most use and enjoy the lands given over to the NPS by the citizens of Marin and San Francisco counties, to hold in perpetuity and to preserve for those citizens the access to open space to enjoy without development or malicious interference, the NPS will not relent in its determination to rid these areas of those it finds personally undesirable and a hindrance to its goal of creating a pristine, limited use wilderness area.

2. The alternative plans offered for on and off lead dog areas are at best disingenuous, and at worst dangerous. You provide a range of concepts from near total prohibition to such restrictive ideas that at their best restrict and confine the current numbers of dog owners now frequenting the open space into tight concentrations of such high density that issues of sanitation, overcrowding of trails, canine territorial disputes, and most simply put, a miserable environment that discourages access. ( Mission Accomplished ? )

3. I frequent Fort Funston. Have done so since the Army vacated it. It has survived decades of abuse by the military, and like most of San Francisco's open space bears little resemblance to it it's native state. However, it is in it's present form and appearance, a paradise, an oasis, and the last remaining open space in an ever encroaching urban environment where i can walk with my dogs, enjoy the nature that it is, wander among the ruins and remnants of the past, and renew my spirit without the confining barriers, limits, and restrictions of the city. I am renewed and refreshed by the effort of walking in the dunes and on the beach, and I take an incredible joy in watching my terriers racing about like children at the playground. I know that every other dog owner there would share to some degree that sentiment.

4. What you are offering is little more than a doggy latrine, and a crowded sidewalk. If you are determined to fix what ain't broke, a million heartfelt entreaties won't stop you. I truly question the wisdom though of taking away such an essential urban environment in violation of the original intent by which it was acquired. I know that intent because I made the case for it at inception and was in fact supported in that brief by the first local director of the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5304 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 02:24:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I urge you to move away from plan A to an alternative that takes into account the detrimental effect of dogs on the environment, wild animals and on human visitors. I live in Marin and

---

will comment specifically on Marin County. At Muir Beach, I would like to enjoy the beach without being surrounded by dogs. As it is now, I do not go to Muir Beach nearly as often as I would if dogs were more restricted on the beach. The dogs are barking, running fast and wild, and seem to outnumber human beings. There should be a large area at the beach where no dogs are allowed and people could rest, nap or picnic without staying on a constant vigilant watch for dogs running over their blankets or getting into their food, fighting, etc. I love the beach, and Muir Beach is the closest to my house but it seems so unfair that I just can't enjoy it without the never ending hyper activity of dogs.

Dog owners are campaigning hard for off-leash access everywhere they can get it. But I ask, what about people who don't want to be surrounded by dogs every time they hike or go to the beach? Why is the dog's privilege of being off-leash more important than a person's desire to enjoy nature in peace?

Here in Mill Valley, residents complain several times a week about dog poop on Marin trails. Those who have dogs and walk dogs complain just as much as non-dog owners. Some dog walkers are not acting responsibly about picking up poop and the rest of us are left to suffer. Dogs create conflicts, between off leash dogs that attack each other to dogs that attack humans or knock over children. I had a dog until recently, and we plan to get another. Our dog was attacked by off-leash dogs a few times on separate trails in Mill Valley. I love animals, but when I have my own dog I act responsibly and obey leash laws. Many people here feel that they and their dogs are above the law, and I don't see anyone enforcing those laws. I would opt for dogs on leash on most trails, but the problem is that no one has seemed to enforce leash laws. I feel that the on-leash rule almost never works, since no one is there to enforce it. I cannot go on a relaxing hike if I have to be the one to contend with those who do not respect the rules nor my right to feel secure.

We have plenty of trails open to dogs in Marin, but ones that ban dogs are very hard to come by. In Mill Valley, dogs are on every trail except Tennessee Valley main trail. I'd like to be able to hike or run Miwok and Coyote Ridge and Coastal trails without dogs running free. Dog walkers often ignore leash laws and let their dogs run free. I've had dogs run full speed at me or at my children, and the owner ignoring me or arguing when I ask that they leash their dog. The more aggressive the breed, the more the person seems to argue. "My dog is friendly" they call as the pitbull is rushing at my child. If I politely ask them to put their dog on a leash while they pass us, the response is typically that their dog is harmless, and they would rather argue and defend their dog's character than to comply with the rule and my request. I plead that you give hikers or joggers more trails without off-leash dogs and more trails without dogs at all!

I urge you to adopt a more restrictive plan on dogs especially at Muir Beach, Stinson Beach, Miwok Trail, Coyote Ridge trail, and Coastal Trail. That is, I vote against plan A, and would like either F, B or C. I have studied the whole plan, and the alternative that I most agree with Plan F. This seems to be the most balanced and fair plan to compromise between opposing interests. I do want there to be places where dogs can walk and run, but also more places where dogs must be on leash, and more dog-free places including longer sections of trails for hikers. The on-leash trails and beaches will only work if signs are clearly posted and you employ workers to actually enforce these rules.

The pro-dog groups are very vocal, but don't be fooled; there are many of us who want to enjoy the outdoors without hordes of dogs, even if some of us haven't voiced our opinions as loudly. Stay strong and go forward with a more fair and balanced solution than the status quo of alternative A. Thank you!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5305	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Bloomington, IN 47401 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

â—¾I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

â—¾I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

â—¾The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Will Allendorfer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5306    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 03:02:41

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a tax payer and voter and I have children and a dog. I would like to see a much more balanced approach to allowing dogs and families to walk and play together. There certainly is enough space for all the inhabitants of the city and its environs to enjoy being outdoors together. I don't feel that your mandate to manage the recreation area includes the intention or the direction for the exclusion of so many people from use of these facilities. Management might mean co-ordinating the various uses and users to everyone's satisfaction. All of the stakeholders should be accommodated if you are doing your job. A great many people and their family pets depend on these areas for exercise and mental recharge from the pressures of everyday city life. Why is it that we should support your work if we can find no relief or recreation in this park? Everything in moderation; nothing to excess. Your new plan for dogs and their owners is excessively restrictive for poor reasons and dubious science. Relax and stop trying to reorder the world; please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5307    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have enjoyed and cherished being outside in nature my entire life. I have been a member of the Sierra Club, the Nature Conservancy, the Yosemite Fund, and the World Wildlife Federation. I am a current member of the California State Parks Foundation. I have backpacked in the Sierra Nevada, the Trinity Alps, Kings Canyon, at least 10 California State Parks, and three National Parks in California.

The park system in California, including the GGNRA, is my sanctuary, my church. I am grateful for it and I work to protect it for future generations on the local, county, state, and federal levels. But my love for and my protection of the park system does not encourage the exclusion of canines especially in an urban setting where dogs desperately need space to run freely.

My dog, Yoki, is my companion and a huge part of my life. She has stood by me and asked for very little. Since I developed a serious illness 10 years ago, Yoki has lifted my spirits when I am in despair and has shown me unconditional love every day. But I am happiest when I see that she is joyfully playing and

running as a dog should. A walk on the beach at Fort Funston is just the ticket. It is not far from my home and we try to get there 3-4 times per week depending on my physical stamina. Once there, Yoki gets to run freely under my voice control with her dog friends. It is so good for her health and for mine. She is a happy dog because she is able to run and play, then come back to me. And I am her happy human companion being witness to her pure joy. This off-leash freedom is something I can give her when she gives me so much every day.

Without a large off-leash open area like Fort Funston I would not be able to allow my dog this kind of play time pleasure. Due to my illness I am not able to run with her to keep her exercised. So the off-leash freedom to run at Fort Funston in a safe area with other dogs is a godsend to my current life situation. And it is a beautiful sanctuary that supports my spirit at the same time, not at all like a worn out fenced in dog park. There are no other nearby areas in San Mateo County where I can do this. The San Bruno Mountain County Park right next to where I live will not even allow on-leash walking with a dog.

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from being able to provide adequate exercise for my dog. For both my own wellbeing and my dog's, I want to continue to be able to enjoy the GGNRA properties with my dog as I have for the years prior to and since my illness.

From what I have learned, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the significant concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA may have lost sight of its purpose. It was set up to be recreation areas for a densely populated urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Using fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA is unreasonable and will be difficult to maintain and unsightly in these natural environments. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please seriously consider the above comments and help those of us who are older or physically limited. We cherish our dogs and their companionship and want them to be able to benefit from off-leash areas in the GGNRA where they can get the exercise and play time they so deserve.

Sincerely,  
Susan L Damron

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5308	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 03:39:21				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Superintendent Dean,

Thirteen years ago, I wrote letters and attended meetings to express my opposition to the NPS/GGNRA's decision to rescind the 1979 Pet Policy.

Tonight I am writing yet again to express my OPPOSITION TO THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE OF THE GGNRA'S DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN with the proposed restrictions to off leash recreation.

On a rainy night in January of 2001 I was among 2000 Bay Area citizens who came to protest the GGNRA/NPAs decision to rescind the 1979 Pet Policy which would end off leash dog walking recreation throughout the GGNRA.

Many of us were standing outside in the rain because the venue you selected for this event was too small to accomodate all of us inside.

It was not a good night to be stuck outside. But this meeting was so important to each one of us that despite the rain, cold and darkness, we did not leave. We stayed and tried to hear and see what was going on inside. We had all written many letters, made many phone calls, all in opposition to this move by the GGNRA. That night thirteen years ago, we were there in person to tell you how much we opposed this decision.

I have been walking, with my dogs, at Fort Funston for years. Long before the GGNRA. All the dogs that walked with me during those years, are long gone and I have gone from my late thirties to my 60s. I am now officially a senior citizen.

And still I find myself standing outside in the rain trying to tell you how important off leash recreation is in my life. It is the only recreation I engage in. I dont hang glide. I dont surf. I dont ride bicycles. I dont jog.

I DO walk with my dogs off leash.

If I had known then, what I know now, I would never have voted to turn these lands over to the NPS. But back then, who knew what the NPS was capable of doing to the residents of the Bay Area.

Almost all of our coastline is now within your control. You ignore credible science in favor of junk science because it suits your end goal. You mis-state statistics on purpose. At a recent town hall meeting in Stern Grove you made the statement that dogs are at the top of your list of reported incidents. This is not true. Ive seen the data.

You want us banned from the areas where we have always walked with our dogs off leash. They comprise less than 1% of the entire GGNRA and you want to take away 75% of that 1%

I often think of all the wasted time and money. Time and money that could have been allocated to make this tiny area of the entire available GGNRA lands a destination for tourists and locals alike, where they can walk with their dogs off leash along the dunes or beach. People today travel everywhere with their dogs, and visit areas where their dogs are welcomed.

Ive been hearing a local radio commercial that encourages people to bring their dogs along when they visit Mendocino. Mendocino gets it. Theyre dog friendly and are proud of it! Im sure youve heard that

Carmel is dog friendly as well.

But instead of welcoming tourists and their dogs to the Bay Area, the GGNRA is preparing to allocate two million dollars so you can enforce keeping people and their dogs away from your park, as I saw it referred to in a recent newspaper article.

These areas are an urban park. Our park. Not Your park.

We are here to stay and we will continue to take our dogs on off leash walks in the same areas where we have walked for decades.

I will continue to fight fo preserve off-leash access in the GGNRA.

Sincerely,  
Jean Kind

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5309	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	corte madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 04:06:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We need to preserve off leash recreation for the health and well being of our pets. This in turn will promote the health and well being of our citizenry as we can exercise ourselves as well as our pets. Restricting off leash areas is dangerous for all pf us as we all become less able to properly exercise our bodies along with our canine companions.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5310	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This is serious!				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

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

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

ilia gvozdenovic

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5311	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. â€œâ€œ				

I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors. â€œâ€œ

Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands! Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain. Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.â€œ

Dogs in national parks are incompatible with multiple use activities such as nature viewing. Dogwalkers often fail to observe leash laws and voice control regulations. I have often observed off leash dogs in flushing wild birds. There are many other places for people to enjoy being outdoors than a national park. Please help preserve our national parks.

Thank-you,

Marjorie Siegel

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5312	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland , CA 94602 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 05:35:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In my opinion the recommendations in the of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement of the GGNRA are misguided and imprudent with respect to reducing the off leash area of the park. They address a problem that does not exist and create problems that shouldn't exist.

I am 67 years old, retired, and living in the East Bay. Every day my two dogs and I go hiking somewhere around the Bay, frequently on the Marin Headlands and Fort Funston trails. I've been doing this since before I retired for the last fourteen years. In all that time and on all those occasions there have been very few encounters (I can count them on the fingers of one hand) with other park users who have problems with off leash dogs. Instead all the different types of folks I've encountered on the trail seem to have learned to get along with one another, especially after it became evident that, due to funding cuts everywhere, there's no authority figure they can run to with their problems. So dog walkers and dirt bike riders and joggers and hikers and families with children out for a stroll all seem able to accommodate and get along with each other in civil and sociable manner, knowing that they have no choice. I have never had any unpleasant encounters in the GGNRA at all. On the contrary, people usually seem delighted to encounter my dogs and if anyone has any anxiety about them, which is rare, they generally let me know and I take appropriate action to address their concerns.

But I consider myself an open minded person and looked at the report trying to understand what the problem was that led to the drastic recommendations. To my surprise, I found nothing to indicate there was a problem. The majority of park users surveyed were in support of off leash dog walking.

"approximately 22 percent of all respondents who had visited the park and had seen an off-leash dog reported that off-leash dogs detracted from their visitation experience. Twenty-seven percent said that seeing an off-leash dog added to their visitation experience and 49 percent stated that off-leash dogs did not affect their experience" and when I looked at the compilations of incident reports relating to off leash dog walking I was startled to find how few incidents there were of environmental damage or park user conflict. I'm fact the overwhelming majority of incidents involved violations of the off leash laws.

So I'm at a loss to understand what problem needs to be addressed here.

Furthermore the GGNRA has, in my opinion, created animosity and resentment among park users by its very insistence on discriminating against a segment of park users whose behavior doesn't seem to bother other users. Who's next? Can we single out horse riders or dirt bikers or joggers, spotlight whatever incidents are associated with their activities, make them feel as unwelcome and irresponsible as off leash dog walkers?

Rather than let people work out their differences among themselves, as I've observed they can do quite well, this report suggests that an authoritarian bureaucracy needs to impose its will regardless of evidence that there is a problem, creating conflict, resentment and acrimony among park users to justify its actions in the process.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5313    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 05:56:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please so not take this off leash freedom away from our city dogs. It's critically needed.

Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5314    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 06:12:07

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Tracey Gold and I'm a responsible dog owner living in Pacific Heights. I take my dog to Crissy Field everyday where he socializes with other dogs and gets his exercise. Off leash versus on leash makes a world of difference in terms of his happiness and and overall health.. He has very strong name recall and has been trained to stick by my side ever since he was a puppy. Training him properly allowed us both to have the quality of life that is far better than making a dog stay on leash or fenced in. I never take my dog to fenced parks because they are DANGEROUS. Nervous owners with nervous dogs are attracted to fenced areas because their dogs are not behaved and the likelihood of a fight is much higher. Attacks are common in fenced areas that serve as bullpens.

I support the 1979 Pet Policy plus off leash access in San Mateo and on our new GGNRA lands. The new Preferred Alternative is extremely limiting and scary. Thank you for listening and I hope you will take my plea and those coming from so many other responsible owners into strong consideration. Please do right by us and our pets.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5315    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 06:18:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have two little children; agree that there should be dog management plan in San Francisco ex. Clearly designated spaces where dogs can run free. However I'm more concern with the dog feces left on sidewalks all over San Francisco, dog owners should have serious fines to discourage these areas especially poop visible on frequent public/common spaces/areas. There should be a night & early morning patrol giving out hefty fines to prevent dog owners & dogs from allowing this to continue. In the City & County of San Francisco, a major metropolitan City & County, homeless people living on the street should not be allowed to have a dog or pet. It's not fair to the pets who are malnourished & lack proper hygiene/grooming/cleaning. The City & its people should honestly tackle these sensitive real life issues.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5316    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Huron, OH 44839

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Charles Cloak

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5317	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jimmy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5318	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 07:11:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I absolutely oppose any changes to the long-established dog walking policy at GGNRA. Maintain the 1979 pet policy.				

If wildlife or a sensitive area needs protection, then build fences to exclude dogs from those areas, not the other way around. Fenced off leash areas are completely unacceptable.

Thank you,

Dave Johnson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5319	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 07:23:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not reduce the size of the off leash area's for dogs. There aren't that many places for dogs to run free and Fort Funston (that I use frequently) is a wonderful place for me to walk through the dunes running my dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5320    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose restrictions on current off-leash areas for dogs.

First, the Preferred Alternative is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Second, I oppose fences surrounding or delineating any off-leash area in the GGNRA. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes to install fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs in will hinder movement of wildlife. If fences are not secure enough to keep small dogs in, why have them?

Third, I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS' Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5321    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 07:55:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello

I am a long time bay area resident who has a young dog in my family. We take incredible joy in going to Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and up into Marin. I am certain that these free runs on the beach where she gets to play with many other dogs and people in a low stress environment, are a huge part of her excellent socialization that makes her a kind, obedient, and happy dog. It certainly goes a Kong way to keeping us both healthy. The bay area very much needs,our off leash spaces. There are so many dogs, and so many responsible pet owners counting on you to save our off leash areas. Please don't let us down. Please vote to keep them for all of us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5322    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 07:58:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-T Miller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5323    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SF , CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:00:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please please please save the no leash areas so that our dogs have space to run. We are city dwellers living in a small apartment and our time at Ft Funston and Crissy Field off leash is the best part of our daily lives. I really mean this. No hyperbole.  
Do not take it away.  
Please.  
Thank you,  
Karen Rivo  
SF

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5324    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:00:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Kriese

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5325    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Bruno, CA 94066  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:03:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog parents. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my dog and I will be losing one of the many great reasons as to why we live here in the San Francisco Bay Area.

There is an estimated 120,000 dogs in the Bay Area. It's been stated since 2007, that dogs outnumber the amount of children in our community. This fact alone is reason enough to not deplete our use of the dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA.

Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on my dog and I, but our entire community. Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.

We've been coexisting fine all these years. Let's keep the 1979 Pet Policy. The policy's backbone is recreational and nature based. Nature and recreation are two things the Bay Area is made up of and should continue to be made up of.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5326    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:04:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sample Letter

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any

compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5327	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 08:05:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Christopher Gamble

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5328	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 08:06:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Aaron Kienow

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5329	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 08:07:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Colleen Allen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5330	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 08:07:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Michael Vincitorio

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5331	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 08:08:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Neil Ruggiero

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5332	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94133 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 08:10:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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



health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, John Baumann

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5333	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94602 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	self Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 08:16:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please leave some off leash space for our best friends! This is a very important part of family happiness. Thank you!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5334	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Samuel

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5335	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fairfield, CA 94534 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:24:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner and lover!!!

Being able to take my dog to an area that allows them to run free and play with other dogs is not only fun for the dog, but fun for the owners. In my experience most dog owners are responsible and take pride in the environment.

For those that aren't, education is key.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5336    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:24:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposed leash law changes in GGNRA. I support maintaining a large voice-control region in Crissy Field - - more or less equivalent to Map 10-A. This is one of the few large areas in SF County where dogs can run and play, and for the most part, owners do a good job of keeping their dogs in line.

My wife and I regularly use Crissy Field to let our Westie run and play. Even on heavy-use weekends, it is not the case that dogs interfere with non-dog-family beach usage - - they get along quite well. It is not clear to us what user groups would be benefitted from a significant revision of the GGNRA leash laws, but it is quite clear which user groups would be disadvantaged.

I wish to make it clear that we are not "dogs are every bit as important as humans" dog owners. While we love our dog, and greatly appreciate other dog owners who let theirs play with ours at Crissy Field, if it were clearly established that human interests were significantly diminished by such play, we would be very willing to consider a leash-law change. In our opinions and experience, however, supporting data for such diminishment do not exist.

Finally, we do not believe that the fact that the GGNRA is part of the National Parks System - - with its own history of leash-laws and rules - - is a sufficient reason for changing those in the GGNRA. In general, the NPS was created in order to both maintain existing natural beauty and eco-systems, and allow the public to experience them pristinely. Crissy Field, however, has been a dog run for longer than it has been a part of the GGNRA. We do not believe that the relatively new designation as a NPS area should preclude dogs from enjoying the area as they and their parents did well before that designation. Please note: we neither contest nor lament this designation. The "N" of GGNRA has been a profoundly successful and beneficial structure for the parklands in the Bay Area which it protects, and has allowed thousands and thousands of persons to "R" in ways that would not have been possible had these lands been privatized. We only ask that dogs be allowed to play off-leash in a few of the GGNRA acres in ways that allow them maximal enjoyment as well, so that when they return to their homes in a very densely-populated urban area, they are more relaxed and content. This, too, is an overall feature of the NPS.

Thank you again for this opportunity to comment, and best wishes as you make your decision.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5337    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117-1149  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** WEI Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:25:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The GGNRA's ad hoc off-leash policy is no longer tenable. The GGNRA is currently reviewing comments on a Draft Environmental Impact Statement that discusses pet management in the Park. The outcome of this environmental impact assessment process will dictate how the park is managed for many years.

We all love our dogs. The question facing us all is whether we love each other enough to recognize that how we recreate with our dogs at the GGNRA has impacts on other people and other forms of life. The Wild Equity Institute believes that the GGNRA has not struck a proper balance with its draft document, because it fails to ensure that off-leash dogs remain safe in the park.

The best way to ensure dogs remain safe while roaming off-leash is to ensure that any off-leash area is enclosed with a physical boundary. These boundaries could be post-and-cable fences or natural features. But if a physical boundary cannot be placed around a specific off-leash area, than that area should not be an official off-leash area: it is simply too risky for our dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5338    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:30:32

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5339    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:31:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** most dogs are really well behaved and it is very important for them to be able to run freely.

it is unfortunate that the law would change because of the minorities of the dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5340    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Brisbane, CA 94005  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:32:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** If this plan goes forward without any apparent accommodation of dog owners it will  
A) negatively impact the livelihood of professional dog owners  
B) cause a substantial surge in the number of dogs in all the other parks in San Francisco which has no plans to address it  
C) sadly it gives an impression of GGNRA as bullies - requesting comments and then ignoring a vocal community

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5341    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** palo alto, CA 94306  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:37:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Amy Balsom

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5342    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 08:41:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog parents. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my dog and I will be losing one of the many great reasons as to why we live here in the San Francisco Bay Area.

---

There is an estimated 120,000 dogs in the Bay Area. It's been stated since 2007, that dogs outnumber the amount of children in our community. This fact alone is reason enough to not deplete our use of the dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA.

Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on my dog and I, but our entire community. Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.

We've been coexisting fine all these years. Let's keep the 1979 Pet Policy. The policy's backbone is recreational and nature based. Nature and recreation are two things the Bay Area is made up of and should continue to be made up of.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5343	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	private citizen Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I was born and raised in Marin. I am 52 years old. I remember a time when every park allowed dogs as long as their owners were respectful to the park and others that were using it. My family used to hike all over Mount Tam, China Camp, the Presideo and the Headlands growing up. They are some of my fondest memories and may soon be just that; memories.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am very active in my community through Rotary, serving on CSAs, neighborhood associations, MALT, the Environmental Forum of Marin, Boy Scouts, etc and have always tried to lead by example. There has to be a better way of dealing with this than closing access which has already been done to numerous places around the Bay Area. Please do not go forward with this draconian solution. I feel like my efforts

over the years will have been wasted and will give me one more reason in the negative column to move on. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Karl Dannecker  
President  
CMS, Inc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5344    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I visit Fort Funston often. It is our favorite place to take our dog to roam free and play in the waves. There are so few areas where we can visit that allow Lucy to be a dog, and for that reason we oppose the GGNRA's dog restrictions.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Thank you,  
Stephanie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5345	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	South San Francisco, CA 94080 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not further restrict places where dog lovers can take their pets. There are so few places that we can take our beloved pup.				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims

that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Matt Ruble

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5346	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 08:52:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't further reduce the places dogs can go....this has gotten out of control in recent years. The rare occasions of problems don't justify this. I am not a dog owner, but am definitely a dog lover and truly enjoy seeing dogs when I go trail running or hiking. There are already PLENTY (i.e. too many) of non-dog friendly places for the few people that have over-zealous fears of dogs to go.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5347	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Pablo, CA 94806 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	2/18/2014				

Dear Superintendent Dean,



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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Sincerely,

Jeff Dillender

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5348	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Bruno, CA 94066 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Play and Paws Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 08:56:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog parents. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my dog and I will be losing one of the many great reasons as to why we live here in the San Francisco Bay Area.

There is an estimated 120,000 dogs in the Bay Area. It's been stated since 2007, that dogs outnumber the amount of children in our community. This fact alone is reason enough to not deplete our use of the dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA.

Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on my dog and I, but our entire community. Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available

simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.

We've been coexisting fine all these years. Let's keep the 1979 Pet Policy. The policy's backbone is recreation and nature based. Nature and recreation are two things the Bay Area is made up of and should continue to be made up of.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5349	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 08:57:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Feb 27, 2014				

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Re: Comments on Draft Dog Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Dean,

I am writing to request that the Draft Dog Management Plan be modified to make dog use in the GGNRA more, rather than less, accessible. I am concerned about the welfare of dogs and dog owners, particularly the urban population that exists in and around the GGNRA lands.

The reality is that the park lands under discussion are part of an urban community, not a wilderness.

The GGNRA is a unique urban open space, the historical result of lands preserved from residential and commercial development as a result of military use and political will in the Bay Area. It was created to serve the outdoor recreational needs of a large metropolitan area. The current analysis and recommendations fail to consider dogs as part of the urban environment in which the GGNRA was created.

Dogs and dog-walking, both on and off leash, existed in the lands now controlled by the GGNRA before the GGNRA was created.

People and dogs have lived together in urban environments for thousands of years and will continue to do so. It is critical to the emotional and physical health of dogs to be able to exercise fully. This is rarely possible on leash or in small postage stamp sized "dog areas"

If dogs are not given adequate exercise they are prone to more physical health problems. More importantly they often exhibit more behavior problems that affect people. As a veterinarian of 30 years I can tell you that dogs that need exercise and do not get it are more likely to have aggression related

issues, including dog bites. I am concerned that if you do you not continue to provide space for dogs to run you will see an increase in the incidence of dog related problems.

The dog policy in the GGNRA has always differed from the policy in other national parks for valid reasons. Dogs should be regarded not as something foreign from which the environment must be protected, but as part of the urban environment which can co-exist in harmony with the other parts of that environment.

Given that people will continue to have dogs, and that these park lands have permitted dogs to run, there is an established expectation that they will continue to do so. Many people made responsible decisions to get dogs while thinking that they had a wonderful place close by to exercise them

In fact, many people made choices about where to live, and bought homes, with the expectation that they would be living in a area where they had access to many beautiful trails that allowed dogs to walk with them. As a veterinarian, I know how important dogs are to people in the bay area. Many people consider them as family members, and they will make life decisions with their dogs in mind.

Personally, I would not move to an area with severe restrictions for dogs, and it would be a factor in my decision to move elsewhere.

It is unfair to punish all responsible dog owners with such severe measures for the problems created by a few dog owners. For example, we do not see similar severe measures being taken against bicyclists for the actions of a few.

Elderly people, special needs people and lower income people are more severely and unfairly punished by these current GGNRA proposals because they will have to travel so far to properly take care of their dogs. They may not be able to do so and may be forced to surrender their beloved companions.

A culture is judged by its wisdom and kindness to the old, the frail and to animals. This harsh proposal reflects poorly on the awareness of the GGNRA. There are more cooperative and community oriented approaches to this problem. A collaborative, educational approach is more humane and balanced.

A multi-use policy is appropriate for the GGNRA, including an adequate balance for dog-friendly and non-dog areas. The vast majority of GGNRA lands are already closed to dogs. The GGNRA should continue to allow a significant portion of its lands for both on-leash and off-leash use. The GGNRA policy should be made more, rather than less, dog friendly and expand dog use areas to allow even more responsible dog ownership enjoyment.

Sincerely yours,

Pamela Bouchard DVM.  
Medical Director, VCA Tender Care Animal Hospital

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5350	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** 2/18/14

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Thanks

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5351	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	castro valley, CA 94552 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 09:00:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Rachel Trujillo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5352	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As a responsible and respectful dog owner who lives near both Ocean Beach, Ft Funston, and Golden Gate Park, and who enjoys these beautiful space with and with out my trained dog, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Respectfully and with hope,  
- Shelley Smith, Certified Professional Dog Trainer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5353	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Moss Beach, CA 94038-9697				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 09:01:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/16/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...				

I have walked my dogs in Montara, Moss Beach and El Granada on Rancho Corral de Tierra trails for the past 7 years. I mainly meet other local people with their dogs and we sometimes chat while our dogs play together. These dogs are off-leash with no incident.

The Dog Management Plan of GGNRA is to restrict or ban dog walking on and off-leash on the trails that dog walkers use every day (and have for decades). The reasons for these restrictions (dogs destroying the environment and wildlife) are unfounded and all the responsible people who use the park lands regularly

---

(with exception of people who just like to complain and control) know this to be true. Seeing my dogs sniffing and playing with other dogs is sometimes the funniest stuff--we all laugh our heads off. Nothing can replace the joy we all feel being out with our dogs in such a beautiful place. Good for both physical and mental health. Please convince the GGNRA to reconsider their restrictions of dog walking. The local people and dogs will be the ones to suffer and pay the price for such an outrageous, negative plan. Thank you for reading this.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5354    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116-1404  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/16/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because having a safe place for dogs to be prevents them from congregating in less safe areas.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5355    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133-1628  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/16/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I love spending time with my dog off leash. I don't appreciate the bird lobby and their desire to leash dogs that aren't causing a problem.

-----

sent via popvox.com ; info@popvox.com ; see <http://www.popvox.com/bills/us/113/x237/report>

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5356    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:03:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I don't take my dog to Fort Funston or to Crissy Field often, but the few times I've taken my pup have been fantastic experiences and not something I'd like to see dog owners (and lovers) everywhere to lose. It's great for people and dogs alike to be able to get out and enjoy the beautiful California coast and weather, and for the dogs to frolic and socialize and run out their energy. Dog owners already have so few places they can take their dogs, and I sincerely hope the NPS deeply considers all of this when they make their final decision about what to do with Fort Funston and Crissy Field, but removing these as options for dog owners in they bay would be a huge loss for everyone.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5357    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941

**Outside Organization:** United States of America

**Affiliation:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:03:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I regularly use the ggnra trails which allow my pet access. I see the same people enjoying the same trails without harm or bother to all people who visit the area. The new regulation is a contradiction to the 1979 agreement for use already in place. The areas in question do not fall under the guidance and use of national parks and should NOT be subject to those regulations. Further review and input from the tax paying individuals like myself is needed. We will not stand by idle where free access to this treasured area can be canceled. The GGNRA needs to reconsider and change to a more inclusive use of the areas agreed upon since 1979.

Sincerely,

William Tyma

Tax payer / dog owner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5358    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-2103

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:05:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** 02/16/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because my dog(s) and I have made Fort Funston our place for rejuvenation and sanity in this vertiginous world for over 25 years! We hike the bluffs to the south of the stairs for about 45 minutes and then we make our way down to the beach. It is spectacular through all seasons and during day light hours. We are respectful of the bird life and other people and their 4 legged beasts. The area is amazingly free from dog feces and litter. Dog walkers are respectful of other groups and keep their packs in tow. All people out at the Fort are sensible, attentive and excellent stewards of the park. Please don't restrict our usage.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5359    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

**Outside Organization:** United States of America

**Affiliation:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:05:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider destroying the San Francisco tradition and culture of being an inclusive and dog friendly place. This will change the future of our city from family oriented to the just plain financially driven persona of most cities. In my opinion it would be a very sad time in San Francisco history if you follow through with banning our canine residents from our parks :(

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5360    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:06:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wilhelm

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5361    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:06:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** COMMENT ON GGNRA SEIS Feb., 17, 2014

I live in San Francisco in the Presidio, I have a dog and I vote. I love the GGNRA and all the options for walking/hiking with my dog. I regularly visit Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach and all the trails in the Presidio. Off leash is our preference as both of us get more exercise and the natural interactions with other dogs and people are priceless. Off leash but under voice command, which is a key component of ensuring that dogs are behaving responsibly. When at the beach we play frisbee to the delight of men, women and countless children. We cannot play frisbee on leash!

I am an amateur birder and enjoy watching birds wherever I am. As I continually mull over the proposed restrictions on off leash dog walking I look out at the San Francisco Bay and see that the majority of land has no access for humans or dogs, surely we can afford to let people walk their dogs and share the beach with the birds. This is San Francisco and this is a Recreation Area and so lets not short change the humans and their canine companions.

Love vs. Hate this is an observation made at one of the meetings, which the NPS hosted at Fort Mason where there were lots of easels up so people could write down their comments. My memory of the



comments was that the anti-dog comments came from people who HATE dogs whereas the prodog comments were from people who love dogs. I understand that in comments submitted in 2011 for the DEIS they were overwhelmingly in favor of off leash dog walking and the 1979 Pet Policy by 3:1. So how can hate trump love? Remember this is San Francisco the "City of Love" so cast off your regional biases and let San Franciscans walk their dogs like it is 1979.

Swimming is good for dogs and humans. While it really could be done, for all practical purposes: You cannot swim a dog on leash!

Fencing in your minimalist planned off leash areas would be a travesty and further diminish the magical park experience by separating people from the dog people, bad idea.

Lastly it is a huge waste of the taxpayer's money for the NPS to continue their campaign to push through these unpopular new restrictions.

Sincerely, David Caldwell 411B Washington Blvd., San Francisco, CA 94129  
caldwellz@gmail.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5362	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 09:10:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I find it unacceptable that govt agencies who are required by statute to get public input and modify plans accordingly, ignore this mandate and keep their jobs. We have laws that require us to bag our pets excrement and no proof that this law s not being followed. These properties belong to us. Our taxes pay to support them and you need to budget to protect our rights. I'm sure there are other places you can look to cut your frivolous spending to keep our parks open to our pets and preserve out rights as tax payers.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5363	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112-2618				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 09:10:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/17/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because as a responsible dog owner, it is necessary for me to be able to visit and enjoy the GGNRA. I was a resident of the Presidio from 2005-2009 and walked my dog every day on Baker Beach and surrounding trails. I continue to drive across San Francisco in order to visit that beautiful area with my dog, on leash and with extra com postable bags to pick up after him! It would be heartbreaking for me to not be able to enjoy those walks with or without my dog. Please do not go forward with the draft dog management plan.				

---

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5364    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Albany, CA 94707  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:12:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a passionate environmentalist and an advocate for public safety in public places, I understand and share the concerns that both park managers and members of the public have about off-leash dogs in parks. However, regulatory restriction is the wrong tool to deal with these issues. Cultural change through education would be a far more constructive approach, and one that would provide much greater benefit to the parks over the long term.

Dog people are park people. Many of the best stewards and advocates for public parks are those who enjoy them in the company of their dogs. Denying access to the large and rapidly growing segment of the public for whom off-leash dog play is an essential part of their park experience may offer some short-term conservation benefits. But it is the wrong thing to do, and will ultimately damage the parks by cutting off important public support that may be essential to their future.

A much better way to approach this problem would be to reach out to dog owners to engage them in helping to change the culture of dog ownership, to emphasize the necessity of effective voice control and cleaning up after one's dog. If the behaviors of concern - such as allowing dogs to approach people who do not want them near and chasing wildlife, as well as failing to clean up after them - are frowned upon by dog walkers themselves, and are reported to rangers and/or sanctioned by direct comments to the offenders, then people who are trying to do the right thing will change their behavior.

Granted, these changes that will not happen overnight, but they will happen, and ultimately they will be far more sustainable as well as more appropriate than the current proposal to simply exclude so many innocent park users.

For many dog owners, especially the growing numbers of childless people and empty-nesters, their dog is a member of their family. Denying such families the ability to use the parks for the simple pleasures of off-leash play - such as throwing and chasing a stick - is not only unnecessary and wrong, but is ultimately not in the interest of the parks. Please reconsider, and join with responsible dog owners in developing a more just and sustainable approach that will build rather than diminish public support for parks as a social priority.

Thank you for considering this comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5365    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114-1836

**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** member

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:12:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** 02/17/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because we were at Ft. Funston Saturday with 2 families and 5 kids and 2 dogs. We wouldn't have been there if it weren't for the dogs because they need to get out every day. But we adults need to get out too. The kids definitely need to get out or they'd be inside and play video games. It benefits us all. The kids would only play video games and be com e loners and psychopaths (probably not only my kids), the adults would lounge (which would be fun for a few days) and start drinking, eventually get into drugs and probably end up on the street. The dogs would get cabin fever, escape and cause who knows what havoc on the streets.

That's why we need open spaces for the dogs ... and the humans.

-.--.-.-

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5366	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94117-1104				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 09:14:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** 02/17/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because... A huge number of San Franciscans rely on these spaces to provide recreation and relaxation for themselves and their families- including the family dog!! San Francisco is so unique in its access laws and provisions for people with dogs. This is an absolutely essential piece of living in this area. Without access for humans AND their dogs to the coastline, many residents, myself included will be robbed of the simple recreation I most treasure. Whatever issues and impacts arise from the use of these spaces by dogs, can certainly be managed and mitigated through education and thoughtful appeal to a very sensitive, responsible, and responsive public, which is exactly how I'd describe 99% o SF dog owners.

-.--.-.-

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5367	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132-1723				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 09:14:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** 02/17/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...I am a non-dog owner who delights in the happiness of my fellow dogowning citizens and their pets when I walk throughout the trails of Fort Funston, near my home. It is one of the most special places in SanFrancisco. I adore the dogs, have NEVER had a problem with the pet owners or their animals! PLEASE keep this area as a little piece of paradise for our dog-loving owners & non-owners alike! Thank you...Kathryn Ovcina, R.N.

-.--.-.-

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5368	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116-1662  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:15:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/17/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because...my family and I take our dog for walks daily. The areas you propose to make off limits are one of the I only areas that my 3 year old twins and my dog can walk freely together. You would be limiting the ability for us all to play fetch and run together. We don't have a yard to play in in the city. Please help us keep our family time!

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5369    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131-2421  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:16:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/17/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because, as a dog owner, the joy my well-trained dog brings to me and the people in my com munity far exceeds the limited damage NPS claims she and other dogs do to OUR GGNRA. The NPS claims are widely unsupported by fact, analysis or survey. In my time spent over 15 years taking care of my past and current dog, 95% o the dog owners I encounter every day are thoughtful, respectful and environmentally conscious about how they use the park systems, including clean-up and adherence to park rules. Please do not take this right away from dogs and their owners.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5370    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-4621  
**Outside Organization:** DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 02/17/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because I am a past NPS intern at GGNRA, a San Francisco native, homeowner and dog owner. I believe I have the right to responsible use of open space for my dog and myself.

-----

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see h ttp:// w ww .popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5371    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Granada, CA 94018  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:18:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Christine Gardner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5372	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Curtis Cochran

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5373	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Lagunitas, CA 94938 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my service dog to many GGNRA trails and beaches here. This is the third dog that I am training for search and rescue work and she NEEDS to run while under control in areas that allow this. We simply cannot just train at Rodeo Beach!

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you.

Bob Burns RN

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5374	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Bruno, CA 94066 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 09:24:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Michael Yablon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5375    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** None Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:25:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are completely against the trails in question being closed to dogs. We have lived in Mill Valley for 17 years. We choose to live here to enjoy the open space and to hike and walk with our dog. We have always respected the trails as we share them courteously with dog owners and non dog owners alike.

The banning of dogs on the trails in question will make our community less desirable for so many of us to live here.

Please count me among the hundreds of folks that are against this outrageous plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5376    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:28:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs need exercise. If you take away off leash areas, it will be the most evil thing you ever do in your life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5377    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:29:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

Sincerely,  
John Davis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5378    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Amherst, MA 01002  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Private College Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As an East-coast person I've participated with the dog walkers at Fort Fungston while visiting. Having seen first-hand the current amazing use of this recreational area, I can only say the GGNRA is as misinformed about this issue as Mayor de Blasio of New York is misinformed about the tradition of the Carriage Horses of New York. I can only assume, the GGNRA has a hidden agenda, as de Blasio has. Ignore what constituents want and watch your smaller parks absorb the 75% displaced dogs converge on the smaller parks and still open off-lease areas.

I oppose the Preferred Alternatives because they are too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on NEW LANDS that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome, including those without dogs. Multi-use areas must remain open and accessible for all uses. Fences require maintenance. That's an added cost to whom?

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Lack of foresight regarding traffic, parking, over-crowding and inconvenience for owners who employ dog walkers will forever change the current amicable status-quo. Like that Direct TV commercial, don't change, because if you do you may have to watch the downfall of an entire civilization.

Sincerely,  
Amanda Birnbaum

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5379    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

February 3, 2014



Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have lived in Sausalito and owned a business in San Francisco for 23 years. During that time I have loved and lost three golden retrievers - and I can honestly say the best moments of those 23 years were spent walking with my dog(s) off leash on beaches in the GGNRA that you now propose to restrict from dog walking.

I chose San Francisco as my place of business and Sausalito as my residence, precisely because of its dog friendly policies and the extensive urban recreational access both locations afforded.

I write now and I join the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Congresswoman Speier, Congresswoman Pelosi, the Crissy Field Dog Group, Animal Care and Control of SF, Peninsula Humane Society, Montara Dog Group, Save Off Leash, and thousands of tax paying individuals who strongly object to the proposed GGNRA preferred alternative dog plan as far too restrictive, far too limiting in where we can recreate with dog(s), unfair to dog owners, and not fact based in its planning or findings.

How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply ignore the voices of so many individuals, groups and elected representatives?

How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply not consider or address a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS?

These unanswered questions lead to the conclusion that the process has been only for show and the GGNRA never intended to incorporate public or even elected representative's views.

For 23 years I have walked at Crissy Field, East Beach, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Rodeo Beach and throughout the hills of Fort Cronkhite. I cherish these walks with my dog(s) and the opportunity to enjoy recreation with my dogs after work, and close to the places I live and work.

I located my business in San Francisco for the very reason that East Beach, Baker Beach and Fort Cronkhite provided easily accessible off leash dog walking on my way to and from work. I have paid California's high taxes on my home, my income, and San Francisco's additional city taxes on my small business - because San Francisco and Sausalito have provided such wonderful dog recreation access.

I'm shocked at the GGNRA's conclusions and preferred alternative which demonstrate a lack of understanding that the Bay Area GGNRA lands must serve an urban population.

When the GGNRA was created in 1972, Dog Walking was already a long standing use of the lands that were turned over to the park. Dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, and as such this specific recreational use and part of the San Francisco Bay culture - and this use must continue indefinitely.

There are millions of people with dogs in the Bay Area. People who work, who have families, and have dogs. Bay area residents need access to off leash dog recreation in the mornings and afternoons - access that is close enough to their homes and work to allow them to strike the balance between work, family, pets, and recreation. The preferred alternative will result in millions of people being unable to recreate with their dog(s) - in the GGNRA lands these families support with their tax dollars.

I firmly support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. The Bay Area GGNRA is a unique national recreational area in an urban environment - not an isolated untouched park in the wilderness. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

Additionally, the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties.

In Marin County there will be one beach where all of Marin's dogs can recreate off leash. This beach has extreme tides, forceful waves, and will be packed with thousands of dogs - because it's the only off leash beach that will be preserved for all of Marin County in the preferred alternative. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

It would appear the GGNRA's preferred alternative intentionally sets up the proposed dog policy to fail - by restricting a large dog and urban resident population to use such small areas that over crowding is inevitable. The overcrowding will result in friction between residents with and without dogs. And this will lead to even more restrictions - which is precisely what the GGNRA has preferred all along.

Why does the GGNRA rely on outdated studies and information for the latest supplemental environmental impact statement?

Why hasn't the GGNRA updated its enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released?

Is it possible the GGNRA has gone through this process always intending the end result to be an overly restrictive dog policy that ignores the urban location of the recreation area, is unfair to tax paying residents, and is designed to fail before it is even released - ensuring the GGNRA can eventually simply do away with any dog access in the Bay Area GGNRA locations?

How is it that the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented?

How is it the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis?

Again. I join thousands of residents, elected representatives of California and San Francisco, and groups dedicated to animal safety and I ask the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Lynn Keller  
Resident  
Sausalito, California  
94965

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5380	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San leandro, CA 94578 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Travis stein

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5381	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	vizslawalk Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 09:37:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	If we want to have "balanced dogs" we need to meet their needs. The end of a 6 foot leash is not enough to create a balanced life. I have seen incredibly stable and balanced dogs in the off-leash areas where I walk my dog. I have great concern for what behavior we will create with our canine companions when we limit their balanced life.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5382	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94114				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 09:37:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	People have rights that dogs do not have. People have the right to take a walk in a national park without being concerned about a loose dog attacking them, or even coming up to sniff them, with a slobbery snout. People should be able to sit down without strange dogs swarming around them, and disturbing their peace.				

---

Wildlife also has the right to peace. Dogs are supposed to be on a leash in a park. Dogs do not pay taxes. Domestic animals are not allowed to roam free in National Parks.. If you choose to have an animal, it's your responsibility to find some recreation for it that does not disturb other people.

II don't want to have to worry..."oh, he's friendly."

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5383	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:37:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Brisack

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5384 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:39:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep these off leash available for dog owners to enjoy our wonderful Federal Parks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5385 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:40:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please consider the health and safety of threatened species when determining where dogs are allowed off leash. These species are in need of protection and the GGNRA is responsible for their safety as well as their ability to reproduce and live in peace. Please allow for clearly designated areas for off leash dogs so that everyone and every species can depend on the park for safety as well as recreation. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5386 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94619  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:41:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5387    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** New York, NY 10013  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Sarah and I live in NYC. But I grew up playing in the sands of Muir Beach with our family dog! And I am visiting my sister in Muir Beach and was horrified to learn of the GGNRA's intention to restrict dogs so heavily in this historically dog-friendly area. I oppose your "preferred alternative" for Muir Beach, and also for the surrounding trails of the Marin Headlands. Both are far too restrictive and unsubstantiated. I support the "No Action" alternative for these areas. "A"!

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't included any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. There are no studies differentiating impacts as human or dog caused. The SEIS is biased against dogs, and is sloppy science.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to people in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. My Dad and my sister and my brother live right up against the GGNRA, and it's literally their front yard. They use it regularly and rely upon it. I use it and enjoy it every time I'm home, which is several times a year. All Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained, and enforced. Try initiating policies that help make the situation more workable, like better signage, better education of ALL park users about good stewardship, and poop bags at trailheads and parking lots. ENFORCE the Pet Policy and stop barking up the wrong tree!!!

Sincerely

---

Sarah Lovitt  
NY, NY

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5388    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Leandro, CA 94577  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:46:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't restrict off leash areas. My dogs love the freedom to run and explore - and if there are other dogs nearby we keep our boys close. Instead of removing off leash areas provide more garbage cans for us to put our poop bags in.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5389    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:47:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am in opposition of the GGNRA plan to reduce off leash dog walking. I have been an SF resident for 25 years. My family, dogs and I have enjoyed, benefitted from and contributed to our off leash walking areas as well as neighborhood parks.

Walking and playing with a dog provides incredible benefits. I doubt my daughter would have much interest in walking with me at Ft. Funston without our dogs! Dogs make it fun! Being able to take my dogs and daughter out together improves our family dynamic. It also teaches a sense of responsibility and community. We have regularly participated in park and beach clean ups. We clean up messes when we see them. We get to know other people (dogs have a way of allowing people to talk) and have made many friends. We ALL get exercise. Community and responsibility are values I hope my daughter continues to experience as she grows up in SF.

Areas to walk dogs off leash are already so limited. Reducing them further will truly be a detriment to our area- -it certainly will be to me and my - -both the human and dog memebers.

Sincerely,

Susan Fry  
(415)759-7202

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5390    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:47:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

I have stopped donating to the National Park Service due to what I see as a mismanagement of resources in the National Park Service developing dog-restrictions for Recreation Areas to solve problems that do not exist, according to any peer-reviewed or site-specific study.

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. Your own leadership has shown a complete lack of interest in working with the community.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Nada Djordjevich

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5391	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Golden Gate Audubon Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 09:49:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** It is essential for the enjoyment of the public and the protection of wildlife that dogs be allowed off leash only in specified enclosed areas. I have a 70 pound active dog that needs off leash exercise to maintain health. It may be inconvenient, but I find ways to offer him space to run and play that will not threaten precious wildlife resources or frighten those who are trying to find peaceful relaxation in their parks. Dog parks may not be the most esthetic places to be with your pets, but they do allow off leash romp and play time. There are many places one can walk or jog with their dogs on leash.

Many favorite trails are now overrun with off leash dogs that are not command responsive or may respond "sometimes". When chasing rabbits or squirrels or birds, commands are ignored by the majority of canines. These trails are no longer pleasant and instead intimidating, as one never knows when they will encounter an animal that is often wary and nervous. Dog fights on trails are not uncommon, likely due to nervous or territorial dogs. Trails in the East Bay once had horses, but in large part due to dogs, equestrians can no longer use them safely.

I fear that strict enforcement and significant penalties will be the only way to change the attitude of many dog owners. It is a sorry situation when they feel entitled to have so many parks and trails open to their pets, while denying the impacts to others including those animals who rely on minimal disturbance to survive.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5392	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94605 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:49:45

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I personally would not have a dog for a pet in the city. It is so unnatural for a canid to be cooped up in a house or apartment or confined to a small yard all day....they are thwarted every day, since their nature is to roam a territory. This should be obvious. It is a difficult question, but I do feel the wildlife that co-inhabits our open spaces is harmed by a daily onslaught of overwrought dogs.....thus, a policy protecting indigenous wildlife is necessary. Truly if I had my way i would discourage people from having dogs in the city on the premise that it is cruel to confine an animal in such an unnatural habitat.....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5393    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:50:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My dog needs exercise to maintain a healthy weight and Fort Funston in particular is extremely important to that. The off leash areas on the beach are one of the few areas where he can run freely over long, flat distances. And the sand is good for his legs, particularly if he develops arthritis as he gets older.

Please keep the off leash areas as-is.

Thanks,

David

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5394    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.



Sincerely,

Patrick Thurmer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5395    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:51:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

I'm concerned with the planned reduction of off-leash areas planned in the SF Bay Area. While crucial habitat and nesting sites should be protected, San Francisco is a highly dog-centric city, with more dogs than children. Dogs often provide a link with the natural world and the crucial impetus for residents to get outside and exercise.

I'd prefer to see more education for dog owners, teaching them the importance of not allowing their dogs to chase birds or dig holes in parks, rather than banning some of the favorite off leash areas.

Thank You,

L Roth

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5396    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Sterling-Rice Group Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please, please please do not move forward in pushing this action through. I will be devastated and Charlie will be devastated, too. This is what makes San Francisco so wonderful - is allowing open fields in an urban environment for all!

Sincerely,  
Jena Garlinghouse

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5397    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Keron

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5398    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94612  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:55:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Leah Goldberg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5399    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:55:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Vincent LoPresti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5400    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94612  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Rahul Kanakia

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5401    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Milpitas, CA 95035  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:56:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please please keep the off leash areas. It is one of the very best things about living here. If I couldn't take my Border Collie up to Ft. Funston to run, we'd go nuts.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5402    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Bolinas, CA 94924  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:56:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kyra Epstein  
415.690.9603

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5403    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:57:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you again for accepting comments on the GGNRA Proposed Dog Management Plan. The following text is a revised submittal from an earlier comment period being offered here as a reminder that the problems experienced due to off leash dogs in 2009 are generally the same as those experienced today only more so: there are now more dogs than ever being brought to the area covered by the GGNRA. Also, based on recent personal experience and relevant studies there has been little to no improvement in the behavior of animal owners and acts of civil disobedience in regards to the existing rules are on the increase.

---

These records are based on the GGNRA's Criminal Incident Records for the year 2009 (Redacted) that relate to domestic animal issues at the GGNRA. The incidents that were available to us have been categorized and copied into this comment for the record.

These reports were provided at the request of a colleague under the Freedom of Information Act. We believe information included in all Criminal Incident Records related to domestic animal incidents should have been included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

In reviewing the 2009 Criminal Incident Records several items stand out.

1. Based on these 2009 reports the professionalism of the U.S. Park Officers and Rangers was outstanding during this difficult period of transition and should be commended for their performance. As local naturalists and wildlife advocates these officers have our gratitude for performing a very tough job with patience and dignity. Thank you!
2. There are a high percentage of non-compliant dog owners and professional dog walkers who provide false information or are rude and verbally abusive to the U.S. Park Officers. We are saddened to read about these incidents but not surprised based on our own experiences with non-compliant dog owners in the GGNRA.
3. There are a surprising number of fraudulent representations of dogs as Service Dogs
4. There are a high number of non-compliant dog owners who are repeat offenders.
5. Professional Dog Walkers place a tremendous burden on the natural resources of the parks and GGNRA Staff.
6. There is a high degree of variability between Park officers and at different park properties as to whether a non-compliant dog owner will be cited or given a warning.
7. Many dog owners whose dogs have acted aggressively towards other dogs or visitors flee the scene when an injury occurs or a complaint is registered.
8. Many non-compliant dog owners are abusive to visitors who complain to them about their dogs behavior or their handling of their dog.
9. Overall there is a tremendous burden to the U.S. Park staff in dealing with non-compliant pet owners.

Some conclusions:

1. Based on many hundreds of hours over decades of personal observations while at the GGNRA and the number of records in this 2009 report, the officers are observing only a very small subset of the number of actual domestic animal code violations that occur within the GGNRA. Of course the most egregious violations, if observed by visitors or park staff, are reported and handled quickly by officers. It is apparent that the vast majority of violations of rules are never reported by visitors or observed by park staff. Naturally, many non-compliant owners change their illegal behaviors quickly upon noticing the presence of park staff. Due to the size of the parks compared to the parks small number of staff a visitor can hike for many hours, even days, without ever coming in contact with park staff. Therefore the incidents in this report should be considered as a small percentage of the overall violations that do occur within a year at the parks.
2. The non-compliant dog owners listed in the majority (>90%) of incidents in the 2009 Criminal Incident record are given a verbal or written warning. The reports indicate that their names are entered into a database and they will be cited for subsequent infractions. During this transition and education period I personally concur with this method. However, using traffic law violations as a metaphor for pet rules in the parks is not unseemly and if licensed auto drivers come to expect only a warning when they are caught running a stop sign they are much less likely to comply with that law in the future.
3. Repeat dog rule offenders should always be cited and chronic offenders fines should increase with the number and severity of the offense.
4. Professional Dog Walking should not be allowed but being that the burden of proof is so high for the officers, all dog walkers should be limited to three dogs per walker.

5. The burden on the patrolling officers could be greatly reduced by reducing the area that domestic animals are allowed. While on-leash will always be the preference for naturalists the burden of cat and mouse game of on-leash/off leash game that is repeatedly played by irresponsible pet owners in the many areas of sensitive habitat could be virtually eliminated by making these changes.

#### GGNRA 2009 Criminal Incident Records involving dogs

Off-leash dogs at the GGNRA have harmed park visitors.

13 Records, at least 13 people injured

140009008641 Muir Beach, dog and juvenile on boogie board collide in water, boy taken to hospital for medical care

070009-012319 Ft. Funston 3 dogs charge visitor, one bites visitor

060009-000882 Ft. Funston 1 Dog bites NPS Employee, owner flees

270009-003014 Presidio Pacific Arguello 1 dog off leash bites visitor

Being walked by Professional Dog Walker

200009-003278 Crissy Field One child bitten, another harassed by off leash dog

270009-004443 Presidio Pacific Arguello - Bicycling tourist attacked, bitten by group of dogs being walked by Professional Dog Walker - hospitalization required

070009-006549 Ocean Beach Off leash dog attacks, seriously injures off-leash dog and then bites dog owner

260009-009703 Presidio Riley Ave. 8 dogs off leash, one bites visitor

Being walked by Professional Dog Walker

070009-009837 Ft. Funston 1 dog off leash bites Hang Glider when landing, owner flees

070009-011151 Ft. Funston Off leash dog attacks, seriously injures off-leash dog and then bites two dog owners

200009-011718 Crissy Field Visitor bitten by off leash dog, dog owner flees but tracked by vehicle license and cited

070009-011102 Ft. Funston Two off leash dogs attack, injure third off-leash dog, a visitor (not a dog owner) was bitten breaking up the three dogs, requiring care. One owner was slightly injured. All three dogs over 125 pounds in weight.

150009005047 Stinson Beach - dog bites adult jogger

070009009173 Ft Funston person with leashed dog that had been attacked by group of unleashed dogs asked person responsible for off leash group to leash her 10 dogs. Person with unleashed dog group accused of throwing coffee on car.

Non-compliant, aggressive and/or abusive dog owners interfere and endanger Federal Officers and Rangers:

260009-001736 Portola St, Pres. 4 aggressive off leash dogs nearly bite ranger

200009-011332 W. Bluff Picnic area - off leash dog harassing Police Horses

Disorderly Conduct

200009-009110 Mountain Lake Professional Dog Walker, 7 off leash dogs, 2 harassing Police Horses, walker rude and disorderly to officer

260009-010113 Ecology Trail 6 off leash dogs, harassing Police Horses, Professional Dog Walker rude, non-compliant and disorderly to officer - only verbal warning due to hazard to horses and officers

260009-010431 Ecology Trail 24 dogs off leash in on-leash zone, 3 Professional Dog Walkers given verbal warnings due to hazards to horse and officer

030009-011260 Ft. Mason Non-compliant, disorderly, abusive conduct towards a Police Officer from off leash dog owner in an on leash area while officer is performing duties. Dog Owner resisted arrest and claimed to have an illegal agreement with another U.S. Park officer.

260009-011736 Pops Field Professional Dog Walker, 6 off leash dogs, 1 charging, harassing Police

Horse, professional dog walker non-compliant to officers commands  
 070009-012408 Ft. Mason Off leash dog in on-leash area attacks Police Horse on Ft. Mason Horse Trail requiring use of force (pepper spray) by officer  
 070009000382 Ocean Beach off leash providing false information  
 070009000615 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash, resisted officer requests  
 070009000615 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash, resisted officer requests  
 060009000909 Sutro repeat, 2 dogs off leash, resisted officer  
 07000901976 Ocean Beach 2 dogs leashed but not held, needed police backup  
 030009002386 Ft Mason 40 unleashed dogs, harassment of officer by another individual  
 030009002482 Ft Mason 2 unleashed dogs, false ID, others taunted officers  
 090009009835 Ft Baker dog off leash, verbal abuse of officer  
 090009010129 Ft Baker dog off leash, resisted officer  
 170009010168 Mori Pt 2 dogs off leash, false identification, insulting officer  
 100009-012117 Black Sands Beach Dog in No Dog area, disorderly owner  
 170009003226 Mori Pt using social trail, dog off leash, insulted officer, backup requested  
 070009003594 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash, false identification, repeat offender  
 200009-010170 CF WPA 2 dogs off leash in WPA, one disorderly owner  
 170009010168 Mori Pt 2 dogs off leash, false ID  
 200009-011750 CF WPA dog off leash, disorderly owner  
 260009-000289 Ecology Trail 3 dogs off leash  
 Disorderly Professional Dog Walker  
 200009-000624 CF WPA 1 dog off leash, disorderly owner  
 200009-000629 CF WPA 1 dog off leash, disorderly owner  
 200009-001094 CF WPA 5 dogs off leash in WPA  
 4 Verbal warnings, 1 citation, disorderly owner  
 070009-001248 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA, owner disorderly  
 260009-001283 Portola Dirt 3 dogs off leash, owner disorderly  
 070009-001883 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash in WPA, 2 disorderly owners  
 030009-002486 Ft. Mason 40 dogs off leash, abusive & non-abusive owners  
 230009-007759 Kobbe/Washington 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone  
 disorderly owner  
 170009-007110 Milagra Ridge 2 dogs off leash - disorderly owner  
 230009-010532 Ft. Mason 3 dogs off leash in on-leash zone, owners disorderly  
 130009-011660 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area, disorderly report

Off-leash dogs have been involved in many dog fights and dog bites at the GGNRA.  
 260009-000538 Lombard Ruger Pres. Off leash dog attacks, injures on-leash dog  
 070009-001603 Ft. Funston Off leash dog attacks, injures on-leash dog  
 070009-002888 Ft. Funston Off leash dog attacks, injures off-leash dog  
 030009-005768 Ft. Mason Off leash dog attacks, injures off-leash dog, false information given by dog owner  
 070009-006064 Ocean Beach Off leash dog attacks, injures off-leash dog, owner flees scene  
 200009-006422 Crissy field Off leash dog bites, injures off-leash dog  
 030009-007267 Ft. Mason Off leash dog attacks, injures off-leash dog, false information given by dog owner, flees scene  
 080009-008403 Mori Pt. 6 dogs off leash, one attacks, causes stroke to on-leash dog  
 20009001231 WPA off leash dog bites officer  
 07000902736 2 dogs off leash, one bit officer and growled  
 070009007313 Ft Funston woman bit by German Shepard, woman required medical care  
 2000097656 WPA two dogs bit a miniature leashed horse, stopped when bystanders kicked the dogs and

pulled their collars, horse required UC Davis vet hospital care  
070009008771 Ocean Beach pit bull attacks bulldog, bulldog injured in head and eye requiring vet care. Racist, foul language from group associated with bulldog, group fled before officer arrived. Person separating the dogs, punched dog, and was bit.  
14009188 Muir Beach pit bull and boxer fight, boxer required \$315 vet care from bite  
0700090140048 Ft Funston group of off leash dogs, one dog bit human  
0700090003500 Ocean Beach off leash golden retriever bit by 1 of 3 off leash pit bulls. Dog required 36 stitches \$950 in vet costs  
130009004632 Marin Oakwood Valley Trail May 8, 2009- coyote bit off leash dog which was off trail, dog required vet care.  
1140009013962 Rodeo Beach - unleashed dog snapped, growled, humped another unleashed dog then dog was bitten. Owners argued, foul language ensued.  
60009001627 Sutro 2 dogs chased another dog, false information to officer  
70009001710 Ft Funston 2 off leash dogs; 1 dog owner kicked dog

Off-leash dogs have been injured at the GGNRA falling off steep cliffs:  
070009002454 Ft Funston, off leash dog ran away, stuck in cliff, Fire Dept, Ambulance  
070009008417 Ft Funston dog stuck on cliff, technical rescue required  
070009009156 Ft Funston dog stuck on cliffs, Fire Dept. dispatched for rescue. Two beach patrol officers, 3 rangers, 1 park police, 10 firefighters required 2 hours for this preventable rescue.  
0700010001 Ft Funston man and dog stuck on cliff, SF Fire Dept rope rescue required  
070009004582 Ft Funston dog and person stuck on cliff, 3 park rangers, 2 life guards, rope rescue required  
070009013710 Ft Funston dog and person stuck on cliff 12/16/2009, several park officers required for rescue  
070009-001832 Ft. Funston Dog fell over cliff - Heavy Rescue required  
070009-010997 Ft. Funston Dog fell over cliff - Heavy Rescue required

Charging and growling off-leash dogs frighten visitors and hamper their ability to enjoy the GGNRA:  
200009-006182 Halleck/Mason 1 dog off leash repeatedly runs into path of bicyclists in Escape from Alcatraz triathlon Race, interrupting endangering riders  
070009-007421 Ocean Beach 1 off leash dog knocks down, bruises two children  
070009-008052 Ft. Mason 2 Dogs harass 2 horses whose owners harass dogs  
200009-008867 CF Beach 2 dogs off leash aggressive towards complainant visitor  
020009-010027 Aqua. Park 1 off leash dog harasses visitor who complains to dog owner - dog owner then abuses visitor  
260009-012622 Ecology Trail Visitor Complaint - 8 dogs off leash in on-leash zone, 2 dogs attack visitor, Professional Dog Walkers flees  
070009013141 Ft Funston - dog jumped out of car, nearly hit by officers vehicle, owner did not stop immediately, visitors helped place dog in officers vehicle

Dogs in areas where no dogs are allowed: 89 Records involving at least 130 dogs:  
090009-010410 Ft. Baker 1 Dog in No Dog area, disorderly, abusive owner  
060009-001055 China beach 1 Dog in No Dog area  
130009-010846 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
100009-010836 Black Sands Beach 3 Dogs in No Dog area  
130009-010876 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
140009-011621 Pirates Cove 1 Dog in No Dog area  
130009-011661 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area



Cite# 2334208 Coastal Trail/Fire rd. Dog in No Dog area  
130009-000410 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
060009-001743 China beach 1 Dog in No Dog area  
130009-002061 Tenn. Valley 2 Dogs in No Dog area  
130009-002448 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
170009-002964 Sweeney Rg. 3 dogs off leash  
050009-003884 Ft. Point Pier 1 Dog in No Dog area  
100009-004272 Black Sands Beach 2 Dogs in No Dog area  
200009-005249 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in closed portion of WPA  
100009-005297 Black Sands Beach 1 Dog in No Dog area  
180009-006355 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
130009-006708 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
150009-006959 Stinson Beach 1 Dog in No Dog area  
100009-007372 MH Kirby Cove 1 Dog in No Dog area  
150009-007467 Stinson Beach 2 Dogs in No Dog area, repeated after warnings  
130009-007482 Tenn. Valley 2 Dogs in No Dog area  
130009-007575 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
130009-007936 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
130009-007938 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
150009-008231 Stinson Beach 2 Dogs in No Dog area  
200009-008756 CF Lagoon 1 dog off leash in closed section, left feces  
130009-009861 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
230009-010774 Batt. to Bluff Tr. 1 Dog in No Dog area  
110009-012950 MH Bobcat Tr. 2 Dogs in No Dog area  
130009-012955 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
130009-013146 Tenn. Valley 1 Dog in No Dog area  
130009000049 area closed to pets  
130009000360 area closed to pets  
150009000452 area closed to pets 4 dogs  
150009000455 area closed to pets 2 dogs  
230009432 dogs in plants in area closed to pets  
150009000457 area closed to pets 2 dogs  
130009000488 area closed to pets 2 dogs  
13009001879 Tennessee Valley 3 dogs in no pets area, 1 off leash  
230009002396 Ft Scott dog in no pet area  
130009002543 Tennessee Beach dog in no pets area  
13000902459 Tennessee Beach dogs off leash in no pets area, bottles on beach  
06009007120 China Beach dog in no pets area  
130009007470 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area, false info  
130009007469 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area  
10009007951 Marin Headlands dog in no pets area  
80009008116 Phleger Estate 3 unleashed dogs  
1109008503 Marin Headlands Marincello dog in no pets area  
80009008501 Marin Headlands dog in no pets area  
111009008579 Marin Headlands Bobcat Trail, 2 dogs off leash  
130009008584 Tennessee Valley dog off leash  
070009008724 Ft Point Pier dog, no dog area  
110009008952 Marin Headlands, 3 dogs in no pet areas  
140009008983 Coyote Ridge 2 dogs in no dog area  
130009009591 Tennessee Valley 2 dogs in no dog area  
130009009588 Tennessee Valley dog in no dog area

130009009822 Marin Headlands dog in no pets area  
130009003069 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area  
130009003071 Tennessee Valley 3 dogs in no pet area  
130009003673 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area  
110009003652 Marin Headlands dog off leash in area closed to pets  
130009004234 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area  
100009004277 Black Sands 2 dogs in no dog area  
110009004739 Bobcat Trail dog off leash in no dog area  
230009005038 Presidio Bluffs trail 35 contacts with off leash dogs, 10 dogs in no pets area  
130009005318 Tennessee Valley 2 dogs in no dog area  
130009006265 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area  
150009006959 Stinson Beach - owner refused lifeguard instructions to remove dog from beach  
110009012716 Marincello Trail 2 dogs in no pets area  
130009012952 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area  
140009013158 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area  
130009013250 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area  
130009013251 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area  
060009013252 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area  
100009013244 Kirby Cove dog in no pets area  
140009013285 Coyote Ridge, dog in no pets area  
130009013406 Tennessee Valley 2 dogs in no pets area  
130009013402 Tennessee Valley 2 dogs off leash  
09013773 Tennessee Valley dog off leash in no pets area  
150009013935 Stinson dog off leash, out of sight of owners in no pets area  
150009014036 Stinson beach, dog in no pets area  
14000911878 Coastal Fire Rd - dog in no pets area  
090009000166 off leash  
1400000358 dog with no owner on beach, begging for food  
09009000454 dog off leash  
20009000581 dog off leash being washed in shower facility

Running dogs off-leash at the GGNRA puts the welfare of wildlife at great risk.

007009000043 WPA dog off leash  
007009000113 WPA dog off leash  
200009000193 WPA dog off leash  
070009000266 WPA dog off leash  
070009000268 Ocean Beach off leash  
070009000307 Ocean Beach off leash  
120009000385 two off leashed dogs in leash area, flushed birds  
08000900403 Dog off leash in endangered species area  
070009000383 Ocean Beach off leash  
070009000443 Ocean Beach off leash  
070009000451 Ocean Beach off leash, left dog unattended  
070009000444 Ocean Beach off leash  
070009000448 Ocean Beach off leash  
050009000484 off leash in leash area Ft Point  
200009000482 WPA dog off leash  
200009000576 WPA dog off leash

070009000616 Ocean Beach off leash  
070009000570 Ocean Beach off leash  
070009000612 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash  
070009000661 Ocean Beach advised 5 people with off leash dogs  
150009000677 Sweeney Ridge dog off leash  
170009000676 Sweeney Ridge two dogs off leash  
070009000825 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
070009000822 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
080009000928 Mori Pt 2 dogs off leash  
070009000981 Ocean Beach 2 dogs disturbing plovers and other shorebirds  
200006000890 WPA dog off leash  
800090001045 Mori Pt off leash  
800090001042 Mori Pt off leash  
070009001060 Ocean Beach 3 dogs off leash  
200009001106 Crissy dog off leash  
070009001101 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash  
070009001109 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
070009001112 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
000909001102 Ft Baker dog off leash  
170009001143 Milagra Ridge dog off leash  
170009001163 Sweeney Ridge dog off leash  
170009001148 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
170009001142 Milagra Ridge dog off leash  
070009001149 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
200009001200 WPA 2 dogs off leash  
070009001209 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
07009001207 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
20009001241 Ocean Beach 3 dogs off leash  
20009001231 WPA 5 dogs off leash, 1 scattered birds  
20009001239 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
07009001249 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
07009001243 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
07009001251 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
07009001289 Marin Headlands dog off leash, off trail  
20009001290 WPA 2 off leash dogs  
00809001316 Mori Pt. Off leash repeater, near cliffs  
08009001322 Mori Pt 2 off leash dogs  
07009001362 Ocean Beach off leash dog  
17009001440 Sweeney Ridge off leash  
20009001451 WPA 6 off leash dogs  
20009001526 Mori Pt dog off leash  
07009001583 Mori Pt 4 off leash dogs  
30009001604 Ft Mason off leash repeater  
08009001733 Milagra Ridge off trail, unleashed dog  
09009001795 Battery Yates off leash dog in Mission Blue habitat  
09009001785 Ocean Beach dog off leash, no voice control  
09009001768 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
09009001769 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
17000901958 Mori Pt off leash  
07000901974 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
07000901979 Ocean Beach off leash

17000902003 Sweeney Ridge off leash  
08000902205 Mori Pt off leash dog  
07000902228 Sutro off leash  
07000902232 Ocean Beach 2 off leash dogs  
070009002453 Ocean Beach off leash  
170009002626 Sweeney Ridge off leash  
170009002616 Sweeney Ridge 2 dogs off leash  
170009002625 Sweeney Ridge human urination, dog off leash  
170009002684 Sweeney Ridge dog off leash  
200009002622 WPA dog off leash  
008009002701 Mori Pt off leash dog in newly planted area  
080009002699 Mori Pt off leash dog  
70009002689 Ocean Beach off leash through 5 Snowy Plovers  
13000902825 Tennessee Valley off leash off trail  
07009002835 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
20009002918 WPA off leash, no voice control  
08000902919 Mori Pt 2 off leash dogs  
080009002920 Mori Pt off leash dog  
170009007107 Sweeney Ridge off leash & Mori Ridge off leash  
170009007345 Sweeney Ridge off leash dog  
170009007340 Milagra Ridge off leash dog  
170009007348 Sweeney Ridge 2 off leash dogs  
20009007365 WPA 2 people 2 off leash dogs  
20009007374 WPA dog off leash  
090009007676 Ft Baker dog off leash  
2000900007754 WPA 6 dogs off leash  
70009007856 Ocean Beach off leash  
090009008162 Ft Baker dog off leash  
10009008166 Marin Headlands 3 off leash dogs 1 off trail, no voice control  
20009008205 WPA 2 unleashed dogs  
20009008251 WPA dog off leash  
80009008499 Mori Pt dog off leash  
080009008567 Mori Pt dog off leash  
070009008555 Ocean Beach dog off leash, no voice control, repeat offender  
090009008880 Marin Headlands dog off leash in leash area  
090009008888 Ft Baker 2 dogs off leash  
80009008940 Milagra Ridge 2 dogs off leash  
150009009116 Mori Pt dog off leash  
20009009245 WPA dog off leash  
170009009926 Mori Pt 2 dogs off leash  
200009009329 WPA dog off leash  
080009009429 Mori Pt dog off leash  
070009009508 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
070009009568 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
070009009566 Ocean Beach WPA dog off leash  
090009009753 Ft Baker traffic violation and 2 off leash dogs (repeat off leash offender)  
200090009784 WPA dog off leash  
200009009788 WPA dog off leash  
080009009820 Sweeney Ridge dog off leash  
070009009811 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
200009009850 WPA 3 dogs off leash

200009009856 WPA dog off leash  
090009009951 Ft Baker off leash dog, growled at officer  
070009010067 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
100009010128 Main Black sands beach, nude sunbather with off leash dog  
090009010182 Ft Baker dog off leash  
200009002941 WPA dog off leash  
100009002942 WPA dog off leash  
170009002962 Mori Pt dog off leash  
170009002964 Sweeney Ridge 3 dogs off leash  
060009003043 Sutro Park dog off leash digging plants  
070009003116 Ft Funston dog damaging park by digging  
170009003174 Sweeney Ridge off leash dog  
170009003170 Mori Pt 2 dogs off leash  
170009003171 Sweeney Ridge dog off leash  
170009003227 Mori Pt dog off leash  
170009003252 Milagra Ridge 3 dogs off leash  
200009003287 WPA 2 dogs off leash  
070009003283 Sutro Park dog off leash  
070009003589 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
80009003611 Mori Pt dog off leash  
80009003614 Mori Pt 2 dogs off leash  
070009003848 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash  
070009003878 WPA 11 people contacted re: dogs off leash in 2 hours, 4 additional people could not be contacted  
20009003877 WPA 2 dogs off leash  
090009004059 Ft Baker dog off leash  
200009004057 WPA 2 dogs off leash  
070009004262 Sutro Heights dog off leash  
170009004378 Sweeney Ridge professional dog walker with 4 dogs off leash  
090009004561 Ft Baker off leash dog  
090009004621 Ft Baker off leash dog  
170009004687 Mori Pt dog off leash  
230009004954 WPA dog off leash  
060009006043 Sutro Heights dog off leash  
170009005239 Sweeney Ridge dog off leash  
090009005250 Ft Baker dog off leash  
090009005254 Ft Baker dog off leash  
170009005711 Mori Pt dog off leash  
170009006025 Sweeney Ridge off leash dog  
170009006342 Mori Pt dog off leash  
170009006369 Sweeney Ridge off leash dog  
170009006344 Mori Pt dog off leash  
170009006350 Mori Pt Sweeney Ridge 2 dogs off leash  
170009007107 Sweeney Ridge 2 dogs off leash  
800090012503 Mori Pt dog off leash  
800090012576 Milagra Ridge 2 dogs off leash  
070090012683 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
070090012686 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash  
080009012697 Mori Pt dog off leash, false ID  
070009012903 Ocean Beach dog off leash interested in gulls  
110009013103 Marin Headlands Rifle Range - off leash dog harassing deer

080009013195 Sweeney Ridge dog off leash  
070009013176 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
140009013198 Marin Coastal Trail dog off leash - repeat offender  
060009013222 Sutro Park dog off leash  
060009013223 Sutro Park dog off leash  
140009013233 Muir Beach dog off leash  
080009013274 Mori Pt dog off leash  
140009013398 Muir Beach 2 dogs off leash Coastal Fire area  
080009013435 Mori Pt 2 dogs off leash  
070009013421 Ocean Beach dog off leash  
140009013779 Marin Coastal Trail dog off leash  
080009014097 Sweeney Ridge dog off leash  
080009011 Mori Pt dog off leash - repeat offender, agitated owner  
14000913943 Marin Coastal Trail dog off leash  
070009010152 Ocean Beach dog off leash, repeat offender  
070009-010152 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
150009-010319 Sweeney Rg. 1 dog off leash in on-leash area  
200009-010375 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-010378 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-010379 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
080009-010421 Milagra Ridge 2 dogs off leash in on-leash area  
080009-010488 Mori Pt 1 dog off leash in on-leash area  
080009-010490 Mori Pt 2 dogs off leash in on-leash area  
090009-010658 Ft. Baker 1 dog off leash in on-leash area  
140009-010821 Muir Beach Tr. 1 dog off leash in on-leash area  
080009-010952 Mori Pt 1 dog off leash  
080009-010953 Mori Pt 1 dog off leash  
080009-011038 Milagra Ridge 1 dog off leash in on-leash area  
080009011026 Mori Pt 1 dog off leash  
200009011211 WPA dog off leash  
080009-11253 Mori Pt 2 dogs, separate owners, off leash  
080009-11659 Mori Pt 1 dog off leash  
070009-011275 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
080009-11711 Milagra Ridge 2 dogs off leash  
200009-011752 CF WPA 1 dog off leash  
Cite# 2334207 Coastal Trail/Fire rd. 1 dog off leash  
070009-012123 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash  
070009-012340 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-012414 CF WPA 1 dog off leash  
070009-0900112 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
260009-000323 Ecology Trail 3 dogs off leash  
Professional Dog Walker  
070009-000445 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000446 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000447 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000452 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000491 Sutro Heights 1 dog off leash  
260009-000551 Ecology Trail 3 dogs off leash  
Professional Dog Walker  
070009-000573 Ocean Beach 39 dogs off leash in WPA  
38 Verbal warnings, 1 citation

070009-000577 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash, pet impounded  
070009-000617 Ocean Beach 55 dogs off leash in WPA  
53 Verbal warnings, 1 citation,  
MVN for fraudulent rep. As Service Dog  
070009-000619 Ocean Beach 10 dogs off leash in WPA  
10 Verbal warnings, 1 prior  
030009-000620 Ft. Mason 1 dog off leash  
200009-000625 CF WPA 4 dogs off leash, 4 owners, verbal warning  
030009-000626 Ft. Mason 1 dog off leash  
230009-000663 CF WPA 1 dog off leash  
200009-000674 CF WPA 7 dogs off leash in WPA  
7 Verbal warnings  
070009-000697 Ocean Beach 25 dogs off leash in WPA  
20 Verbal warnings, 5 citations  
200009-000700 CF WPA 3 dogs off leash in WPA  
3 Verbal warnings  
070009-000776 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000798 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
060009-000700 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000831 Ocean Beach 17 dogs off leash in WPA  
17 written warnings  
070009-000853 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
070009-000877 Ocean Beach 3 dogs off leash in WPA  
3 written warnings  
090009-000892 Ft. Baker 1 dog off leash  
060009-000912 CF WPA 3 dogs off leash in WPA  
3 Verbal warnings  
070009-000917 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-000919 CF WPA 3 dogs off leash in WPA  
1 written warning  
070009-000920 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000925 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000929 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000930 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000955 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000957 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000960 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000961 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-000979 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-000982 Ocean Beach 31 dogs off leash in WPA  
28 written warnings, 3 citations  
200009-000983 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-000998 CF WPA 9 dogs off leash in WPA  
9 Verbal warnings  
070009-001026 Ocean Beach 29 dogs off leash in WPA  
27 written warnings, 2 citations  
070009-001038 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA, owner cited  
Dog chased Snowy Plovers for 21 minutes  
260009-001059 Ecology Trail, Pres. 3 dogs off leash  
070009-001066 Ocean Beach 42 dogs off leash in WPA  
40 written warnings, 2 citations

200009-001152 CF WPA 11 dogs off leash in WPA  
11 written warnings, two grateful citizens  
814009-001167 Ecology Trail Numerous dogs off leash  
200009-001174 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
230009-001211 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-001229 CF WPA 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
070009-001238 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-001242 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-001245 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-001250 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-001314 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-001398 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-001557 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-001558 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-001585 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
200009-001594 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
260009-001597 CF WPA 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
200009-001598 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-001770 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
070009-001780 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-001833 CF WPA 3 dogs off leash in WPA  
260009-001868 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash  
060009-001872 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash  
900009-001875 CF WPA dog off leash in WPA  
070009-001884 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
070009-002032 Ocean Beach 3 dogs off leash in WPA  
200009-002467 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
260009-002513 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash  
200009-002588 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-002590 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
260009-002700 McArthur Lp 5 dog off leash  
200009-003067 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
110009-003347 Marin Headlands 1 dog off leash in on leash area  
900009-003067 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
070009-003572 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
070009-003571 Ocean Beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
080009-003938 Mori Point 1 dog off leash  
200009-004046 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
200009-004440 CF WPA 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
070009-004440 Ocean beach 9 dogs off leash in WPA  
080009-005320 Mori Point 2 dogs off leash - Professional Dog Walker  
260009-005332 Simonds Lp 1 dog off leash  
080009-005711 Mori Point 1 dog off leash  
270009-005770 JK Playground 1 dog off leash  
080009-006031 Mori Point 2 dogs off leash  
260009-006337 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash  
260009-006338 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash  
260009-006341 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash  
170009-006350 Sweeney R. 1 dog off leash  
230009-006410 Magazine Rd. 7 dogs off leash in on-leash zone  
Professional Dog Walker



260009-006483 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash  
 260009-007070 Ecology Trail several dogs off leash  
 Professional Dog Walker  
 270009-007073 Ecology Trail 2 dogs off leash  
 260009-007411 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash  
 260009-007597 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
 200009-007783 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
 200009-007796 Ruger @ Lombard 8 dogs off leash  
 170009-007860 Mori Point 1 dog off leash  
 200009-008194 CF WPA 1 dog off leash in WPA  
 070009-008395 Ocean Beach 3 dogs off leash in WPA  
 230009-008495 Pops Field 2 dogs off leash in on-leash zone  
 020009-009384 Aqua. Park 1 off leash dog in on-leash zone, false service dog info provided  
 070009-009572 Ocean beach 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
 170009-009573 Milagra Ridge 1 dog off leash  
 070009-009810 Ocean beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
 200009-009962 CF WPA 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
 070009-010105 Ocean beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
 200009-010154 CF WPA 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
 260009-010253 Ecology Trail 8 dogs off leash in on-leash zone, Professional Dog Walker given one citation  
 060009-010471 Sutro Heights 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone  
 200009-010750 CF WPA 1 dogs off leash in WPA  
 070009-011324 Ocean beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
 080009-011749 Mori Point 1 dog off leash  
 070009-011753 Ocean beach 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
 070009-011807 Ocean beach 2 dogs off leash in WPA  
 030009-011814 Ft. Mason 4 dogs off leash in on-leash zone  
 140009-011877 Muir Beach 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone  
 260009-011995 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone  
 260009-011995 NW Pres. Golf Course Several dogs off leash in on-leash zone - Professional Dog Walker  
 260009-012005 Ridge Trail 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone  
 260009-012057 Central Mag. Rd. 8 dog off leash in a WPA, one cite - Professional Dog Walker  
 030009-012410 Ft. Mason several dogs off leash in on-leash zone  
 030009-012417 Ocean beach 1 dog off leash in WPA  
 030009-012853 Ft. Mason several dogs off leash in on-leash zone  
 030009-012974 Ft. Mason 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone  
 140009-012980 Muir Beach 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone  
 260009-012983 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone  
 260009-013031 Ecology Trail 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone  
 070009-013270 Ocean beach 1 dog off leash chasing wild birds  
 030009-013391 Ft. Mason 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone  
 030009-013393 Ft. Mason 1 dog off leash in on-leash zone

Off-leash dogs are more likely to leave behind dog feces in the park, reducing the recreational value of the GGNRA:

17000001957 Mori Pt 4 off leash, 1 defecated in restored habitat  
 230009007425 Baker Beach, off leash, dog feces covered with sand  
 13000907466 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area, failure to pick up feces  
 070009008449 Ocean Beach failure to remove dog feces  
 070009005080 Ocean Beach 2 dogs off leash, left dog feces, no bags to pickup

150009-001375 Stinson Beach 1 dog off leash & owner refused to pick up feces  
230009-004742 Crissy Field Dog owner neglects to pickup off leash dogs feces  
13000907466 Tennessee Valley dog in no pets area, failure to pick up feces

Other:

150009001126 Stinson Beach solar powered lamp installed where 2 pets buried

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5404    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 09:59:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Hanna Bockh

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5405    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** oakland, CA 94609  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:00:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,

there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Janet Sessions

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5406	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95125 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	German Shepherd Rescue of Northern California Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:00:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	For us responsible dog owners that clean up after our dogs and train them dogs to be well behaved, save off-leash rights at our beaches.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5407	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:03:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
  
Katelyn Sullivan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5408	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94709  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:03:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please let dogs remain off-leash. It means a lot to them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5409    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:04:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Erica Johnson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5410    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** MILLBRAE, CA 94030  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:04:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Pamela Fena

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5411	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	dog owner of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:04:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please reconsider this plan as it will negatively affect all of us good dog owners.

Sincerely,  
Tyler Dalbey

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5412	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fremont , CA 94539 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:05:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Hi. We have been driving up to SF parks for many years with our dogs. There is no place like it. It would be a shame to take this away from our four legged friends and parents. Please reconsider. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5413    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please reconsider this on behalf of all of the good dogs and dog owners here in San Francisco.

Sincerely,  
Alica Lemler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5414    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Cerrito, CA 94530  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:12:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not eliminate space for our dogs and people to play.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5415    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service Personnel -

Thanks for this opportunity to comment on the GGNRA dog management plan. I am a strong supporter of National Park values and policies, and I appreciate what you have done so far to uphold park values within the GGNRA - especially those values that protect wildlife, seek to preserve nature, and that allow responsible recreation ensuring the sustainable future of the parks. Thanks for providing these lands and for protecting them for people and nature of the Bay Area.

In general, I am pleased and supportive of the Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. I appreciate the thoughtful review that you have done, and the careful presentation of the various alternatives for each of the open spaces. I feel that The National Park Service should maintain its strong and effective dog management policies within their parks, including the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

1) We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. San Francisco is a relatively small urban area that hosts dozens of endemic and/or endangered species. Many users - including myself - come to these areas to learn about and see the nature enclosed in the parks. Many of the park segments contain critical patches of habitat for endangered species and other nature. The presence of dogs in many of these areas can be disturbing to wildlife, and should be restricted in some. Please make sure that the most critical wildlife areas are designated as off limits to dogs.

2) If there are to be off-leash areas, these should be clearly marked off with fencing, a cable boundary marker, or natural borders such as thick bushes. In many city parks without boundaries, I have seen off leash dogs (often on "voice control") spill over into adjoining areas. This essentially extends the off-leash area and allows other visitors in adjacent areas to be affected by dogs when they don't wish to be. It will be easier for everyone if there is a clear boundary; dog owners can relax and let their pets run more freely, and other visitors and wildlife can have more assurance that they will not be disrupted by off leash dogs.

3) Park officials need to effectively enforce the dog rules. Unfortunately, many of the park rules are not followed by dog owners. Just recently my family was hiking in Marin County when an off-leash dog ran up and began aggressively barking at my wife, with the dog owner nowhere in sight. My daughter, who is under two years old, was visibly shaken and brought to tears. By the time the owner approached, with claims that her dog "never acts like this", the day and hike were already ruined for my family. When I asked the owner to please keep her dog on a leash, she became hostile, and barked that she said she was sorry, what did I want from her. I simply said that she should keep her dog on a leash in this area, to which she gaffawed and walked off with her dog still off leash. My baby daughter could not be calmed, and we had to end our nature walk.

Unfortunately, although there are many dog owners who respect the laws, there is a visible and vocal minority of dog owners who do not respect laws or the rights of other citizens. These people ruin the park experience for all users - dog owners and non-dog owners alike. They give other dog owners a bad name, and honestly if all dog owners were respectful and aware of the needs of wildlife and other people, perhaps there would be less need for stringent dog laws. Unfortunately, too many of our San Francisco citizens will not respect these laws unless they are effectively enforced.

I recently attended a town hall meeting organized by Jackie Spier at Stern Grove to discuss and learn about the GGNRA dog walking plans. Even at this meeting, an off-leash pit bull was allowed to disrupt the meeting. Not only was the owner not in control of her dog, she admitted to not even having a leash. And of course, there were absolutely no repercussions for this dog owner. Does someone need to be attacked or injured before we hold people accountable or enforce our laws? How much wildlife is attacked or chased every day by dogs with no accountability?

4) Visitors to the park should be limited to a maximum of two dogs per person. I live at the trailhead of a large open space, and I see that people with more than two dogs are often not in control of all of their dogs; they do not notice when their dogs defecate and they do not keep them under control. There must be limits to the numbers of dogs that people can bring, and this number allowed must be justified with real information about how average users handle their dogs.

5) Commercial dog walking should not be allowed in the GGNRA. Other commercial enterprises typically must go through review to evaluate their impacts, benefits, and alignment with the parks' mission. This has not been done for commercial dog walking. Furthermore, commercial dog walking - often with many dogs in tow - can have a greater impact on trails, wildlife and other users than is fair. And this is not a recreational activity - it is a commercial activity that does not align with park values or mission.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it is by far the most dog-welcoming of any real estate under the park's jurisdiction.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5416	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:13:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear National Park Service managers,				

Please accept this brief comment on the National Park Service's proposed Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. I am concerned that the Plan does not strike the proper balance between the Park's mandated duty to protect endangered, threatened, and sensitive wildlife, particularly bird species in the GGNRA with the Parks' discretionary decision to provide access for users' dogs. Protection of listed and sensitive species must take priority over dog use. That being said, the proposed plan appears to be a good faith effort by the NPS to provide more trails and areas where dogs are prohibited within the San Francisco portion of the GGNRA and to better enforce the park's dog rules, while still allowing substantial opportunities for persons with dogs to enjoy the GGNRA. One addition should be to include fencing off or otherwise restricting areas designated for off-leash dogs. Any visitor should be limited to no more than two dogs. Although if I were writing the Plan, I am sure I would think even more stringent restrictions on dog-owners would be appropriate, I do believe the NPS's proposed compromise is a reasonable balance that is absolutely essential for the NPS to meet its mandatory wildlife protection obligations.

Thank you for your efforts to create a sustainable GGNRA.

Sincerely,

Michael Lozeau

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5417	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Individual Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:13:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** I have children and dogs, and I prioritize all humans above all dogs. Anyone who prioritizes dogs above any human should not ever have children. Dogs will not suffer from the dog management plan, only irresponsible dog owners will. I speak as someone whose child has been endangered by an irresponsible dog owner.

Please pass and enforce a responsible dog management plan in any city and community that contains a human population.

Thank you,  
Jess Dines

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5418	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Half Moon Bay, CA 94019 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:14:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As a parent of two dogs, I ask that you do not suspend off leash privileges for any of the parks, especially Fort Funston or Chrissy Field. We have grown quite fond of them. I can understand that there are dog owners who do not clean up after their pups. I see more people doing this than not doing it. If I happen to notice someone leaving a mess, I offer them one of my bags. Please reconsider this idea and do not punish the good dog owners. Taking our dogs on day hikes is a big part of every weekend, as well as many fun afternoons.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5419	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:14:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
PJ Pedroncelli

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5420    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:16:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are enough restrictions on dogs as it is. Please don't take away the play areas. Dogs are therapy and help us everyday. Let us be able to pay back their unconditional love by walking and playing off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5421    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:16:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

This is about open space for all.

I am a very responsible dog owner with an extremely passive and gentle dog who deserves to be out in open space and fresh air as much as people do.

With have to learn to live with nature, with respect to all creatures and living organisms.

Thank you for your time and service.

Alex C.  
Fairfax

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5422    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

---

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Sincerely,

Adam D. Borod  
3245 Clay Street, Apt. 3  
San Francisco, CA 94115

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5423	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SF, CA 94110				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:20:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	i support restricting access for dogs to our parklands. there is no other way to safely protect wildlife & natural features. i love dogs. but they are domesticated, urban creatures. they will (by their nature) chase & harass wildlife & heavily impact the environment.				

dog owner are rabid abt their defense of free access. however, from an environmental & democratic standpoint, free- access is not fair.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5424	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:22:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent				
	Building 201, Ft. Mason				
	San Francisco, CA 94123				

---

February 17, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I believe it is important to note that when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs in this urban recreational area. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.

This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

I strongly urge you to keep Crissy Field and East Beach open to off leash dog access.

I also strongly urge you to keep Muir Beach open to off leash dog access.

I also urge you to maintain the off leash dog access in the trails at Fort Cronkite which are currently open to off leash access.

I also urge you to maintain the on leash dog access in the trails at Fort Cronkite which are currently open to on leash dog access.

Thank you for your consideration in creating a more balanced plan.

Sincerely,

Lynn Keller  
Resident  
Sausalito, California  
94965

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5425    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Cupertino, CA 95014  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:25:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having safe, accessible and public areas for our animals/dogs/pets is essential. One only has to look at the plight of dogs in Russia in these olympics to see what the effects of overly restrictive policies can have. While there are multiple options for humans to enjoy public spaces, many of us have 4-legged friends that also come with us. To restrict our ability to access these areas takes away areas that our taxes pay to maintain. Please save off leash areas for mixed use by both off leash animals and people. Help educate people about safe handling of off leash dogs. Provide education, provide assistance, provide training, but do not legislate barriers that only generate more aggression and animosity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5426    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Modern Hound Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:25:57

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Off leash dog space makes this city unique. It provides adventure and exercise for our dogs. It is vital for their health and the health of our city. Please reconsider taking away our off-leash dog parks!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5427    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:27:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm writing to express my strong opposition to GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I exercise my dog on Crissy Field/Fort Mason and Ocean Beach daily and our walker takes her to Baker Beach and Fort Funston. There would be very few places in the city where she (and I) would get sufficient exercise if this plan were implemented, and roaming the beaches and parks is one of the reasons I love living in San Francisco.

I oppose fences for off-leash areas in the GGNRA because my dog is very shy and does not feel comfortable running in the fenced areas within dog parks. With no alternative free space, she will not have anywhere to exercise.

The purpose of these recreational areas within the city is to give people and their dogs access to trails and beaches. Denying access for our dogs would prevent many people for enjoying these recreational areas.

Sincerely,

Anna

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5428    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:29:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Playing with my dog in an open area that I would choose to walk in alone as well (as opposed to the terrible dog parks) is one of my greatest joys.

She is well behaved, under voice command and I pick up after her. Limiting us access to federal parks is unkind and unfair. I certainly pay my fair share of the taxes, I want my fair share of access to our parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5429    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:31:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The original platform to promote these areas being converted into National parks to begin with and garner proper support was to allow pets being off-leash, so it will be a contradiction of promises.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5430    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94945  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:31:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It is important for me that I can enjoy walks and hikes with my dog as I do now. I already feel limited in where I can hike with my dog. Don't let the few irresponsible owners ruin it for everyone. Hiking with your dog is so great for your health too. Please do not limit dogs anymore then they are!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5431    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Napa, CA 94559  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:31:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** It shocks me to think that so much space is designated to be taken away from people that enjoy using these areas with their beloved pets. If they are no longer allowed to go there to enjoy the outdoors and exercise their dogs, where do you think they'll end up going? They have to take their dogs somewhere to exercise them. I foresee many, many people using areas such as small city parks to run their dogs; areas where dogs have either always been banned or only allowed on-leash. Perhaps the powers that be see this as a new revenue source for issuing tickets to such offenders? I also see many more aggressive dog issues as people are forced to use smaller, congested designated dog parks; areas that are frequently used by owners that are either ignorant of the need, or are just too lazy to provide proper supervision. I thought recreation areas are for people to enjoy 'recreating' in . . . without their beloved dogs, I don't see these same people going there at all. So who exactly benefits from banning dogs? The occasional GGNRA user and the tourists, rather than the local people that have come to enjoy using these areas daily? It makes absolutely no sense to me! I'm just glad that I have places to go with my dogs, and that I don't live in and around SF!! Please reconsider these bans. Take a page out of Carmel-by-the Sea's book, and allow everyone the same benefits that the lucky folks down there enjoy!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5432    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:31:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The plans to restrict dogs to Rodeo Beach only is FAR too restrictive. Please reconsider to allow dogs access to more beaches and trails than is currently planned. I am OPPOSED to this plan.

Regards,

Harry C. Chapman  
415-971-5746

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5433    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:31:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** City folk and their dogs need safe, legal places to play and exercise. There is no place better than parks. Please do not reduce the current off leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5434    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Seattle, WA 98107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Niklas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5435    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:35:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

My name is Ashley and my dogs name is Lilly. Lilly is a Husky mix, she needs at least 2 hours of exercise a day at a minimum, which she gets. However, she does love walks, but even more she loves to run! She can do this on leash with me, but not as fast as she can with out it. Her favorite part of the day is getting to get off the leash and run as fast as she can, sniff things, and play with other dogs. She is loving and kind, she would never hurt anyone or anything. She is more afraid of people then they are of her.

---

It would be horrible and she would be very sad if she wasn't able to run off leash. Dogs are like children, they are messy and they run and play with no fear. If you think that dogs should be on a leash, then why shouldn't kids be on leashes. They are wild, and out of control, messy and dirty, they scream and cry. It's the same thing, our dogs are, our children. We love them and want the best for them. We will do anything to protect them. I understand that there are some bad apples, but that shouldn't be the reason to punish all dogs. I always pick up my dogs messes, and even ones that are not ours. Dog owners are a community and we are there to help each other out. Tell us what we can do, to make the situation better. Don't take it to extremes yet, give us some help, throw us a bone.

There are not many dog parks, and we don't have a lot of options. We are trying to keep the small areas we have. Think about your options. Please don't go through with this. Lilly and I would greatly appreciate it! She loves to run and this would be heart breaking to me and her. Her mood will change and just like humans she will be depressed due to her lack of exercise. Please, please don't go through with this!

Thanks,  
Ashley Hiben

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5436	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94945 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5437	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Springville, CA 93265 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:36:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I'm writing to express my concerns regarding the preferred alternative proposed by the National Park Service on the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas' dog management plan. I was recently made aware of the new proposed policy and was surprised and disappointed to hear about it. Although I don't live in the San Francisco area, I frequently come to the area to visit family and friends. When I do, I always bring my dog partly because of all of the wonderful off leash dog areas. Reducing the amount of off leash dog areas will restrict where I can take my dog out to run, play with other dogs and get some exercise. In all of the off leash dog areas I have been to in San Francisco, the one thing I have always appreciated is



how clean and open they are. From my experience, dog owners who come to these areas pick up after their dogs, are responsible with their dogs and enjoy the opportunity to let their dogs be free to run and play. I've had nothing but positive experiences. The new policy seems to be too restrictive and will make it more difficult for me to take my dog out when I'm in th area.

I really hope your agency re-thinks this proposed new policy and at the least, reduces the restrictions being proposed. One of the wonderful things about taking my dog to the San Francisco area are all of the great off leash dog areas especially those managed by your agency.

Sincerely,

Teresa Ernst

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5438    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not make san francisco a dog leash only town - this is unfair and unjust. As a NATIVE SAN FRANCISCAN I truly oppose this and COMPLETELY AGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING:

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

RACHELE NOBILI

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5439    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 90608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Student Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:36:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep San Francisco weird! Don't take off-leash dog walking areas away from the community!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5440    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** TBD Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:37:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Please don't remove these vital area for me and my dog to bond and bound around.

It is one of the greatest places and areas for me to exercise and my dog to do the same. its not only our 4 legged friends that get a good work out ever time we visit, Funston and Chrisy. We all benefit from these walks, we need these areas (and more of them) with easy access for all.

I really see no reason to change the way these lands are currently used!  
we all benefit from easy and open access.  
Please leave these areas as Off Leash open access for me and my dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5441    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
L F & Mila (pug/beagle)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5442    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Albany, CA 94706  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:39:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't close the areas out dogs are allowed in and off leash. My family has two dogs that are active and needs areas like GGNRA to run around and release some of their energy!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5443    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:39:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam:

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I regularly take my dog to Crissy Field and other GGNRA areas. My dog Olive loves to run and play fetch off leash. She is very well behaved and responsive to verbal commands, so is never in danger of harming off-trail wildlife. Depriving her of and I of this activity is a major blow to each of us and our respective physical and mental health. As has been commented before, having off-leash areas are especially important in highly dense urban settings and gives us and our dogs a release.

Thank you,  
Lauren

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5444	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:40:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog owning parents with children. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that one of my family's favorite activities will be swiped off our "Fun to-do List".

We are an active family with an active lifestyle and much of our lifestyle includes our dog. Our household is happy hugely in part to our dog and limiting access to our dog's favorite playgrounds (I.E. Fort Funston, Muir Beach and Ocean Beach) will be devastating to us all. Especially to our (breed of dog) (name).

The points brought up in the SEIS are completely unjust for such a radical change to be made. My family and our dog won't be able to have the bonding time and exercise like we do on the GGNRA lands at our local, fenced-in dog park. Nothing is quite as fulfilling as having my family together, (your dog's name here) included, out for a day of hiking, observing and learning about the great environment around us.

Please consider keeping the 1979 Pet Policy - it keeps all points of nature and recreation in harmony. It ensures my dog and any other future dogs my family has; will have their space now and for years to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5445	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94709 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:40:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** The EIR greatly understates the extent to which visitors fail to comply with dog rules, in GGNRA and in other areas. In fact, I was astonished to read the claim "The East Bay Regional Park system does not have any major compliance issues" (p.31). I spent a lot of time in the East Bay Regional Parks and cannot imagine a reasonable definition of "major" that would result in that statement being true. Specifically, I frequently see dogs that are supposedly "under voice control" chasing birds (including flightless birds such as quail) and deer, while the dog owners helplessly yell for their dogs to stop. Dogs that are "under voice control" when nothing interesting is happening become unmanaged and unmanageable when their instinct to chase is triggered. And I have seen dogs chasing coyotes. Indeed, one dog owner I spoke with says she likes to visit a specific area of Tilden Park because "every now and then we see coyotes, and my dogs love to chase them."

The evident assumption that dogs that are under voice control will indeed be under control leads to the EIR grossly understating the impacts of dogs in areas where they would be permitted off-leash under some of the plans. Areas that permit off-leash dogs will experience substantial declines in terms of wildlife and bird habitat. This should be acknowledged.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5446	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Folsom, CA 95630 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:41:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please go forth with the preferred alternative for Ocean Beach. I believe the current regulations would be sufficient if they were actually enforced, but that is not the case.				

Dog owners do not regulate each other, and the Park Service doesn't either. As such, I have witnessed dogs chasing endangered species (snowy plovers) as well as migratory shorebirds (willets, gulls, terns, marbled godwits, sanderlings) foraging to build up strength for their journey. I've even seen dogs walking along the rock revetment at the south end of the beach barking at nesting bank swallows. They shouldn't be subjected to the threat of dogs, especially in a National Park.

In addition to wildlife being harassed I have also witnessed people being harassed by dogs. Some people are very sensitive to animals and they do not appreciate it when dogs approach them or their kids. The percentage of dog owners who actually have "voice control" is very low.

Please do not let Ocean Beach become a dog park the way Fort Funston and Crissy Field have. I understand that dog owners in San Francisco need places to take their dogs, but during my visits I have witnessed the blatant abuse of the privilege of being able to bring dogs into a National Park. Ocean Beach is a unique place and should be protected for the sake of the wildlife and park visitors such as myself.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5447	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet				

---

Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5448	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** As a pet owner in San Francisco, I'm greatly concerned about the overtly restrictive new draft dog management plan. This plan must be stopped so we San Franciscans can continue to live in dog-friendly, healthy city. The benefits to off leash areas far outweigh the concerns that the plan attempts of solving. Please do not move forward with the plan.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you for your consideration and attention.

Heather

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5449	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.
------------------------	--

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis

was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5450	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:46:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep the dogs out!				

Please, please, please prohibit dogs on Ocean Beach. According to the current signs protecting the Snowy Plover from Lincoln Way to Sloat Blvd, they should be on leash almost all months of the year. 95% of the dogs are off leash. Is the law not enforced? Are the signs wrong? What do I tell my kids- - signs and laws don't matter? I am a San Francisco native, grew up in the sunset district, and now have lived 3 blocks up Lawton Street for 20 years. Walking on the beach is a daily event. My children grew up playing on this beach.

Let me outline my reasons for urging prohibition, or at least a fully enforced leash law. We have drunken driver laws. 99% of drivers aren't drunk, but we need the laws for those who are. A very few dog walkers on Ocean Beach obey the leash laws or have their dog under "voice control", so we need the law for this vast majority who are breaking the current rules or will break the new policies.

I realize the dog owners are a very powerful force and I fully assume they will get most everything they want in this decision from the most powerful government on earth. But in the hopes of making you think a little about the upcoming decisions, let me tell you a few examples of my experiences on Ocean Beach:

1) Several times playing peacefully in the sand with my small children we had barking, angry dogs approach us, kick sand in our faces, destroy our sand castles, with us not knowing how far the attack would go.. bites? Each time the distant owner would do nothing- maybe lamely call the dogs name or look at us like we were the ones at fault for enjoying some quiet family time in a national treasure. Or even get angry at us! We often just went home disappointed and sad.

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

3) Several times being approached by a vicious appearing dog, yelling at the owner to call it off, not knowing if my leg is about to bit off. Owner far away or looking at me like something is wrong with me, not with the dog. Or the frequent remark: "oh, he's really a friendly dog, never hurt anybody".

4) Countless times seeing dogs chasing the protected snowy plovers down into the water. Owner does nothing. Very sad.

5) Just this morning a loud barking dog, audible from 1/2 mile away in both directions, ruining the peaceful morning.

The dog owners lay claim to the land as if it is theirs to do what they wish. They say it's part of being in a city, we must all live together, they threaten to take their dogs out into our neighborhoods if they are denied access to beach, or even, god forbid, required to put them on a leash.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5451	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	I vote on dog issues Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There are already NOT ENOUGH places for dogs to play off leash in the Bay Area.				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no



explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5452	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Larkspur, CA 94939 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:48:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Aimee Demaret

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5453	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94124 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:48:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs are an important part of human societies and one of the things that makes San Francisco and amazing city is the facilities we have for taking care of these members of our families. Eliminating these off leash options would seriously impact hundreds of thousands of families in San Francisco. There are environmental solutions that don't involve ignoring the needs of so many of our citizens.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5454	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Larkspur, CA 94939 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:48:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet

policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Rick Demaret

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5455	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:48:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I will start this with.....All creatures great and small, the Lord God loves them all.				

I am a 4th generation San Franciscan. I have lived in Marin from 1969-1975 and 1999-to the present. It is the most wonderful place. So many people move out of the city to live in this beautiful county and be able to enjoy the mountains and beaches with their families and dogs.

Everyday I hike with my dogs and meet up with other people and their dogs. In so many of our conversations we say how truly blessed we are to be living here and enjoying the outdoors with our dogs and children. There have never been any altercations in all the years I have been hiking.

Why would the GGNRA want to cut off the enjoyment of the majority of the people who hike, with their dogs. Having the freedom to let your dog run , using it's God given energy , and love of outdoors, is something we cherish and should cherish for all our generations to come. The GGNRA issued a Pet Policy in 1974 that should stand on for all those generations.

Has the GGNRA considered what will happen if they ban dogs on all those trails. Where will people take their beloved companion to run ? Dog parks where there have been so many fights not only from the pent up dogs , but from the owners. I have seen way too many people screaming at each other in those parks. They are toxic places for many reasons.

The GGNRA is a recreation area, not a National Park. This area has been enjoyed by hikers, hikers with their families and dogs, bicyclers, visitors from all over the world. It should remain as it is.

Please be considerate and keep the Plan A in effect, the 1974 Pet Policy in effect, for the enjoyment of all creatures great and small.

Mary Lyons

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5456	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston for many years.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Meagan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5457	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:50:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	In case you did not receive a hard copy of my SEIS Comment Letter dated 2/5/14, I am submitting the same letter and attachment electronically below.				

Brett Becker, AICP  
324 Nelson Ave.  
Pacifica, CA 94044  
February 5, 2014  
Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Subject: Public Comments on the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS

Dear Mr. Dean:

I hereby submit the following additional concerns and comments on the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS regarding the proposed Preferred Alternative for the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System located in San Mateo County:

1) I am a Pacifica resident who has been using the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System for over 6 years. I typically hike and run the trails 4 days a week with my dog on-leash between the Mori Ridge Trail located at the base of Sheldance Nursery and Portola Discovery Site or SFPUC Portola Gate (Please Note: the Mori Ridge Trail is mistakenly labeled as the Sweeney Ridge Trail in the Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS Alternatives Maps). I am fully in support of continued multi-use of the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System for all uses including dog walking (leash only), hiking, trail running, mountain biking, horseback riding, wildlife watching, etc. I am opposed to GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plans revised Preferred Alternative (Alternative F), which would ban on-leash dog walking on portions of the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System (including Mori Ridge Trail located at the base of Sheldance Nursery). Alternative F is still too restrictive and severely limits the community of Pacificas use of the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System for on-leash dog walking purposes. My preference would be for Plan adoption of Alternative A (Map 19-A), which would allow continued multi-use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System. I would also support Plan adoption of Alternative E (Map 19-E) since it includes Mori Ridge Trail for authorized on-leash dog walking. I would like to reiterate, based on my experiences using the Cattle Hill/ Sweeney Ridge Trail System, that this trail system (including Mori Ridge Trail) is appropriate for continued multi-use purposes for the following reasons:

2

- a) The trail systems existing ranch/paved roads are wide enough to support multi-use purposes and avoid user conflicts.
- b) The trail systems existing ranch/paved roads are surrounded by extremely dense coastal scrub habitat, which serves to prevent and deter trail users (including dogs) from going off-trail and impacting sensitive habitat.
- c) The GGNRA maintains the trail systems existing ranch/paved roads on an annual basis through re-grading of the roads and clearance of overgrown vegetation on either side of the roads. Currently, the GGNRA is in the process of clearing overgrown vegetation within the trail system. On Mori Ridge Trail, I have witnessed trimming of overgrown vegetation (including coastal scrub) up to 4 feet on either side of the trail. This annual maintenance surely causes more impacts to sensitive habitat along this trail system than trail users (including dogs).
- d) The GGNRA makes no clear distinction between on-leash dog walking, mountain biking, horseback riding, or hiking regarding their intensity of use. Therefore, it would be unreasonable to limit or favor one type of use over another.

2) Based on my comments in item 1 above, can you explain why Alternative A (Map 19-A) or Alternative E (Map 19-E) would not be suitable as the Preferred Alternative in order to avoid use conflicts and protect sensitive habitat from trail user degradation?

3) I previously submitted comments on the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan/EIS in a letter dated April 26, 2011. This letter focused on the Sweeney Ridge Trail System in San Mateo County and provided detailed comments regarding my trail use experience, problems with the very restrictive preferred alternative, and inaccuracies/discrepancies contained in the analysis of the EIS. My letter is documented in Appendix A of the Public Comment Summary Report for the GGNRA Dog Management Plan/EIS dated September 2011 as Correspondence 2295 (first letter within the Appendix). I was disheartened to find out that none of my comments were adequately addressed in the Supplemental EIS, and that it appears that none of my comments would be responded to on an individual basis. It was my

understanding, per Appendix A of this document, that this appendix contains letters coded differently than others due to the nature of the comments. These letters were not assigned codes as the majority of the letters contained detailed comments referring to specific text within the Draft EIS. Instead responses will be prepared for each letter individually. I am requesting that the GGNRA explain why they did not follow through with responding to the correspondence contained in Appendix A on an individual basis. I am also requesting that the GGNRA reconsider my previous comments as they are valid to the construct of the Dog Management Plan and Supplemental EIS as it pertains to the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System in San Mateo County (attached is my previous comment letter for your reference).

Please feel free to contact me via email at bcbecker13@gmail.com if you have any questions regarding my concerns and comments. I would also like to request that you continue to place me

3

on your mailing list so that I may receive notifications of future public hearings and updates regarding the GGNRA Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS.

Sincerely,

Brett Becker, AICP

Pacifica Resident and Sweeney Ridge Trail User

Cc: Congresswoman Jackie Speier

155 Bovet Rd., Suite 780

San Mateo, CA 94402

1

Brett Becker, AICP

324 Nelson Ave.

Pacifica, CA 94044

April 26, 2011

Frank Dean

General Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Building 201, Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Subject: Public Comments on the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan/EIS

Dear Mr. Dean:

I hereby submit the following concerns and comments on the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan/EIS regarding the proposed Preferred Alternative for the Sweeney Ridge Trail System located in San Mateo County:

1) I am a Pacifica resident who has been using the Sweeney Ridge Trail System for over 3 years. I typically hike and run the trails 4 days a week with my dog on-leash (6 feet in length) between the Mori Ridge trailhead and Portola Discovery Site or SFPUC Portola Gate. I have also used the trail system for regular hiking with my family without dogs as well as mountain biking. I am fully in support of continued multi use of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System for all uses including dog walking (leash only), hiking, trail running, mountain biking, horseback riding, wildlife watching, etc. I am opposed to GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plans Preferred Alternative, which would ban on-leash dog walking on the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. My preference would be for Plan adoption of Alternative A (Map 19-A), which would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge Trail System with the exception of the Notch Trail, which would allow hiking only. I would also support Plan adoption of Alternative A with Modification by also limiting use of the Meadow Loop Trail to hiking only. By providing two trails for hiking only, this would help reduce potential user conflicts while protecting the most sensitive habitats within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. The Notch Trail is a narrow

single track trail located within an identified sensitive Mission blue butterfly corridor. The Meadow Loop Trail is also a narrow single track trail located next to a sensitive fresh water wetland that likely supports California red-legged frog and potentially San Francisco garter snake. The rest of the trails within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System are wide enough (8-12 feet) to allow continued multi use while avoiding user conflicts. Further, these trails are heavily degraded from a habitat standpoint since they are old ranch roads or paved roads that were used to access the old Nike Missile Site. Can you explain why Alternative A or Alternative A with Modification as described above would not be suitable to avoid use conflicts and protect sensitive habitat from trail user degradation? Please explain.

2

2) Please address the following observations that Ive made based on my long term use of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System:

a) The trail system is made up of mostly wide dirt ranch roads and paved roads (8-12 feet wide) that can easily accommodate multi use and allow for safe passing by users. These roads are wide enough to allow park ranger and CDF fire truck use. Please explain the reasons why this was not considered when deciding to ban dogs on-leash from the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

b) Much of the trail system and surrounding area is degraded with abandoned and graffitied buildings, paved roads and ranch roads. These disturbed areas are not pristine in terms of sensitive habitat with the exception of the butterfly corridor at the Notch Trail and the freshwater wetland next to the Meadow Loop Trail. Please explain how banning dogs on-leash from the Sweeney Ridge Trail System would help reverse this existing degradation. There was no mention in the Dog Management Plan that the abandoned buildings would be removed and those areas restored with native vegetation. Wouldnt this be more effective in improving the trail user experience? Please explain.

c) The existing ranch and paved trails are surrounded by thick coastal scrub/chaparral vegetation (4-6 feet high in most places) with poison oak. It is highly unlikely that trail users with dogs on-leash would desire to go off trail or let their dogs off-leash so that the dogs could go off trail. Please explain why this was not considered in the Dog Management Plan.

d) Most of the small offroad trails appear to be caused by wildlife (deer, coyote, etc.). Please explain why this was not considered in the Dog Management Plan.

e) The Sweeney Ridge Trail Systems topography is steep and rugged and is not suitable for beginner trail users, small children, or people with physical disabilities. This limits the number and diversity of users on the trail system and overall user conflicts. Please explain why this was not considered in the Dog Management Plan.

f) In my experience, I have never had a conflict with another user while walking my dog on-leash and typically see between 0-20 people during my hikes on average. Considering this low number of user traffic, how can there be a case for significant user conflict to justify banning dogs on-leash from the Sweeney Ridge Trail System? Please explain.

g) I have never observed professional dog walkers with multiple dogs (3 or more dogs) on the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Please explain if this was a consideration in proposing to ban dogs on-leash from the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

h) The Sweeny Ridge Trail System is a multi-use trail system typically used by hikers, hikers with dogs on-leash, horseback riders, and mountain bikers. How can the EIS analyze the environmental impacts from hikers with dogs on-leash in isolation from the rest of the users? Please explain.

3

i) The Dog Management Plan and EIS make the assumption that most hikers with dogs dont have dogs on-leash while on the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. However, in my observations, most hikers with dogs have their dogs on a 6 foot leash as required by

GGNRA regulations. Please provide additional factual support for these assumptions.

j) During my 3 years of use of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System and being on the trails approximately 4 days a week, I have observed park rangers only a handful of times. I think that additional ranger presence would help provide incentive for all users to follow the GGNRA regulations, including having dogs on a 6 foot leash. Please explain why this wasn't considered in the Dog Management Plan.

k) There is limited signage at most of the trail heads. For example, there is not much signage at the Mori Ridge Trail entrance and the Portola Discovery Site area (intersection of Sweeney Ridge Trail, Baquiano Trail, and Sneath Lane Trail). There should be additional signage that explains the important rules and regulations applicable to all users similar to the signage installed at the Notch Trail entrance within Skyline College and the Milagra Ridge Trail System entrance. This would significantly help in reducing potential user conflicts by educating trail users and reinforcing the regulations. Please explain why this wasn't considered in the Dog Management Plan for reducing user conflicts.

l) In order to protect the surrounding habitat and make sure trail users stay on the designated trails, there should be additional signage installed at the trail heads explaining w/illustrations the local habitat and wildlife. This signage should be similar to the signage installed at the Notch Trail entrance within Skyline College and the Milagra Ridge Trail System entrance. This would also help educate and reinforce GGNRA regulations. Please explain why this wasn't considered in the Dog Management Plan for reducing potential user conflicts within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

m) Banning hikers with dogs on-leash would remove a significant user group from the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Most of the hikers with dogs are local community residents and hike the trail often. Considering that the trails are steep and rugged and fairly remote, hikers with dogs serve as important eyes and ears on the trail system, especially since there is limited ranger presence. Please explain why this was not considered in the Dog Management Plan.

n) The Sweeney Ridge Trail System is one of the few trail systems left in the Bay Area to allow hiking with dogs on-leash. The trail system offers long and steep hikes that are great exercise for both the dog and dog owner. The Dog Management Plan does not provide an apples to apples analysis when describing alternative nearby locations to the Sweeney Ridge Trail System for hiking with dogs on-leash. Please explain this discrepancy.

3) Please address the following specific comments regarding sections of the Dog Management Plan/EIS:

4

a) Page 108, Chapter 2, the National Park Service Preferred Alternative section, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill subsection -

i) Please elaborate on how not allowing dog walking within the Sweeney Ridge area would protect Mission blue butterfly habitat? Dogs are required to be on a 6 foot leash per the regulations and most dog walkers using these trails have their dogs on a leash. Also, there are other users on the trail system, including hikers without dogs, mountain bikers and horseback riders. How is it that dog walking can cause impacts to Mission blue butterfly habitat but hiking without dogs, mountain biking and horseback riding doesn't? Please explain.

ii) Considering that the Sweeney Ridge Trail System is made up of wide dirt ranch roads and paved roads and includes numerous abandoned structures and debris, how is it that this portion can be considered undisturbed contiguous habitat that is rare and contains wildlife that could be disturbed by the presence of dogs? Other areas outside of the designated trail system are inaccessible to hiker and dog alike due to the rugged topography and dense chaparral and poison oak vegetation. These are the areas that



should be considered undisturbed contiguous habitat and by its very nature is already protected from degradation by humans and dogs. Please explain.

iii) The Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill subsection states that this site is contiguous with the San Francisco watershed, which also does not allow dogs. This statement is misleading and incorrect. In fact, the Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Trail System is contiguous to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Watershed Lands, which is predominantly off limits to the public, not just dogs, since these are pristine lands that provide the Bay Area with 15% of its drinking water source. Please explain why this incorrect comparative statement was made to support the Preferred Alternative?

iv) This subsection states that Alternative C would be clear to the public and would be easily enforceable by park law enforcement staff. This statement is incorrect since it's not clear how the GGNRA will notify the public that dog walking is not allowed within the Sweeney Ridge area. Not to mention, other nearby San Mateo County and San Francisco County GGNRA sites are proposing their own site-specific areas where dog walking will be allowed, including such nearby sites as Mori Point and Milagra Ridge. Please consider that the public can access the Sweeney Ridge Trail System from multiple access points, and that there currently is limited signage to help educate the public to the GGNRA rules and regulations at the major trail heads within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. This all seems like it will be a nightmare to effectively make clear to the public where dog walking is allowed/not allowed and to enforce. Wouldn't it be more effective to educate the public with appropriate signage and ranger presence while still allowing dog walking within the designated trails as is currently allowed? Please explain.

v) This subsection states that Alternative C would allow multiple user groups to experience the trail and provide balance. This statement is incorrect. By not

5

allowing hikers to walk with their dogs on-leash on most of the trail system, you are not allowing a significantly large user group from experiencing the trail. Please consider that many of the users of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System live locally and access the trail system from 3 very different geographical trail access points. These include the Mori Ridge Trailhead at Shelldance Nursery in North Pacifica, the Sneath Lane Trailhead in San Bruno, and the Baquiano Trail in South Pacifica. Please explain how this will allow multiple user groups to experience the trail system and provide balance?

b) P. 203-207, Chapter 2, Sweeney Ridge and Cattle Hill section of Table 5 -

i) There is a consistent argument made in this portion of Table 5 that Alternative C, the Preferred Alternative, which would not allow dog walking within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System, would have a negligible impact on most of the environmental resources because of the physical restraint of dogs via leash and dog walking only occurring on previously disturbed/designated trails. Why isn't this same argument made for Alternative A, the No Action Alternative? Under the No Action Alternative, dog walking with a leash would continue to be allowed throughout most of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. The current GGNRA regulations require that dogs must be on a leash (6 feet in length) at all times and dog walking shall only occur on the previously disturbed/designated trails within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Per the GGNRA regulations for the Sweeney Ridge Trail System, off-leash dogs are prohibited. Therefore, wouldn't Alternative A have similar negligible impacts on most of the environmental resources because of the mandatory physical restraint of dogs via leash and dog walking only occurring on previously disturbed/designated trails? Please explain.

c) P. 273, Chapter 3, Table 9 -

i) For the Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill site, the percentage of visitors walking dogs is described as Low to Moderate. However, it has been my experience (using the trail system approximately 4 days a week for at least 3 years) that the percentage of visitors walking dogs out of the total visitors (hikers, dog walkers, horseback riders, mountain bikers, etc.) is Moderate (10-30 percent) to High (> 30 percent). This means that visitors walking dogs represent a significantly large proportion of total visitors using the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Please elaborate on how this visitor data was collected and why there seems to be a discrepancy in the proportion of visitors walking dogs?

d) P. 278, Chapter 3, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill subsection -

i) This subsection states that Sweeney Ridge has low visitor use, consisting mostly of bikers and hikers, and low to moderate use by dog walkers (table 9). Based on my experience using the Sweeney Ridge Trail System, I agree that Sweeney Ridge has low visitor use compared to other GGNRA sites. I disagree that visitor use is mostly bikers and hikers. In my experience, visitor use is mostly hikers and dog walkers.

6

Please explain how this information was assessed and why it was assumed that bikers make up a large proportion of users on Sweeney Ridge? I also disagree that the proportion of dog walkers is low to moderate. Based on my experience, the proportion of dog walkers is moderate to high. Please explain this discrepancy.

ii) This subsection states that the closest off-leash dog walking areas outside park property are Esplanade Beach in Pacifica and the San Bruno Dog Park. First, why are off-leash dog walking areas provided as examples when the Sweeney Ridge Trail System only allows on-leash dog walking? Other nearby examples should include on-leash dog walking areas. Second, even though the City of Pacifica allows dog walking on Esplanade Beach, for several years, Esplanade Beach has been completely inaccessible to the public, especially for dog walking, due to significant coastal erosion and storm destruction of coastal access points to this beach. Please explain these discrepancies.

e) P. 279-282, Chapter 3, Visitor Experience -

i) This section provides a description and analysis of the visitor experience to the GGNRA sites relative to off-leash dogs. Please explain why this section does not also provide a description and analysis of the visitor experience relative to on-leash dogs? This would be especially applicable to the Sweeney Ridge Trail System (which currently allows dog walking on-leash only) since none of the Alternatives proposed for the Sweeney Ridge Trail System would allow off-leash dog walking. Please explain.

f) P. C-10, Paragraph 2, Appendix C, Potential Impacts to Vegetation from Dog Walking -

i) This paragraph discusses that to minimize impacts to coastal scrub, chaparral, and grassland plant communities that are found at the GGNRA sites (including Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill), on-leash dog walking would be required at all sites except Oakwood Valley. It further discusses that by restricting dog walking to a 6-foot leash, the impacts would be limited to a 6-foot corridor immediately adjacent to the trails. This paragraph concludes by stating that overall, impacts would be limited to the trail and the 6-foot corridor, which is a relatively small impacted area when compared to the size of each site. Based on my observations using the Sweeney Ridge trails, the trails are located predominantly within coastal scrub, chaparral, and grassland habitat. These trails consist of dirt ranch roads or paved roads that are approximately 8-12 feet in width. Using the same logic and analysis described in Paragraph 2, one should conclude that since the Sweeney Ridge Trail System already

requires dogs to be on-leash (6 feet in length), and since trails are 8-12 feet in width, the impacts to the predominant habitat surrounding these trails would be negligible. Therefore, why does the Dog Management Plans Preferred Alternative propose to not allow dog walking on-leash within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System? As described throughout the Dog Management Plan, physically restraining dogs on-leash would protect habitat and wildlife off trail and would eliminate chasing after wildlife. Please explain.

7

g) P. 293, Paragraph 4, Chapter 4, Potential Soil Impacts Common to all Alternatives -

i) This paragraph states that on-leash dog walking is based on an allowed 6-foot dog leash. In general, and assuming compliance, impacts as a result of the action alternatives (B-E) would be limited to the existing trails/roads and the 6-foot corridors of land adjacent to both sides of the trail (limit of disturbance, or LOD; LOD = width of trail plus 12 feet). Restricting dogs to trails would concentrate impacts on the already compacted soils of trails/roads, whereas dog walking off-leash may cause more dispersed impacts over a wider area. Based on my observations using the Sweeney Ridge trails, the trails consist of already compacted dirt ranch roads or paved roads that are approximately 8-12 feet in width. Using the same logic and analysis described in Paragraph 4, one should conclude that since the Sweeney Ridge Trail System already requires dogs to be on-leash (6 feet in length), and since trails are 8-12 feet in width, the impacts to soils and erosion would be negligible. Therefore, why does the Dog Management Plans Preferred Alternative propose to not allow dog walking on-leash within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System? Please explain.

h) P. 438-439, Chapter 4, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Alternative A: No Action -

i) It is stated that this site has documented high visitor use by dog walkers and 55 leash law violations were recorded in 2007/2008 (table 9); therefore, off-leash dog walking is currently occurring along the trails of Sweeney Ridge. I agree that there is high visitor use by dog walkers. Please make this correction in table 9 since it currently says low to moderate. I disagree with the assumption that because there were leash law violations over a two year period, that most dog walkers using the Sweeney Ridge Trail System have their dogs off-leash. Based on my experience of using the Sweeney Ridge Trail System (approximately 4 days a week for the past 3 years), I have observed that most dog walkers have their dogs on-leash. Rather than proposing to ban on-leash dog walking within the Sweeney Ridge area, wouldnt it be more effective to increase ranger presence (especially during busier times such as on weekends) and educate users of the GGNRA's on-leash rules in order to deter this behavior? Wouldnt it be more effective to provide better signage at the trail heads to explain the rules and regulations and why its important to keep dogs on-leash and on trails in order to deter this behavior? Please explain.

ii) What is the total number of dog walkers that visited the Sweeney Ridge Trail System during 2007/2008? Without knowing this number, it is impossible to know what percentage of total dog walkers were not obeying leash laws. This makes the 55 leash law violations meaningless without a total number of dog walkers to base it on. Please explain this discrepancy.

iii) Is there more comprehensive data over a longer time frame (10 years) that can be evaluated to determine dog walking trends within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System?

8

Making off-leash dog walking assumptions based on two years worth of incomplete data does not follow appropriate statistical methodology. Please explain.

i) P. 440, Chapter 4, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Alternative C: Emphasis on Multiple

Use, Balanced by County -

i) It is stated that under Alternative C, no dog walking would be allowed at Sweeney Ridge. Therefore, no impacts on soils from dogs would occur at this site, because dog use would be eliminated. Soil disturbance and compaction would no longer occur. I disagree with the statement that soil disturbance and compaction would no longer occur. Other users that would be allowed within Sweeney Ridge include hikers, mountain bikers, and horseback riders. These uses would surely cause further soil disturbance and compaction. Please explain this discrepancy.

j) P. 440, Chapter 4, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Alternative C: Emphasis on Multiple Use, Balanced by County -

i) It is stated that on-leash dog walking is based on an allowed 6-foot dog leash. Since dog walkers may walk along the edges of the trails, dogs would then have access to the adjacent land 6 feet in both directions, resulting in an LOD area for soils that would extend 6 feet out from both edges of the trails. In general, impacts on soils would be limited to the existing trails and the 6-foot corridors immediately adjacent to the trails. I disagree with the statement that there would be an LOD area for soils that would extend 6 feet out from both edges of the trails. The Sweeney Ridge Trail System consists of 8-12 feet wide dirt ranch roads and paved roads surrounded predominantly by extremely dense chaparral and coastal scrub (poison oak) vegetation. In most places the chaparral and coastal scrub vegetation is at least 6 feet in height. This makes the side of these trails inaccessible to both humans and dogs. Please explain how there can be impacts within these 6-foot corridors immediately adjacent to the trails due to this natural vegetative obstacle?

k) P. 677, Chapter 4, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Alternative A: No Action -

i) It is stated that under Alternative A, dogs would continue to contribute to physical disturbance at both sites through trampling, digging, and dog waste. In addition, since off-leash dog walking currently occurs at the sites, it is likely that dogs would continue to walk or run through other undisturbed areas. Therefore, impacts on coastal scrub/chaparral/grassland vegetation as a result of Alternative A would continue to be long term, minor, and adverse at these sites because effects would be measurable and perceptible, but would be localized in a relatively small area. I disagree with this assessment. The Sweeney Ridge Trail System consists of 8-12 feet wide dirt ranch roads and paved roads surrounded predominantly by extremely dense chaparral and coastal scrub (poison oak) vegetation. In most places the chaparral and coastal scrub vegetation is at least 6 feet in height. This makes the side of these trails inaccessible to both humans and dogs. Further, on P. 540 of the Dog Management Plan, a study by Andrusiak (2003, 3.2) is cited that suggests that dogs

9

traveling quietly along a trail with screening vegetation on both sides are unlikely to disturb or even encounter wildlife. This study along with other studies were summarized in this section to provide a basis for discussing impacts on vegetation. Since the dense and tall chaparral and coastal scrub vegetation within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System acts as barrier and screening vegetation, how can it be concluded that dogs would cause continued measurable and perceptible impacts to coastal scrub/chaparral/grassland vegetation if its unlikely for dogs to trample through it or be triggered to trample through it by wildlife? Please explain.

l) P. 681, Chapter 4, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Alternative E -

i) It is stated that physically restraining dogs on-leash would protect vegetation off trail. Therefore, assuming compliance, the overall impacts on coastal scrub/chaparral/grassland vegetation from on-leash dog walking at Sweeney Ridge and Cattle Hill would be negligible because impacts would result in no measurable or

perceptible changes in these plant communities. Why wasn't this same assessment made for Alternative A: No Action? Alternative A would continue to allow dog walking on-leash and similarly should assume compliance. Further, why isn't this 'physical restraint with a leash' argument not applied for all environmental resources under Alternative A with a conclusion that there would be negligible impacts on resources? Please explain.

m) P. 698, Chapter 4, Wetlands and Aquatic Habitats -

i) Within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System, there is a freshwater wetland located adjacent to the Meadow Loop Trail. This section did not include an analysis for Sweeney Ridge and this freshwater wetland. Please address.

n) P. 1158-1159, Chapter 4, Part 2, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Alternative A -

i) This section states that Alternative A would continue to result in long-term minor adverse impacts on the Mission blue butterfly at Sweeney Ridge through damage to host plants and habitat in the trail beds and adjacent areas as a result of dogs. Please explain whether there is a high occurrence of lupine host plants and habitat within the trails beds. In my experience, the Sweeney Ridge Trail System is made up of wide dirt and paved roads/trails. The only vegetation observed within the dirt roads are invasive weedy species. Paved roads do not contain vegetation. Further, these roads/trails are used by park ranger vehicles, horseback riders, mountain bike riders, and hikers without dogs. Wouldn't these other uses also have a damaging effect on host plants and habitat in the trails beds? Please explain.

o) P. 1162, Chapter 4, Part 2, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Alternative E -

i) This section states the long-term minor adverse impacts from dogs in the LOD would occur in a relatively small area when compared to the site as a whole; therefore, the overall impact on the Mission blue butterfly from on-leash dog walking  
10

at Sweeney Ridge would be negligible, assuming compliance. Why wasn't this assessment also applied to Alternative A? Please explain.

p) P. 1210-1211, 1213, Chapter 4, Part 2, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Alternative C / Preferred Alternative -

i) This section states at Cattle Hill, dogs would be allowed on-leash on the Baquiano Trail from Fassler Avenue up to and including the Farallons View Trail. Physically restraining dogs on-leash would not allow dog access to any water bodies that support the frogs or nonbreeding or critical habitat. Therefore, assuming compliance, Alternative C would result in negligible impacts on the frog at Cattle Hill because no measurable or perceptible changes in frogs or critical habitat or nonbreeding habitat would occur. Since Alternative A would also require all dogs to be on-leash, physically restraining dogs on-leash would also not allow dog access to any water bodies that support the frogs or nonbreeding or critical habitat located within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System and would therefore result in negligible impacts. Why wasn't this assessment made for Alternative A? Please explain.

q) P. 1231-1232, 1234 Chapter 4, Part 2, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Alternative C / Preferred Alternative -

i) This section states that although dogs would be allowed on the Cattle Hill trails, dogs would be physically restrained on-leash and the leash policy would be enforced. If dogs are physically restrained on-leash at this site, they should not gain access to dispersal habitat and should not affect the snake. Therefore, assuming compliance, alternative C would result in negligible impacts on the snake at Cattle Hill; no measurable or perceptible changes to individual snakes, the population, or designated critical habitat would occur. Since Alternative A would also require all dogs to be on-leash, physically restraining dogs on-leash would also not allow dog access to

dispersal habitat located within the Sweeney Ridge Trail System and would therefore result in negligible impacts. Why wasn't this assessment made for Alternative A?

Please explain.

r) P. 1545, 1548 Chapter 4, Part 2, Sweeney Ridge / Cattle Hill Alternative C / Preferred Alternative -

i) This section states that impacts on visitors who would prefer to walk dogs at the park would be long term, minor, and adverse. Adverse impacts would occur since dog walkers would no longer be allowed in the Sweeney Ridge site. Visitors would no longer be able to enjoy exercising, socializing, and playing with their dogs at Sweeney Ridge. Impacts would be minor since this is a low to moderate use site for dog walkers. Some visitors in this user group may find a different area in GGNRA or a local city or county park to walk their dogs. As a result, visitation by local residents may decrease slightly in this area. Based on my experience using the Sweeney Ridge Trail System (approximately 4 days a week for the past 3 years), the proportion of dog walkers out of the total number of users is moderate to high and therefore

11

adverse impacts should be moderate, not minor. Considering that most Bay Area state, county and local city parks do not allow dogs on-leash, there are not many options for dog walkers to choose from when they wish to hike with their dog on-leash. Dog parks are very limiting since they don't allow the owner to exercise with their dog. Other GGNRA sites are also limiting since they do not offer similar long and steep trails to hike that the Sweeney Ridge Trail System has to offer. Further, most dog walkers I've observed using the Sweeney Ridge Trail System are regular local community users. Therefore, visitation to Sweeney Ridge by local residents who wish to hike with their dogs on-leash would significantly decrease. Please explain how this information and analysis was derived since it conflicts with my experience and observations at Sweeney Ridge.

Please feel free to contact me via email at bcbecker13@gmail.com if you have any questions regarding my concerns and comments. I would also like to request that you place me on your mailing list so that I may receive notifications of future public hearings and updates regarding the GGNRA Dog Management Plan/EIS.

Sincerely,

Brett Becker, AICP

Sweeney Ridge Trail User

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5458	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I OPPOSE the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive for dog owners. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I OPPOSE fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I OPPOSE the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be

allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5459	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:52:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Anne Walzer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5460	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A



supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5461	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:53:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Angela Gardner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5462	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:54:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5463    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:54:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please look at the big picture and our integration with the land. Most of the people who walk dogs are stewards of nature, contributing to the overall health of the land and love integrating with it. Restricting that access will be detrimental to many and Lessing opportunities to keep eyes on some of our most valuable assists. The actions of the few can not block the needs of the many. Let's police those that don't follow the law and allow respectful citizens the freedom to enjoy the outdoors with their canines.

Sincerely

Brian Reccow

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5464    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5465	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95125 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Merritt Environmental Consulting Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Merritt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5466    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas.

Both of the adults in our family work for environmental organizations. We, and many people like us, choose to live in SF because of the dog-friendly opportunities to be in nature with our families. When we want wilderness we leave our dog at home and travel a short distance to it. We believe that city and state parks near urban areas that the entire family - pets included- can enjoy are an integral part of a healthy and sustainable lifestyle.

Sincerely,  
Melina Selverston Scher

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5467    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:56:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kipley Bruketa - - Dog owner who respects leash laws and don't think we should all be punished!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5468	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 10:56:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer and Kai (9y/o border collie without a voice)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5469	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 941010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no

explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5470	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jeff

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5471    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Kerry Fischer and I am a tax paying, home owner living in SF. One of the small joys I receive living in the city when I'm not dealing with the dysfunctional public transportation system and stepping over homeless people who seem to have more rights then me, is walking my 2 dogs in Golden Gate Park, Crissy Filed and Fort Funstun.

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

I also oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. I live here and I do not want ugly and restrictive fences put up all over the place.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Why don't you fine the people who are not complying and respecting the laws and not penalize everyone else who is complying? Ridiculous!

The new dog management plan does not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Unless the above questions can be answered in a thoughtful way - this is perceived as government making changes without respecting the people's opinions?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5472    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 10:58:46

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Kalyn Chomko and I am a San Francisco resident. I have a dog who I walk with regularly on Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, and Fort Funston, I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

The plan also does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby city parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new

---

plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. But no evidence is given to support either assumption. And if people do move to the city parks, they will be overwhelmed with dogs and their owners, making it an unpleasant and unsafe environment for all city dwellers.

Our National Park space here in San Francisco is a recreation area, not a national park like the Great Smoky Mountains, Glacier or Zion National parks. The GGNRA was built and designed for dogwalking from its inception. Congressional reports referred to dog walking specifically as one of the uses for the space when the GGNRA was created.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. I sincerely ask for a fair, well balanced and fact based approach to environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for myself, my dog and future generations of dogs, owners and all city dwellers to come.â€

Thank you,  
Kalyn Chomko

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5473	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Hello, my partner and I just adopted a 9-month old rescue puppy named Foxy. We've only had her a few weeks but have enjoyed socializing her with other dogs and people at Ft. Funston, Chrissy Field and other GGNRA sites. She's already learned to stay by our side off leash, and she has started to develop the confidence to play with other dogs.

Because these sites are so important to our enjoyment of Foxy, and to the continued healthy development of her, my partner and I strongly oppose the so-called Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Most importantly, we oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Foxy will not get the recreation nor socialization she needs in a pen.

We also strongly oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred



alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Please do not make us regret rescuing Foxy!! The proposed changes will make it very challenging for us to get her the exercise and attention she needs.

Thanks very much.

Scott Willoughby & Camiel Becker

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5474	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:02:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dog owners have already been denied most of the trails in Marin County. What we have left is the minimum we can put up with. Our dogs need "off leash" exercise for everyone's sanity and safety. If they don't get it you will probably see a rise in biting incidents. Because dogs, like humans, get a little loopy without running.				

Please do not lessen our ability to exercise our dogs. If anything we need more off leash opportunities. Why hasn't someone at GGNRA designed a schedule for dog use on beaches and trails? We can have

---

alternate weekdays and time periods for the weekends. This way the people that don't like dogs can enjoy dog free days/periods. It makes a lot of sense.

Rob Ficarro

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5475    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. I am physically handicapped and cannot run with my dog. I walked slowly. I therefore need the ability to play fetch with my dog in order to exercise her so she is low stress. Therefore I feel this plan is biased.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Avi Helman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5476    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:04:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a resident of San Francisco and an owner of two rescued dogs, I understand the desire to have spaces where my dogs can run and play, but I also recognize I have responsibility not to have my dogs not ruin the chance for others to enjoy those same spaces. When family members complain that they are uncomfortable taking their small children to the beach at Crissy Field because they fear an unpleasant interaction with off leash dogs, I have to wonder if we as a society have our priorities correct. When I go to Fort Funston and see the denuded landscape north of the parking lot due to off leash dog activity, I have to wonder how the National Park Service is meeting it's legal requirement to "the service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of Federal ares known national parks, monuments, and reservations hereafter specified, except such as are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, as

---

provided by law, by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." All one has to do is look at the southeast corner of the site to see what the landscape should look like since few dogs run free in that area. I believe the preferred alternative is the best compromise balancing the needs of the park users and mission of the service.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5477    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sf, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:05:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** You must understand that dogs are not only our best friends, they are inspirational and a total joy. The opportunity to experience them running free is one of the most liberating and profound relationships that man can share with animals. Ocean Beach is beautiful, and having our dogs run free enhances this experience. I have walked the entire Ocean Beach nearly every day in the last 20 years, and our dogs running free completes this experience in the highest manner. I will end this with a poem written by Mary Oliver: You may noit agree, you may not care, but/ if you are holding this book you should know/that of all the sights I love in this world-/and there are plenty-very near the top of/the list is this one: dogs without leashes. PLease make all Ocean Beach off-leash, sincerely Peter Munks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5478    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:05:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't ban off leash dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5479    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

**Correspondence ID:** 5480    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:08:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Mill Valley Dog owner and Resident

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5481    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I've always been under the impression that SF is a very open and accepting place to live. Please let that legacy continue.

Sincerely,

Anne Wu

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5482    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** McKinleyville, CA 95519  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:10:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep dog friendly- off leash beaches and parks available in the Bay Area. We travel down to SF frequently and these areas help to keep my dog healthy and happy. In a high populated space like the bay is, these spots are essential to overall well being. As a NYS licensed Veterinary Technician, I can not stress this enough. Dogs need a safe place to run and exercise. Socialization happens at the places which helps dogs to interact appropriately with other dogs from an early age.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5483    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:11:31

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

The GGNRA (Golden Gate National Recreation area) is reducing the off leash areas for dogs in the Bay Area (SF, Marin & San Mateo). Please STOP this from happening.

Thank you,

Ashley John

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5484    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:12:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off leash dog parks are very important living in a city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5485    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:13:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5486	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:13:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been a resident of, and in love with, this great city of San Francisco for twelve years. The main reason I love it so much is it's urban "live-ability." It is a city that understands the balance of metropolitan life vs our need for access to nature.				

Off-leash areas like Crissy Field give vitality to the city. Tourists often cite watching dogs play as one of their favorite aspects of the beach. I have built part of my community around the other dog owners and dog lovers who gather on the beach every morning to watch their dogs romp together over a cup of hot coffee from the Beach Hut Cafe.

Without vital community hubs like this, dog owners and dog walkers will be crammed into tiny neighborhood parks. I imagine residents around these parks will feel this overcrowdedness as well.

Urban life connected with nature is the most unique aspect of San Francisco and what makes it a more attractive place to live than any other city in the country. Taking away city residents' ability to connect with nature in this way, alongside their dogs, will erode the very feature that connects us most to the city and to each other as a community. Please don't take this away.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5487	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:13:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi,				

The GGNRA (Golden Gate National Recreation area) is reducing the off leash areas for dogs in the Bay Area (SF, Marin & San Mateo).

We need more off leash areas NOT less.

Taylor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5488    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:13:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are a couple with 1 dog. We were unable to have children. Our dog is an integral part of our lives and we do our duty to keep her as healthy and happy as any possible - similar to any parent. Taking our dog to local recreation areas to run is the primary source for her health and happiness - as well as one of ours. We have NEVER had any issue with our dog, anyone else's dog, nor any other recreational users. We are always respectful of the rules and other's space. We pay a lot in taxes and we would like to have access to these areas with our dog.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5489    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I got my dog four years ago ONLY after completing due diligence on what his life would be like in San Francisco. What I learned made me so proud of this city I have lived in for 16 years. The city's "dog friendliness" is an important differentiating factor - and one of the few that makes me truly believe that all of the premiums we pay to live in SF are worth it.

The thought of not being able to take my dog to Crissy field anymore makes me anxious, devastated, and furious. These trips to "the beach" are the reason I live where I do, and provides so much joy, community, and pride for SF. When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off-leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This new proposed reduction in off-leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis, especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.

It is shocking how many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan have been ignored. The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The law requires a peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The data I have reviewed does not support it: in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have been only 6 reported dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing, and 1 horse bite incident. The reported incidents involving people are much higher. Further, this data does not support the request for \$2,000,000



for more rangers.

Let's keep San Francisco a leader in community. To lose the off-leash culture is to lose a piece of this city that makes it so incredibly special to so many of us that live, work, and thrive here.

Sincerely,

Jen Tedesco  
3208 Pierce Street  
San Francisco, CA 94123

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5490	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Amber Mercader

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5491	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Address:</b>	private, Montara, CA 94037 United States of America						
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual						
<b>Affiliation:</b>							
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm writing to you to express my deep concern about the alternative to create a Regulated Off-Leash Area for dogs between Le Conte and Tamarind streets in Montara, CA. I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to this.						

Both Le Conte and Tamarind streets are very narrow, and will not accommodate parking for dog owners' cars. In addition, the surface on these streets, especially Tamarind, is marginal and is patched continually. Additional traffic on this normally quiet street will cause more rapid deterioration and increased cost for maintenance, which San Mateo County can ill afford.

This is a quiet, peaceful neighborhood and numerous barking dogs and shouting owners in a concentrated area will be disruptive to everyone in the area, including those in the adjacent Farallon School. I don't believe it is right to construct fences and change the nature of an entire neighborhood for the sake of only the dog owners. This is supposed to be OPEN space for everyone, not fenced-in space for dog owners created artificially in a quiet residential area.

Rancho Corral de Tierra is a large space. Please find a more suitable location with adequate access and parking for this. Or better yet, simply require that dog owners leash their dogs as is required by the County.

Please keep my personal identification information from public view.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5492	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Santa Clara, CA 95050 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:18:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative.

I agree that the GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash laws because of a few offenders and complainers.

Most dog owners and lovers, try to do what is right, and are positive and friendly people. This world needs more of them.

I was born and raised in THE BAY AREA. I am a dog owner and lover.

I really enjoy taking my yellow lab to enjoy nature in the Bay Area. Please do not take away all my places to enjoy with my dog.

Thank you very much,

Marilynn Hanan Ferguson  
408-985-8134

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5493	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Leandro, CA 94577 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:20:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I visit your city often with my families dogs and it would be ashamed to have to go somewhere else.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5494	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

As a resident of San Francisco since 1972, the freedom of movement for me and my dog for recreation is one reason I moved here and why I stay here. San Francisco is gifted with enough wilderness areas in the city to not need restrictions that are reflected in your plan and does not reflect the community's opinion. We live here and expect to be considered when changes that would drastically limit our lifestyle are on the table. San Francisco is very possibly the most dog friendly city in the country ...other than Carmel, CA. I oppose the plan 100% as a pet owner and a business owner located 1 mile from Ocean Beach in San Francisco, CA.

Sincerely,  
Neva Joy Bonehill

\*\*\*\*\*

Thank you for your support.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5495	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:22:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I think the whole problem is easily solve by making places exclusively for dogs and their owners and whoever wants to risk being bitten by a dog. I think the fakir it's of people want to take the risk if it means having their dog leash free. So why don't we leave the choice to owners and people who want to hang around leash free dogs. It'd be fair to put it to the votes of dog owners and see the results. They should have a say. Don't you think?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5496    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94502  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:23:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I fully support the National Parks Service policy to regulate dogs in the GGNRA to protect the wildlife that depend on this habitat for their very existence.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5497    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** \* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5498	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:24:18
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't take away our pets' opportunity to play off leash! It is very important for dogs to have some time to run without being leashed up in a safe environment, and the off leash dog parks are the best place for this to happen. As the owner of 2 fairly large dogs in a fairly small apartment, it is crucial for me to be able to take my dogs out for long walks in morning and afternoon. Without off leash play areas, my dogs would not be able to play catch with me, or run and romp with each other and other dogs. There are far too few safe places for us to do this as it is! Please don't punish innocent dogs by taking away their chance to play off leash!
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5499	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Petaluma, CA 94952 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	self employed dog trainer Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	---

<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member
---------------------	--------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.
------------------------	--

A dog breed club that I belong to, the Portuguese Water Dog Club of Northern California, regularly gathers for fun days at Fort Funston and Crissy Field. We are responsible dog owners who manage our group even though they are off-leash. We have never had an incident with others who are using the great bounty that these two areas have to offer.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. The Bay Area is not only dense in human population, but it is one of the highest densities of dog owners, surpassing homes with children. Forcing dog owners back into the urban parks, most of which are already over crowded will have a disastrous impact on the quality of time spent for owners and dogs.

This RECREATION AREA is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. It is not even a National Park; the Bay Area governments who ceded responsibility to the National Park Service had an agreement. That agreement is being ignored to the detriment of a sizeable group of Bay Area residents. Dog owners rely upon this open space for the recreation it was designed and mandated for, and as such it requires a different management strategy than the country's National Parks.

I am especially appalled at the restrictions being proposed for Marin County areas of the GGNRA! Not even allowing on leash access to areas that have been available to residents in Marin and Sonoma counties for literally decades and decades. This is beyond reasonable and I support the "No Action Alternative" for each area. The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5500	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:25:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We are opposed to the Tamarind location for a off leash dog park this location is inappropriate and a detriment to the surrounding neighborhood. There are many acres in the GGNRA on the coast that could be used for this but not here in the middle of a quiet residential neighborhood. it would be unsightly and disruptive.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5501	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may Concern: Regarding your proposed dog management plan: I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I am a tax-paying citizen who regularly walks my dogs in Marin County, responsibly, safely, and cleanly. I have tried the so-called Dog Parks and they are not much but filthy, crowded, dog gulags. Dogs NEED to run - we need to play with our dogs - and we cant accomplish that with all of the restrictions already in place. Please DO NOT restrict us further.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Theres no compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local

---

residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. We all rely upon this open space for daily recreation. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you for your time,  
Suesan Saucerman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5502	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

Please READ this letter and think about what's being said here.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. Any action other than that surely will be challenged in a court of law, wasting time and precious tax payer dollars.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5503	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:28:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Responsible dog owner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5504	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:28:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kim M

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5505	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** 2/16/14

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Sincerely,  
Peyton Lister

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5506	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Castro Valley, CA 94546 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:29:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendant Dean, The GGNRA has been a very special destination for our family for many years. Our family includes our beloved Lab, Sam. In hundreds of trips to Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Marin Headland and other GGNRA areas, we have				

---

never seen any cause or justification for the restrictive plan being formulated.

We want to strongly express our objection to any restrictive or containment plans that would prevent our family from enjoying the GGNRA.

Thanks for reconsidering your plan,

Kent Anderson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5507	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:29:21				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Blake

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5508	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Adriana

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5509    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Dynamically Fit Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:29:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off leash please in the Bay Area is a God sent! My dogs and I love exploring the coast while they run and jump across the shore. We are always mindful to pick up any waste and respect that these places are very special/unique. It would be horrible to see these places go away, I feel that would negatively effect the sense of community with loving/active dog owners that enjoy hiking with their pets.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5510    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Lilli Rey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5511    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** SuperDog City, LLC Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:30:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I strongly oppose the alternative plan proposed the GGNRA's regarding the new draft dog management plan. This plan will create many problems and is far too one sided. The GGNRA is presenting little to no evidence to support how dogs are providing are creating negative impacts to the ecology and the park, any

more than a person hiking, running, or walking within the park are already doing (without the presence of dogs). Also, we could include how mounted horse cops are permitted to run their thousand pound horses in these areas. I continue to support the 1979 Pet Policy and off-leash dog run areas in San Mateo County.

The GGNRA is proposing taking away nearly 90% of all off-leash lands that dog walkers (like myself) and the general dog owner uses. Not to mention that dog outnumber children in San Francisco, the GGNRA is proposing that the other 90% of people essentially "stack" their dogs on top of one another at the specific parks that sanction. This will create FAR MORE PROBLEMS in the community. As a professional dog walker and business owner since 2005, the negative ramifications far outnumber the reasons to pass along their plan. The analogy can be made for people as it is for dogs, the less "space" in a park, the more agitated people and or dogs may become. Dogs do not have the same reasoning and decision making we do, and therefore dogs will become more territorial and dog fights will become epidemic. Not only dog fighting, and barking creating constant noise problems for local residents, but all fights may lead to humans be injured. Also, I oppose fences to surround off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens leading to less supervision of owners own dogs, but also a mayhem of dogs from dog walkers that are using the park.

Has the GGNRA provided any site specific studies to prove that dogs are "in fact" causing many of the problems they proclaim. It is my knowledge that the GGNRA is making ONLY ASSUMPTIONS on the impacts that "might happen" should dogs continue to use the off-leash areas that we have been using freely for decades. Where is the site-specific evidence to support that any of those negative impacts they are claiming are from dogs only? Or, have they ever occurred or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. For the GGNRA's claims that dogs are negatively impacting vegetation or animals, they ONLY continue to make assumptions as there are NO site specific examples.

In summary the GGNRA the benefits of their proposed plan falls very short of taking away parks and lands, that we (the community) love to use. Bringing a dog into the park that is under voice control and/or dogs that might be within a dog walkers group should not be punished. Sure, the very few poor dog owners need to be fined for not picking up their dog feces or having a dog that is not under voice control. But, this is no different that humans that act unjustly. We can not just pick up a person we didn't like and have them walk only where they wont bother us? I hope that you can come to a fair conclusion.

Best Regards,  
Corey Vitale  
Business Owner of SuperDog City, LLC

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5512	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Piedmont, CA 94611 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:30:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5513	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:31:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from walking with my dog, getting exercise for both myself and my dogs.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Chris Budd

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5514	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:31:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Margaret Dolan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5515	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:32:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits

the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5516	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109				

	United States of America
--	--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.
------------------------	--

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5517	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118-2457				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogPAC of San Francisco Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	02/17/14. I oppose The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan because cutting visitors by 90% is too much! Why have parks in urban areas if people and dogs can't use them? There are less populated areas where visitor restriction makes sense; not here.				

--.--.--

sent via popvox. com ; info@popvox. com ; see http://www.popvox. com /bills/us/113/x237/report

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5518	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.



The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Scott Mulholland

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5519	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:34:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Regan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5520	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:35:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is very concerning to have a few people come in and what to change something that was put into place for the good of the people who live here and near the GGNRA years ago. I STRONGLY OPPOSE the alternative F the plan that wants to restrict our family members (DOGS) off leash & dog friendly access to the GGNRA. I SUPPORT the " NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE" in the SEIS for : Muir Beach, Homestead,Oakwood and the MARIN HEADLANDS. The GGNRA was established for the outdoor RECREATION for people and their families (including DOGS) the ability to have somewhere to go in densely populated urban areas. This is not a wilderness area like Yosemite or Yellowstone which require a different approach to management. Restricting these areas would force more people on the roads which are already congested.				

---

Have you seen Route 1/Shoreline highway congestion on the weekends??? It is so back up already and now these new STUPID LIGHTS have made it even worse and now even through the week it backs up. If you close these areas it is only going to get worse.

Please retain the longstanding 1979 PET POLICY. If anything we need more access to more trails for dog families. More loops not just dead end trails. As it is 99% of trail are off limits. WE only have 1% and you want to take that away, really?? I DON'T THINK SO!!! There have been no site specific studies done that support restrictions. WHY ARE THE PEOPLE WITH DOGS being targeted. What about the mountain bikes & horses I see them in areas they aren't suppose to be and your not kicking them off the mountain. We (Hiker with dogs) do a lot less damage with our feet then they do. I'm not saying go after them I'm just saying we are not being treated fair. There is enough room for EVERYONE & more than enough room to give us more access. I would love to be able to hike to Muir beach from my house with my dog but the trails don't allow it. Why am I being targeted I have felt left out (bullied) on the trails for years. I can't afford a horse why do they have so much access? This is PUBLIC LAND for the PEOPLE in communities of this area to use.

If this new ban is imposed it will just cause a lot of hostility on the trails !!!! I can see more people just getting ticketed and heated verbal exchanges. Next it will be the bikes then the horse then the people. Open space left for no one to enjoy. Lets not spread hate and exclusion let there be love and inclusion.... Let the beauty shine for all of us to enjoy! Thank you ..... Shelley Losch

>>>>>>>KEEP OUR TRAILS OPEN FOR ALL TO ENJOY >>>>>>- - - - ->

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5521	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:35:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Heidi Krakovsky

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5522	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:35:19**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The majority of dog behavioral issues stem from lack of exercise. Banning the ability for a dog to run free, off-leash WILL increase the number of aggressive dogs who are unstable. These animals will be more likely to bite children and other dogs, among other issues. Surprised that San Francisco would place the risk of children as a lower priority than the potential damage of some wild rodents.

Most dog owners have trained animals who are on recall and do not pose a threat to other dogs, people, or wildlife. The few people who have untrained animals cannot be used as an excuse to ban the parks from all dogs/people.

If this bill passes and dogs are not allowed to run free, we WILL see an increase in dog aggression and dog bites due to frustrated animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5523 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:35:44**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'd like to strongly advocate the importance of keeping our public areas open to off leash dog walking and play. Though others may find this an annoyance or danger it is a very important aspect in a dogs health and happiness. I can understand the opposing views fear of danger however these are public areas that should be free for residents and their dogs to enjoy. It is no more dangerous than skateboarders or bikers and accidents may happen in any form however I believe it is wrong to take away the freedom of our Shared public areas. Though some incidents may have occurred that responsibility lies in the hands of individual dog owners and should not be taken out on the entire dog community most of whom have well trained and loved dogs who deserve the freedom to run free and play and discover in nature and be a part of the city. It's very important that dogs are given the opportunity to simply be dogs and enjoy the freedom of the nature and environment they come from and belong in. It is a city to be enjoyed by all residents as well as resident dog owners and their pets and I find it unjustified to take that away. It is important for dogs health longevity to roam free. It is everyone's right to appreciate and enjoy this city including dog owners who make this incredible city what it is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5524 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA, CA 94110  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:35:45**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Elaine

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5525	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94403 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:36:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Brian Stuart

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5526	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	MUIR BEACH, CA 94965-9738 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:36:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As 30-year residents of Muir beach with experience as dog owners and periods without dogs we feel entitled to comment with some knowledge. We strongly support the original 1979 plan allowing voice control dog recreation in the GGNRA.				

The original GGNRA land was "saved" by citizens such as Martha and Frank Gerbode and thousands

more of us. We then tasked the NPS to be its guardian for us. This relationship has been arrogant and heavy handed. Both the late former director, Brian O'Neill, and an attorney for the Presidio have told me that the NPS has looked at demolishing the entire Muir Beach community only failing for the economics.

This is a RECREATION area and the unique situation of a real community in the middle of it must be dealt with in an equally unique manner. National park policies can not be applied here unilaterally.

We successfully fought and saved these trails and beach areas and we wish them to remain accessible to ourselves and our pets. It is recognized by all that the people are the problem not the animals. Dr and Mrs Lloyd gross

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5527	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:36:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5528	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:38:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

What sets the Bay Area apart from many other parts of the country is its reasonable approach to allowing people to exercise their dogs and enjoy their company in nature. And there IS abundant nature here- - certainly enough to go around.

Whatever objections there may be to off-leash dogs- -or dogs' presence in certain areas, period- -the fact is that living among thousands of pent-up, frustrated dogs who are not allowed to run and play properly cannot possibly be a desirable consequence of limiting exercise areas.

(The fact is, too, that the damage and destruction that people do- -compared to dogs- -is infinitely greater,

---

yet the option of banning people from certain areas doesn't appear to be on the table.)

Please do not put further restrictions on leash-free areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5529    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:38:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
JoAnna Schull

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5530    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:39:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I am against this plan because it takes away the traditional uses that come with the land when it was transferred from the City of San Francisco to the GGNRA. The 1979 recreational uses included allowing people to throw a ball or a frisbee to their dogs on the beach or to go running with their dogs off leash or to simply allow their dog to play with another dog on the beach - one of the loveliest sights ever. This is the second time I have commented on this plan, only to have my comments ignored as the revised plan came back pretty much like the first one - eliminating off leash dog areas from Fort Funsten, Crissy Field, Marin etc. and even banning dogs altogether in places! A huge takeback by the GGNRA from the people of San Francisco and Marin. I'd just like to add that I am the mother of child who attends public school here in San Francisco and who plays Little League baseball and used to play soccer, so I understand the field shortages. I also plant native plants in my own garden. I understand that we all have to share limited resources, but this plan takes away too much from the dog owners. Who, by the way, are all kinds of

people of various races, ages, and income levels. A few people who think their children are afraid of dogs is no reason to take away all this land from such a large number of other people, the vast majority who are responsible people and have well trained, gentle dogs. Kids love dogs for the most part. Many of us would like to be able to take our children and our dogs to the same recreational area at the same time. The people who don't like dogs already have plenty of places to take their children. San Francisco is losing families because of the public school lottery assignment system and high housing prices - dogs have nothing to do with it. Many of the families who are left do have dogs and this misguided policy impacts us negatively as well as the many other dog owners who are upset. I hope the fact that elected officials such as House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, Congresswoman Jackie Speier, and San Francisco Supervisor Scott Weiner are listening to those of us who are contacting them and are coming out against this plan will make a difference. - - Megan Smith, mother and dog owner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5531    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:39:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe these harsh regulatory restrictions are the wrong way to deal with these issues. Cultural change through education would be a more constructive approach and would provide much greater benefit to the parks over the long term.

People with dogs are a group of people who enjoy the outdoors and are among the most responsible and devoted people to our parks. Many use the parks and beaches as a daily routine and can be seen taking care of their beloved natural environment by cleaning up after others (ex. removing trash left by others who recreate on the weekends). Off leash exercise and play is healthy for both the dog and the owner and also increases the owner/dog bond allowing a dog to become a balanced and healthy member of society.

A much better way to approach this problem would be to reach out to dog owners and encourage them to work with their dogs (training programs. etc) to create effective voice control and socialization. It would be great to see trainers and dog owners working together at the parks educating the community and non dog owners about dog behaviors.

Please join with responsible dog owners to develop a more educated, equitable and sustainable approach that will help build public support for parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5532    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:40:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Christina Radeff

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5533	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:40:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Please don't force dog owners to put leashes on their dogs at Fort Funsten. It is one of our FAVORITE places to go with our dog. She LOVES being able to run freely on the beaches and the dunes of Fort Funsten. We've always found all of the dogs there to be very friendly and the owners are very respectful and pick up after their dogs.

We started going to Fort Funsten with our chocolate lab nearly 15 years ago. He has since passed but now we take our new dog and she loves it.

Please, there are so few places for pets to run freely. Don't take this freedom away!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5534	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Kate Rice



**Correspondence ID:** 5535    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:41:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I was deeply disappointed to hear that this dog management plan may restrict walking with our dog off leash at Fort Funston. As owners of a young, friendly and energetic dog, a monthly trip to Fort Funston is a highlight outing for me, my children and especially the dog. The few areas close to my home that allow off leash walking are small dingy and dusty fields with nothing interesting to do other than sniff other dogs and romp. Not suprizingly we all lose interest after a few minutes and head home.

We are very aware of leash laws in any park we go, and ensure our dog is on leash as required, but appreciate the freedom that is available at Fort Funston.

I understand that trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. It sounds as though policy should be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you for your time on this matter.

Sarah Murphy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5536    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:42:19

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Brittany Cowing

650-678-8415  
brittany.cowing@gmail.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5537    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I lived in San Mateo County for a number of years and was only able to enjoy a few small areas of their parks because of the unfair and overly restrictive GGNRA pet policy. I wasn't even able to hike with a LEASHED dog in most of the areas. It's unfair I am paying to support these areas that I'm not allowed to enjoy myself because I don't want to leave my dog at home.

Sincerely,

Georgia Clark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5538    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management

---

Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5539	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Dave Conroy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5540    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:44:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner and San Francisco resident for over 10 years, I am strongly opposed to GGNRA's new dog management plan. This is a city where DOGS OUTNUMBER CHILDREN and LEADS THE NATION IN ANIMAL WELFARE... and yet, the GGNRA has been persistently, aggressively and unfairly enforcing their extreme plans to get rid of off-leash dog areas in the SF Bay Area.

The GGNRA's current plan would seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the supplemental EIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. This management plan allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash). Instead, the GGNRA should institute a dog "green tag" system - - which certifies dogs and their owners to use the area. Irresponsible dog owners could have their privileges suspended, instead of all people losing access to a particular dogwalking area.

We urge the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.â€

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5541    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:44:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Nicky

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5542    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:45:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I regularly walk my dog in the GGNRA - Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. As such, I am \*strongly\* opposed to the proposed changes as they will drastically impact my experience at the beach.

I see no reason why the rules should need to change. All dogs I encounter on the beach are well behaved and controlled by their owners. I have not encountered any instances of dogs harassing either wild life or other people. If anything, human impact from littering and walking on the dunes has a far greater negative impact on the beach wildlife than dogs.

These parks are not wilderness preserves - they are urban parks, intended to be used by people and their pets, not maintain the natural preserves. Banning dogs violates the spirit/intention of these parks, and is very unfair to the large majority of responsible dog owners who depend upon these parks to provide their dogs a healthy recreational opportunity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5543    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:45:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Matt Budd-Thanos

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5544    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:46:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sydney Samucha

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5545    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

I live less than a mile from Crissy Field and rely on it for regular exercise with my 16 lb miniature poodle, Fozzie. The days we spend on the beach and the field are what kept me out of severe depression after the sudden death of my business partner last year. The progressive crackdowns, deceptions, and in some cases outright falsehoods (the signs on the lands' end trail for one) are disturbing to me as a resident of San Francisco, named after St. Francis, the patron saint of animals. There is no scientific evidence to what you are claiming- -I've reviewed it with several of my fellow birder friends, some of whom are not dog owners, as well as an environmental scientist. I'm at that beach and field multiple times a week, and I have only once seen someone let their dog into the bird sanctuary, and I promptly called park police to handle it.

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

many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The impact on the city of San Francisco's budget and parks will be substantial and my supervisor is well aware of these issues and that I vote and pay attention to them. There are more dogs than children in the city of San Francisco, and we do NOT welcome your policies in this regard. Our supervisors are mobilized against you and you WILL face a protracted legal battle. There's a lot of libertarian, educated, science minded tech money in this town, lots of young people with dogs who will donate to this cause and fight against your unscientific justification for restrictions on freedom. Do you really want that for your career?

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely yours,

Melinda Byerley

San Francisco resident, dog owner, voter since 2002.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5546	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dog in the near future. The conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and are deeply flawed.

I have been a resident of San Francisco for 20 years. I walk on a daily basis in Crissy Field, Fort Mason and The Presidio, and often visit Rodeo and Stinson Beaches with my dog. We walk in these areas because they are located in our urban environment within very close proximity to our home and therefore are conveniently used for casual and formal recreation.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years for come. In fact, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three Bay Area counties.

Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards than nonurban sites to achieve its fullest potential.

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Susan Spiwak

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5547	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:47:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I walk frequently with my dog at Fort Funston and occasionally at Chrissy Field and Ocean Beach. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Fetty



---

**Correspondence ID:** 5548    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:47:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dog in the near future. The conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and are deeply flawed.

I have been a resident of San Francisco for 30 years. I walk on a daily basis in Crissy Field, Fort Mason and The Presidio, and often visit Rodeo and Stinson Beaches with my dog. We walk in these areas because they are located in our urban environment within very close proximity to our home and therefore are conveniently used for casual and formal recreation.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years to come. In fact, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three Bay Area counties. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards than nonurban sites to achieve its fullest potential.

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

George Merijohn

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5549    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco , CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:47:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5550    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

SF has had a long history of allowing/encouraging off-leash dog activity in designated areas of our beautiful open spaces. Since turning those lands over to stewardship by the GGNRA, this tradition has been under fire. Besides taking a much loved freedom away from dogs and their guardians, citizens of this fair city, disallowing off leash activity in these areas will over crowd city parks, as well as the city shelters with dogs that are unmanageable without getting regular vigorous exercise.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Sheehy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5551    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:49:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The reason why myself and many of us reside in the Bay Area (North. Bay) is because of its rich nature. The parks and trails are essential to human health. To remove the very few trails and spaces that our dogs can com along on would be detrimental to all of us, not just our pets. It is often the dogs that help us out of the house everyday for a much needed walk/hike. I Personally use the oak wood vallety trail, rhubarb trail, occasionally montara slopes where my in laws live, Chrissy fields on a daily basis would leave us nowhere to enjoy nature. So many trails are already banned altogether to us animal lovers and many of us have devoted our lives to help and save pets from traumatic pasts by rescuing them. Please keep whatever little is left for dogs to roam free. Not having these trails, will force me to use my car and drive further distances something I rarely do now. This will impact the carbon footprint that we also must look to for a healthy future. I urge you, please leave whatever is left alone!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5552    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:50:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a homeowner in San Francisco and the guardian of 3 dogs. We regularly go to Fort Funston where my dogs walk off-leash under voice control.

I am dismayed that the SEIS contained only very minor changes from the DEIS, despite the significant number of public comments which opposed the plan. It appears that the GGNRA intended to severely limit off-leash dog access all along and has not operated in good faith to represent both sides.

Of the 4,700 public comments the GGNRA says they received, they do not say how many opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3:1) supported off-leash dog walking. However, the SEIS over-represents comments from people who oppose off-leash dog walking and under-represents comments from those who support off-leash dog walking.

Please heed the voice of the public and do not move forward with the Preferred Alternative in the SEIS. I support the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5553    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:50:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Steven M. Salzman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5554    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:52:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I hope you are doing well. I wanted to message you to share my thoughts about the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA.

Sincerely,  
Rachel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5555    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:52:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Dean-

The current Fort Funston Policy is just fine. I own a well-behaved Australian Shepherd (a very active breed). I have taken him to Fort Funston several times.

I suggest that if you are going to change the policy, you ban both humans and animals so the environmentalist can have what they really want: a pristine natural preserve that is undisturbed by humans or humans with dogs.

The current CA government is doing a great job driving established businesses out of California, now you can do the same with dog owners. Workers in enlightened companies will still be able to bring their pets to work, but, oh no, not Fort Funston.

Your Board must have some big (\$\$\$\$) campaign contributors who hate dogs. I hope it's worth it because you'll still be voted out of office by the legions of dog lovers.

Marisa Alma McGinnis  
(650) 863-0343 cell  
justprenups@gmail.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5556    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to

support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5557	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:52:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lisa Earl

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5558    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94124  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:53:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a SF taxpayer. I own a home, a car, and recently got married to a Bay Area native. I've lived in SF for 15 years. We are here to stay, contribute to our local community, and raise a family. That family includes our dog Wilbur who is a rescue dog that we adopted from wonder dog rescue.

I'm sharing all of this because we have made SF our home and plan to do our part to add value to the city. One thing we love about our home are the open spaces where we can walk Wilbur off leash freely. There are so many things happening in our city that are making it hard for working people to stay and thrive in SF. In fact many of our friends have moved away due to cost of living. We do not need another reason to dislike SF, and taking away off leash areas for us to enjoy SF with Wilbur would sadden so many people, my family included. Having places like Fort Funston to walk Wilbur off leash is honestly one of the contributing factors as to why I chose to remain living in SF and buy a home and start a family. It is a huge part of our lives. I walk there, I pick up trash along the way, while Wilbur gets the necessary exercise and socialization he needs to remain a physically and emotionally happy dog.

Please save off leash dog space. My happiness depends on it.  
Sincerely,  
Rebecca Dworkin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5559    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:53:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

---

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5560    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:53:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello. I just want to say that these measures appear rather extreme to say the least. I feel it is unfair to apply such restrictions on folks who want to take their pets out in nature and allow them to "do their thing." I have had dogs for years. Their favorite place, and thus mine, is the beach - off leash. They have excellent recall and I have never experienced a problem with anyone while at the beach with them. The idea of walking a dog on a leash on a huge open area is absurd to me. I think these restrictions would dampen the experience of many many people (not to mention their animals). It will also encourage folks to break the rules, though I know this generates revenue. I would much rather see certain areas designated to dogs. Even a small fee per pet would be more acceptable. Please please NO NOT LET THIS MEASURE GO THROUGH. I feel it will negatively effect the lives of so many. I am a responsible dog owner who cleans up after my dogs, is respectful of others, and derives great joy and health from romping on the beach with my mutts. Please do not stifle this crucial source of health and enjoyment for myself and thousands of others. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5561    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have been walking my two dogs in San Francisco in a mature responsible way for the past 10 years and fully understand the trade off between dog owners and other users when it comes to our parks and beaches. For instance I agree that the beach facing Chrissy Field parking lot should be on-leash as there are many picnicking families with young children in that area, but at the other extreme Fort Funston is a barren, remote location that rarely sees the general public (other than the occasional school group) and it would be ludicrous to stop off leash dog play in this area because it would create no benefit for the non dog owning public and only punish dog owners by restricting their dog's activities.

Ocean beach is another area that is going to be affected. The current off-leash area is no where near the environmentally protected area of the plovers and the beach already is half zoned as on-leash so if the non dog owning public are afraid of animals they have plenty of space to be away from animals. With these two factors 1) no environmental impact and 2) no human impact, I see no reason to change the existing planning there. If you ask the beach patrol that is regularly on Ocean beach you will find that this beach too is rarely used compared to beaches in warmer, prettier locations. The changes proposed here again are nonsensical.

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is



way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5562	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:54:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Esteemed Panel,				

I am most fortunate to live within one mile of Fort Funston (since 1990).  
For many years I did not know the value of this area other than the many hang gliders who use it on most fair weather days.

About 6 years ago, we (my wife and I) adopted a rescue dog from the Animal Care and Control (SF). And shortly thereafter, we discovered that this is an off-leash area AND it's a mere stone's throw from our house. This area is a Godsend for local dog owners.

My wife and I are very responsible dog owners. We are vigilant in abiding with the doggie litter laws and keeping the park clean. In fact, almost all of the dog owners we've met there are equally as responsible.

We have recently adopted a second dog from the ACC and look forward to the benefits that this area has to offer.

Dogs, like humans, need to interact with each other in order to build social skills. These areas currently being discussed are the perfect venues for such doggie intermingling.

I realize that there are some opponents to the off-leash privileges currently allowed in this park. BUT I believe this is the best and most effective use of this land.

It is a well-studied fact that mankind has benefitted greatly through his relationship with his canine companion.

I wish I could thank the government officials who had the foresight, determination and heart to designate these areas as "off-leash" in the first place. Please have the courage to walk in their footsteps.

Sincerely,

Rick Matsuno

PS - Have you ever seen how happy a dog becomes when you allow them to run off-leash? It's incredibly uplifting!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5563    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:54:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Our city is named for the patron saint of animals. It is depressing and offensive to me that San Francisco would consider severely limiting the freedom of our dogs and their happiness (as well as mine) with the prospect of this restrictive dog leash law. I have been a resident of this city for 23 years and would like to loudly voice my opposition to this archaic proposition.

I live 2 blocks from the beach in San Francisco and witness the horrors that HUMANS (not dogs) inflict on nature and our beautiful land daily. This includes garbage and oil on the beach, among other atrocities. My experience has been that dog lovers are nature lovers. I pick up trash as I walk my dog. I want to protect our wildlife. I am mindful of disturbing anyone else's experience with nature. I try to compensate for the very few irresponsible dog owners I come across (as well as educate them too).

I plead with you to hear the voices of your city that have repeatedly decried these changes and only fallen on deaf ears. I worry about what will become of our society when we refuse to protect the rights of those without a voice. It is not hard to see how unfair and unhealthy this would be to such gentle creatures whose sole purpose in life often seems only to love us. Please keep San Francisco a wonderful place for our best friends.

Sincerely,  
Meredith Preble

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5564    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

---

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5565	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks my dog at Fort Funston, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive, and does not allow for those of us who regularly use these parks with our dogs any alternatives. For Years I have bene able to enoy the parks with my dogs and you will be taking this away from us.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Andrea Rudolf

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5566	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland , CA 94608 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Spencer  
Oakland

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5567    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:56:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need to let dogs run free because they give off love and we need that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5568    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:56:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean:  
I support you wholly in trying to limit off-lease access. Humans and nature should always take precedence. There are other alternatives for dog owners without taking advantage of limited resources and the rights of those who choose not to have a pet. Thanks you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5569    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:56:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not restrict dogs in this manner. There are so few places dog lovers and their pets and walk and enjoy themselves. This is a special place for us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5570    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:56:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the restrictions outlined in this plan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5571    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:57:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5572    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 11:57:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow me and others I see every day to continue to have our dogs off leash.

I frequent Fort Funston every week and have been for 10 years with my dogs.

This is one of the best places for off leash dogs. I actually do not understand the reason for any ban on off leash dogs? In all my time spent there I have never seen a major altercation between dogs or dogs and humans. So why the ban?

Doesn't make sense. These places are known for dogs to run around at, so maybe the people that want the ban should go to another location.

thanks,

-Eric Chanpman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5573    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet

---

Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5574	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir beach, Stinson beach and the few dog friendly trails we have left off Tennessee Valley Road in Mill Valley.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area! I have not seen any research supporting such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you for your time,  
Nancy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5575	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:58:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it may concern,				

I'm commenting on behalf of the dog parents. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my dog and I will be losing one of the many great reasons as to why we live here in the San Francisco Bay Area.

There is an estimated 120,000 dogs in the Bay Area. It's been stated since 2007, that dogs outnumber the amount of children in our community. This fact alone is reason enough to not deplete our use of the dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA.

Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on my dog and I, but our entire community. Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.

We've been coexisting fine all these years. Let's keep the 1979 Pet Policy. The policy's backbone is recreational and nature based. Nature and recreation are two things the Bay Area is made up of and should continue to be made up of.

Best,  
Jasmine w/ Pups Bonnie & Baloo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5576	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:59:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Gordon Rowe

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5577	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:59:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---



objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
A Concerned Dog Owner

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5578	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 11:59:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I take my 3 pound Chihuahua for walks through Fort Funston and have never encountered any problems with other off leash dogs or owners. I have found the community to be considerate of eachother and of the area. We respect the site and treasure the opportunity to have this location. I feel safer today on my walks at Fort Funston than I did in years past when fewer people where there. Please dont change it.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5579	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:01:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To All concerned,				

I am writing to express my strong disapproval of the preferred proposal of off leash restrictions by GGNRA. Since rescuing my dog, Monkey, five years ago she and I have spent nearly every Tuesday at Fort Funston and nearly every Saturday at Ocean Beach. We rely on the exercise and scenery to keep us active and agile. Being a shelter dog was tough on my dog. She does not do well in confined spaces such as a dog parks. She feels safest in open spaces and shows a profound change of character when at one of 'her' beaches. And because I'm out there enjoying my time with her this GGNRA proposal would in a real sense take away this space/exercise for me.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerly,  
Dorothy Adams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5580    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Please READ this letter and THINK about what's being said here.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. Any action to the contrary will surely be challenged in a court of law, wasting time and precious tax payer dollars.

Sincerely,

Joyce A. Greene

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5581    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:01:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not ban off lease dog play in the Bay Area. We have a large, thriving dog community here in San Francisco. It gives us the opportunity to socialize our dogs and exercise them in ways most other dense urban environments can't. It promotes healthy dogs and healthy people but getting both man and dog out and active. It would be nothing short of a tragedy to lose the privilege of sharing such amazing outdoor areas with man's best friend. Dogs thrive in our parks and on our beaches. I've never met a single human who had a problem with the current dog situation in the Bay Area. Please reconsider this new policy. I do not currently own a dog, but I love meeting dogs here in SF and hope to one day have a dog of my own that can be my adventure partner and help my girlfriend and I achieve our fitness goals. This new policy will change the fabric of the Bay Area.

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5582    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 04110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Jean Bogiages

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5583    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

A Dog Lover and Regular User of Parks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5584    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:02:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On page 264 when describing a plant community that should be protect, this is written: Chaparral is dominated by many species of manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* spp.), buckbrush or California lilac (*Ceanothus* spp.), poison-oak, buckthorn (*Rhamnus* spp.), chamise (*Adenostoma* spp.), and other shrubs, including yerba santa (*Eriodictyon* sp.) and black sage (*Salvia mellifera*).

And again on page 265 this is written: Coastal scrub is dominated by low shrubs and herbaceous species, such as California blackberry (*Rubus ursinus*), poison-oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*), and toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*). The coastal scrub community is dominated by coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), bush lupine (*Lupinus arboreus*), and poison-oak, with variations in dominant species based on moisture levels, soil types and slopes, and past land use history (NPS 2005b, 192).

I take issue with a park plan for an urban park adjacent to a large population to put protection of poison oak (*toxicodendron* is its name) as a value above the people of the area. There is probably no human who would not have a negative reaction to this plant. It therefore is a danger for humans. For a plan to want to protect this toxic plant in this busy area of recreation for so many people is unconscionable. This plan reeks of a value system that needs revisiting. It seems the "native plant society" has too much control over this plan. Not everyone in San Francisco agrees with this society's goals nor mission. When I acquired my undergraduate degree in Environmental Studies in 1989, this society was seen as rash and radical and extreme in its views by my department. Native Americans were here for centuries and then the Spanish then other settlers. People have always been a part of this landscape modifying it and it seems protection of people balanced with nature should be the goal of any plan for a recreation area. How can "native" be defined so specifically when evolution is nature. This is not an area miles from a large human habitat and is certainly not a balanced plan. I most definitely would like an answer to this concern.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5585    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to indicate my strong opposition to the draft GGNRA Dog Management Plan. The GGNRA was established to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people in a densely populated urban area. It requires a different management approach than wilderness areas like Yellowstone or Yosemite. The plan addresses dog presence in the GGNRA as if it were destroying the ecosystem in these areas. The ecosystem in urban areas is already altered by people, hang gliders and horses who also frequent these areas. To target dogs as a major factor in altering the ecosystem is unfair and shortsighted.

In addition, the SEIS preferred alternatives force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County. I would like to bring the following items to your attention:

1) The changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011. In fact, comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

2) The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands.

I support the "No Action Alternative" in the SEIS for each area: Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

Please listen to the people who use these areas, and RETAIN THE LONGSTANDING 1979 PET POLICY!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5586    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of

---

needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5587	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Shay

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5588	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:05:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I am writing to voice my strong opposition (and severe disappointment) for the preferred alternative proposed in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. As someone who regularly takes advantage of the few spaces we have available for off leash recreation, I find it concerning that the promise that was made in the 1979 Pet Policy is being threatened. The GGNRA was created as a multi-recreational area for everyone and should be kept as such. If more education and community action needs to be taken to protect endangered species, then so be it.

I was initially drawn to and have stayed in San Francisco because it is so dog friendly. There are few

things more uplifting than taking my dog for a walk/run/playing fetch, even on a gross, rainy day. I spent this last Sunday at Fort Funston and could not stop thinking about how great it is that the Bay Area offers a place where people can run, play with their dog off leash, have a picnic with their family, fly a kite, hang glide, fly their parrots, AND go horse back riding, among other recreations I may have not seen that day. Not to mention the number of seniors and differently abled individuals who were out taking a stroll with their dogs running around them.

To be fully honest, I am disappointed and horrified that the new plan was in no way modified to incorporate the feedback that was given previously. Thousands of people objected to the loss of recreational areas, but it was completely ignored.

People care deeply about recreation and the environment. Please do not have a blanket assumption that dog owners are irresponsible and ignorant of how they affect the environment and people around them. I have been nothing but impressed with the way people interact with others. I've run into more inconsiderate people flying kites than I have dog owners in the GGNRA. In fact, there were fewer than 20 reported incidents involving dogs in the most recent data released.

Furthermore, I find it grossly irresponsible to propose banning dog recreation as the preferred alternative dogs. This will adversely affect our city parks and neighborhoods.

Sincerely,  
Colleen McNulty  
colleen.mculty@gmail.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5589	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hidden Valley Lake, CA 95467 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:05:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Sir,				

For many years I have been taking my dog to Chrissy Field and Baker Beach when I'm in the city, which is quite often since I run a non profit working with arts organizations there. During this multi decade experience I have often been on the beach. I can say with certainty that most days the only people using the beach are the dog walkers and the occasional jogger. The weather in SF is such that most people only go to the beach on the occasional warm and sunny day. On the typical cold and foggy day the beaches are empty except for us. I have not noticed dogs going into the fenced off areas where seeding and native plants are being grown. The dogs stay with their people and other dogs. I have much more often seen children playing in those areas picking flowers and plants. So it might be more effective to ban children. I don't see how you can justify not allowing dogs at Chrissy field, they are much less likely to impact anything than the wind and kite surfers who occasionally take over the whole beach. Yet there is no talk of banning them.

The dogs are very low impact on these areas. I very rarely see scat on the beach and when it's there a dog owner picks it up. This is an important and possibly the most important activity on the beach. I was at Chrissy field this past Saturday Feb 15th from about 9am till 11:30 and easily 90 % o the people on the beach had a dog with them. This has been an important part of the Bay Area for many decades, we police ourselves and require very little from you. The reasons you have stated for banning this activity are specious at best.

Thank you  
Ted Helminski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5590    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Los Altos, CA 94024  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:06:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Please reconsider the proposed changes to offleash access at Ft. Funston, Crissy Field, and all the other affected areas. They have been offleash for decades and have provided, and continue to provide, wonderful and much-needed recreational opportunities for residents of the densely populated Bay Area and their dogs. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Ute Klesenski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5591    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:06:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** One of the greatest attributes of the Bay Area is being able to enjoy the natural beauty with our pets. Strolling Fort Funston with mine and other dogs running off leash and enjoying nature is a wonderful thing. It would be a terrible shame for that to change.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5592    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:06:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.



The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Karlie Guthrie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5593    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:07:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE, PLEASE reconsider current plans to ban dogs from most of GGRNA and allow off-leash dogs ONLY at Rodeo Beach. Please keep off-leash availability at Muir Beach and on the loop trails near and around Rodeo and Muir Beach. GGNRA is a wonderful asset to us, but so many of us enjoy being out in nature with our well-behaved and well-trained dogs. Don't punish us for the sins of a few - Again, please reconsider.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5594    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Antoinette Paterson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5595    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:07:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Have you thought about how you're going to attempt to enforce this ridiculous idea? Think US marijuana laws. No one gives them a second thought which is exactly how the misguided leash rules will be viewed. And speaking of marijuana laws, aren't the states finally figuring out what a massive failure those were? Don't make the same mistake, please. Just save everyone the headache and do the sensible thing now. Enact the 1979 plan.

Edward Seider  
San Francisco, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5596	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:07:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Neshay

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5597	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Spring Street Farms Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:09:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent Dean:				

Well, I am not sure how many times we have to comment on your plan for dog access in the GGNRA before you hear what the citizens of the United States want from OUR Recreation Areas.

At this point, I will only comment on the dog issue. However, I await the opportunity to address the NPS' GGNRA General Management Plan in April with dread but resolve. Citizens of all party affiliations are getting a bit tired of your bureaucracy "planning" what is best for us and our environment from three

thousand miles away.

Given the five EIS Alternatives, my comment this time is simply that we continue with the 1979 Pet Policy rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5598    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:10:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm a dog owner and I'm depressed that this dog management plan has been drafted up. I take my dog to Fort Funston almost every week and it is one of the few places where my dog and I can enjoy a beautiful day together with other dog owners. Please don't take this away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5599    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Leandro, CA 94577  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** oyster bay dog owners off leash Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:12:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I believe that dog owners are an unserved population. I have walking my dogs off leash for 12 years without any problems. I would like to have all off leash areas remain as is

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5600    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Steve Gerety

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5601    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:12:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please please please leave these few trails that are open to dogs off leash, as they are currently. My family cherishes the times when we take our dog to the beach, hike on oakwood trail and simply enjoy the outdoors with our energetic yellow lab. Dog parks are not the same and provide no satisfaction or exercise for our family. We live in mill valley for a reason, please don't take those reasons away

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5602    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:14:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kris Degaut

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5603    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Portola Valley, CA 94028

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I am strongly express my opposed to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and fails to consider the positives of an off leash dog policy. Further it will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. This short sided approach is unjust and unfair to the very people and pets that support and enjoy GGNRA properties.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5604	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent Building 201, Ft. Mason San Francisco, CA 94123				

Dear Sir,

I have lived in Sausalito for nearly 30 years.

I chose Sausalito as my residence, in large measure because of its dog friendly policies and the extensive urban recreational access both locations afforded. I applaud the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Congresswoman Speier, Congresswoman Pelosi, the Crissy Field Dog Group, Animal Care and Control of SF, Peninsula Humane Society, Montara Dog Group, Save Off Leash, and thousands of tax paying individuals who strongly object to the proposed GGNRA preferred alternative dog plan as far too restrictive, far too limiting in where we can recreate with dog(s), unfair to dog owners, and not fact based in its planning or findings.

I too believe the proposed policies are too restrictive and not based in fact. I am surprised the GGNRA is not responding to the comments of so many individuals, groups and elected representatives. Nor do I understand how the GGNRA chose not to address a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS. This has lead me to question if process has been for appearances only and the GGNRA did not intend to incorporate public or even elected representative's views.

The key point missing is that the Bay Area GGNRA lands serve an urban population with millions of residents - not a wilderness.

When the GGNRA was created in 1972, Dog Walking was already a long standing use of the lands that were turned over to the park. Dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, and as such this specific recreational use and part of the San Francisco Bay culture - and this use must continue indefinitely.

There are millions of people with dogs in the Bay Area. The preferred alternative will result in thousands of people being unable to recreate with their dog(s) - in the GGNRA lands these families support with their tax dollars. I firmly support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. The Bay Area GGNRA is a unique national recreational area in an urban environment - not an isolated untouched park in the wilderness. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

It would appear the GGNRA's preferred alternative intentionally sets up the proposed dog policy to fail - by restricting a large dog and urban resident population to use such small areas that over crowding is inevitable. The overcrowding will result in friction between residents with and without dogs. And this

will lead to even more restrictions - which is precisely what the GGNRA has apparently preferred all along.

The GGNRA relies on outdated studies and information for the latest supplemental environmental impact statement.

Further the GGNRA has not updated its enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. This makes the conclusions and preferred alternative unfair and flawed as it is not fact based.

It leads to the appearance the GGNRA has gone through this process always intending the end result to be an overly restrictive dog policy that ignores the urban location of the recreation area, is unfair to tax paying residents, and is designed to fail before it is even released - ensuring the GGNRA can eventually simply do away with any dog access in the Bay Area GGNRA locations?

How is it that the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented?

How is it the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis?

I join thousands of residents, elected representatives of California and San Francisco, and groups dedicated to animal safety and I ask the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.

Sincerely,â€

Ken Horiszny

Sausalito, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5605	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:15:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Kali Kraum

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5606    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:15:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As an animal lover and a long-time resident of San Francisco, I support better regulation of dogs in GGNRA. Please do not allow the doggy folks to take over the use of our parks. The proposed regulation is a good first step, but does not go far enough to protect the parks and allow use by all, not just by dogs and dog people.

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

GGNRA needs to mark off-leash areas with a physical barrier. Dogs should certainly be able to use the parks, but NOT THE ENTIRE PARK. There should be well-defined areas where dogs can be off-leash. This allows the rest of us to enjoy the parks in peace, and better protects sensitive wildlife areas. While some dog owners are conscientious, many others fail to comply with leash requirements in certain areas, to clean up after their dogs, or to maintain voice control over their off-leash dogs.

GGNRA needs to educate dog owners about the damage their pets do when they chase shorebirds. I have stopped going to the southern portion of Ocean Beach (including the supposed Snowy Plover areas) because it is too upsetting. People allow (and even encourage) their huge dogs to chase shorebirds. Birds and other wildlife in GGNRA deserve to also have space where they can rest, forage and live without constant disturbance and fear of death.

There are plenty of City parks in San Francisco that allow off-leash dogs. There is no need to turn the GGNRA into another dog run. GGNRA needs to accommodate many users - families, cyclists, dog owners and nature lovers, as well as wildlife.

Please must move forward with the proposed Dog Management Plan to ensure that ALL park users may enjoy every aspect of the park in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5607    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Jose, CA 95111  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:17:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I ask that you please dont banned off leash. I take my dog here monthly and its the only time we have freedom to enjoy. Its a getaway I'm sure not only for me but for many others to enjoy with our pets. Fort funston is a very special place for me and my dog. I would hate to not be able to feel free and comfortable like we used to if she can't be off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5608    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** el monte, CA 91732  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:19:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Do not do this! This cruelty by all means. Dogs should be able to enjoy their lives as well and not be restricted by territory of people who can control them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5609    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:21:29

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On page 258, there is one report of a dog killing wildlife. This is just terrible. It is a horrible situation in which an owner did not control his dog. There is no excuse but if dogs were licensed to be off-leash, have demonstrated their response to their owners and if signage were more adequate, this would have been prevented. It seems this is the park's fault as well as the owner's. The park service has a duty to protect the natural environment while involving people of an urban area in a recreation area as is stated in the founding of the GGNRA. It is incumbent on the NPS to provide this balance. Requiring owners to have a license to have their dogs off-leash would prevent this. A plan in Boulder, CO has been successful and the NPS should be required to review that plan as it is a great way to keep nature protected while before barring more responsible, tax-paying local citizen's from living their lives as they have for 50 years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5610    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:22:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,



there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Heather K Dennis

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5611	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:22:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sarah Berger

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5612	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Emeryville, CA 94608 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:22:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There are PLENTY of places for dogs to be off-leash in SF. There are much fewer places for native plants and animals to exist in relative peace, so I'm all for less off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA. While not a dog owner, I love dogs, but let's remember they are dogs. Not kids. Not people.				

---

And there are a large number of irresponsible dog owners out there who can't be trusted to maintain control of their dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5613    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Additionally, many people and children (whether dog owners or not) get great pleasure and enjoyment from being around dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5614    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5615    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Santa Cruz, CA 95062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Live Oak Off Leash Advocates Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Dory Mansfield

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5616    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to most of the trails and fire roads listed to become banned or on leash access only. As a responsible dog owner, I do not allow the destruction of habitat, disturbance of wildlife, or unwanted interactions with people.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5617    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:26:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in the Marina and walk my dog in the GGNRA at least weekly. I'm writing because I would extremely disappointed if the GGNRA decided to implement their Preferred Alternative because it is unjustly restrictive. Losing valuable off leash areas and privileges would significantly alter the experience in the GGNRA which I enjoyed before I was a dog owner.

Honestly, I don't understand why the GGNRA plans to make such restrictive changes when there seems to be a better middle ground which has yet to be explored. In fact, the changes don't really take into account the comments or requests make by city residents or even San Francisco's Board of Supervisors. Specifically, I don't understand the decision to restrict off leash walking on trails or the overarching decision to restrict off leash walking on all new acquired land. Rather than make such a sweeping decision, the GGNRA should try to evaluate these changes on a case by case basis. The proposed plan just seems extremely one sided and is downright punitive to dog owners.

I understand the need to regulate off leash dog walking in the GGNRA, but it seems like there are better ways to accomplish this. For example, I'm sure many dog owners would be open to the idea of a off leash license which could be obtained for a small fee and could help offset some of the GGNRA's maintenance costs. Additionally, people with poorly behaved dogs could have their license revoked.

Lastly, take a walk in an off leash area of the GGNRA and tell me that it's not a beautiful sight or a unique experience in San Francisco. I overhear tons of tourists and others remark on how wonderful it is to see so many dogs running and playing off leash in the GGNRA. Losing the proposed privileges and putting dogs behind a fence would seriously change the GGNRA and not in a good way.

Please do NOT implement the proposed changes as is and please listen to the comments and concerns of the people that use the park. There HAS to be a better way to help accomplish the goals of both sides.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5618    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:27:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is important to balance the needs of all park users but let's not be extreme in the restricting off leash recreation use. I think it is worthwhile to review current usage and adapt as needed, however these changes are too much and don't reflect the local population of the SF bay area. At Fort Funston, which is overrun with non-native invasive plant species, I don't see how off leash impacts the native environment. In the areas that are sensitive, where the fence line is in tatters, I could see greater enforcement to reduce impact.

Lastly, the SF bay area has a large canine population. Dogs need to be socialized in order to keep them happy, healthy and most importantly human safe. They need to know how to interact safely with humans and especially children. Off leash areas are important in the development of good dog behaviors.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment!

Kevin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5619    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:28:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Leslie Schmidt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5620    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:28:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having dogs running around parks is one of the most special and unique parts of San Francisco. Every time that I take my pup out to the park dozens of people stop and talk to me about him, want to play with him, and experience genuine joy because of their interactions with him. It seems completely unnecessary to take away this element of San Francisco. Furthermore, the dogs themselves need the ability to run free in the designated park areas. It would be a huge travesty to take this away from the residences and their pup companions. Please focus on real issues of the city that create challenges and difficulties, not the ones that create happiness and already improve the quality of life for San Francisco residences.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5621    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

I do not have a dog of my own, but I am an avid dog lover, and I enjoy all of the dogs i run across. I believe dogs need space to run and play and socialize with other dogs. They need the recreation areas to stay free from strict leash laws, as they are now. Please don't let the fear, irrationality, or other personal issues a few people may have take away a right and a joy from dogs and their people.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5622	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fairfax, CA 94930 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:31:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please consider leaving the national parks open to dog use. I understand that dog use needs to be limited in certain areas, like at the end of Stinson Beach, etc. So as not to interfere with other beach goers. But, it is of utmost importance to have dog walking parks in the area that are not city parks. Dog walking is healthier for dogs and individuals. Smaller city parks are not meant as dog use parks. These are small facilities meant for family use for picnics, games, parties where dog use is only a nuisance. In more open areas, dog are free to excersize and socialize as are their owners. I am not a dog owner, but I clearly see the need and benefit to continue open use of recreational parks and beaches for dogs. Having rules to clean up after your dogs is all that I ask as far as rules are concerned. Most people in the bay area are responsible when it comes to cleaning up after their dog as long as supplies and garbage bins are available. Thanks you for leaving the parks open and free to dogs and humans!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5623	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94104 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Northwestern Mutual Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:31:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent,				

I oppose the fort function leash rule. It is counterintuitive to the reasons people bring dogs to the park. Please reconsider. It will ruin the efficacy of that park.

Best,

Patrick West

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5624    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:32:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** For many years I have contributed money to the GGNRA as a way of saying thank you for the open space available for dogs to run and be free (under voice control of course) It seems the latest restrictions on dog access did little to take into consideration the pro-dog comments since 2011. There are so few areas where I can hike with my dog, please to not further reduce the areas currently available to us. I have hiked the trails and walked the beaches for many years, I have yet to see a dog leave behind candy wrappers, beer and soda cans, broken glass, plastic bags, and garbage- -- -all of which to great harm to wild life and the environment. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5625    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:33:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This plan makes no sense. Dogs need the freedom to run and enjoy the outdoors. Ft. Function as an example would not be used for anything other than a launching pad for wind surfers. It is a shame that people don't see the benefit of the off leash areas instead of crowding the sidewalks of the inner city with dogs on leash. Do not reduce the amount of off leash space.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5626    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:34:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep Fort Funston a place for dogs to run free of leashes!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5627    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:34:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA)  
National Park Service

02/16/14

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in response and OPPOSITION to the current proposal set forth by the GGNRA for the 'Preferred Alternative' Draft Dog Management Plan. It is unclear to me why the GGNRA has wasted a great deal of time and numerous resources regarding this poorly constructed and conceived management plan at least as concerns Fort Funston.

- 1) Most important regarding Fort Funston, it is imperative that any revision allow off-leash dog walking under voice control on the uplands paved pedestrian pathway. The vast majority of visitors stay on this path, and many are elderly or handicapped, preventing them from leaving the pavement. In fourteen years of visiting Fort Funston with our dogs several times a month, we have never seen any significant unpleasant incident regarding dogs. What we have seen is the occasional unpleasant tangle of peoples' legs from leashes in use in this constrained pathway.
- 2) Fort Funston has essentially been abandoned for the past few YEARS by the GGNRA, leaving large portions of the trails in this beautiful area inaccessible for the elderly, the handicapped, families with strollers, and others. While the concrete trails used to be cleared after high winds have caused sand to build up, this has not occurred in the past few years. In fact, a very large sand berm has formed at the northern end that makes it the end point for many walkers who are able to and choose to go that far. Where have the workers been?? I have left messages for GGNRA officials notifying them of this but no response has been forthcoming.
- 3) Some of the garbage bins along the trails have been removed so that the GGNRA doesn't have to do the work required to empty them.
- 4) The water fountain just off the parking area is a disgusting, malfunctioning mud puddle that needs attention. Necessary minor fixes to allow drainage have been ignored by GGNRA my our understanding that the GGNRA personnel involved in this project includes a number of inherently anti-dog people, which in and of itself demonstrates undue bias.

Finally I would say Thank You to all the dog owners who have acted responsibly and proactively to keep Fort Funston a pleasant and mostly clean and orderly place despite GGNRA neglect. People and animals need socialization and outdoor open space areas in which to exercise and appreciate the beauty of nature. I urge you to leave the long-standing dog rules in place and make minor / reasonable repairs and updates while still allowing off-leash activities in those areas currently de facto used for that purpose. As a supporter of numerous organizations that protect wildlife and open space, and a conscious environmentalist, I believe that urban areas serve numerous people, animals, and agendas that are different from wilderness and more rural National Park areas like Yosemite or Yellowstone.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5628	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	South San Francisco, CA 94080 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:37:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I'm heartsick at hearing this document. I moved to San Francisco seven years ago upon seeing its natural beauty. I've spent every free hour of my weekends adventuring with my dog. Exploring the natural parks with her is my primary hobby and source of happiness. Reduce, by all means, but not by ninety percent. You're taking my world away. <a href="http://spirson.vscoco/">http://spirson.vscoco/</a>				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5629	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---



**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

**Correspondence ID:** 5630    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:37:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service staff.

My husband and I have two dogs that have become well socialized, gentle, and happy dogs because I have been taking them to Ft. Funston on a more or less daily basis. The fact that they can run, play, and visit unencumbered has made a huge difference to them as well as us. I strongly urge you to allow us to continue exercising them as well as us at this most marvelous of places.

Kind regards.

Reinhold Gras

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5631    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Marin Conservation League Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 18, 2014

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg. 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent Dean:

The Marin Conservation League previously commented in 2011 on GGNRA's Plan to provide clear, enforceable policies to determine the manner and extent of dog use in various areas of the park. On the basis of information in the Plan and DEIS, we concurred at that time with the NPS selection of the Preferred Alternative for all seven sites in Marin, as a reasonable compromise between the Environmentally Preferred Alternative "D" and the other "action" alternatives.

We have a similar response to the revisions in the Draft Supplemental EIS: We support the National Park Service's (NPS) Preferred Alternative "F", in that it balances the need to protect natural and cultural resources and ensure visitor safety with the designation of appropriate areas in the Park for no dogs, or dogs on- and off-leash. We are fully aware of the potential for adverse effects of large numbers of dogs caused by trampling vegetation, depositing dog waste, and adding nutrients. Such degradation of high quality habitat can result in displacing wildlife from preferred habitats, with eventual loss of species from the area. For each of the seven sites in Marin, the Draft SEIS identifies sensitive species, habitats, and/or cultural resources that may be threatened by dogs and has recommended an appropriate response. Therefore, where a choice must be made between allowing dog access and protecting native wildlife, endangered species or sensitive vegetation, the Draft SEIS tips the balance toward protecting the resource. We believe that this approach accommodates a variety of recreational experiences, both with and without dogs, while ensuring that these resources are protected for future generations.

Other comments are as follows:

1. Under Alternate F, the NPS preferred alternative for Muir Beach, is appropriate for that site to protect the restored habitat at the mouth of Redwood Creek and several sensitive species. The Preferred Alternative in the Draft Supplemental EIS allows access for dogs on leash on the beach. MCL agrees with this approach, despite strong pressure from Muir Beach dog-owners to allow an unfenced ROLA on a portion of the beach. The large expanse of Rodeo Beach provides that opportunity.

2. The on-leash access proposed for the Oakwood Valley Fire Road under Alternative F would remove the fence and gates proposed for the fire road and thus remove a barrier to wildlife movement. Hikers, bikers, and equestrians will share the fire road with on-leash dogs. The Fire Road is currently used by all three, and the almost parallel Trail is used by hikers and dog walkers only. That trail will be closed to dogs under Alternative F from Tennessee Valley Road to the junction with the Fire Road, and thereafter open to dogs on leash to the junction with the Alta Trail. We agree with this approach, which will keep dogs off the lower wooded section of the Trail.

3. MCL also agrees with Alternative F's general approach to trails in the Marin Headlands, which is to allow on-leash dog access on the perimeter of the area, while protecting the integrity of wild inner portions frequented by coyote, bobcat, and other wildlife with large territories and need of protections. This approach safety also enhances visitor safety.

4. The revised Monitoring-Based Management Strategy is less rigid than the previous compliance-based strategy, which did not consider the trail context. Nonetheless, given the size and diverse conditions of GGNRA and a limited number of personnel, the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy needs to be supported by clear standards and vigorous enforcement that includes (a) visible increase in uniformed law enforcement presence; (b) increased issuance of citations, particularly to aggressive violators; and (c) tracking of repeat offenders. We agree with others that enforcement of regulations sends the clearest message to people about what is expected of them. Clear and prominent signage is also important.

Finally, the effectiveness of Alternative F in protecting resources and enhancing safety of visitors and dogs will depend heavily on the combination of responsible observance by dog walkers and enforcement actions taken by GGNRA. Because neither of these can be assured, adoption of this alternative should be conditioned on establishment of a date-certain to allow for review of the Plan's effectiveness based on monitoring of user compliance.

We appreciate the NPS's efforts to inform and engage the public in this long and difficult task, and look forward to your responses.

Sincerely,

Jon Elam Nona Dennis  
President Chair, Parks and Open Space Committee

Cc: Supervisors Kate Sears, Steve Kinsey,  
Susan Adams, Katie Rice, Judy Arnold  
Congressman Jared Huffman  
Linda Dahl, Marin County Parks Department

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5632    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** santa cruz, CA 95062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:39:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

I strongly urge you to curb access of dogs to the GGNRA. I would prefer that dogs not be allowed at all. If that is not possible, then I would hope that the Park Service will allow dogs on leash only in limited areas.

Dogs off leash do not belong in the GGNRA. Dogs off leash belong in fenced areas where they do not interfere with the peace and safety of wildlife and human visitors to the Park.

I think your recommendations for off leash and on leash dog use in the GGNRA are overly generous to dog owners.

Dogs frighten off wildlife in the park. They chase birds. They are the only park 'visitors' that routinely defecate and urinate in the park. They bite people! Children who are at face level with most of the dogs in the park are at risk from dog attacks while playing in the park. Dogs bark. The tranquility of a day in the park is disturbed by the presence of dogs.

I love the GGNRA and visit it often. I will not, however, go to any area of the park where off leash dogs are allowed and I will question the advisability of visiting areas where dogs are allowed on leash due to the irresponsible behavior of most dog owners who either use very long leashes or let their dogs off leash when they think no one is watching.

I understand from reading newspaper articles that the Park Service has been seriously bullied by dog owners. Well- there are many,many people who don't like to have to share their recreation time with other peoples "pooches" and their "poop".

Thank you for standing firm for the rights of birds, other wildlife and people, especially children.

Sincerely, Georgina Monahan  
Georgina Monahan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5633    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** MUIR BEACH, CA 94965-9738  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:40:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE MAINTAIN THE CURRENT 1979 PET POLICY.

I grew up here in Muir Beach and was taught to love animals by this great SF city in which our patron saint is St. Francis De Assisi- of animals. Being around people that loved and were so committed to animals, inspired me to go to veterinary school, which I did. I grew up riding the trails on my pony with my dog, my friends and so many adventures that I want for my children. Closing more trails and beaches to dog use further restricts the possibilities of children learning about dogs, big, small, etc... Programs such as "read to a dog", "Pen Pals", and "Foster Mutts" have provided psychological/psychiatric relief for many people as maintained by these established programs. This positive work has been recently continued with anxiety dogs, further establishing the importance of these creatures to us, humans on a

physiological level. These programs have paved the way in opening doors for dogs, not restricting them. Restrictions are a backwards thought in this day and age with pet policies.

Given the current data that suggests the importance and attachment of these creatures both to us, and us to them, further restriction will cause backlash from all involved in pet care sectors. Pets desperately need adopting from shelters. If restrictions continue with regard to when/where these pets are allowed, it will become too much trouble to adopt them and the mortality rate at shelters in the area will SKY ROCKET. In addition, pets with less exercise in their daily routine develop behavioral problems and will likely be given up/destroyed. For what?

Additionally, I did my undergrad in Upstate NY in the Adirondack State Park. What makes us similar is the fact that Muir Beach is a community in the middle of state land, like the hundreds of residential homes in the middle of the largest state park in America. They have made it work, and they have a great relationship with the park committee because they listen to what is being said, what the PEOPLE living in it and paying for this land WANT.

Hilary

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5634	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94017 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:41:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Since I have been going to the Fort Funston site, I have seen a great improvement in the families and pets that have been there. Prior to it becoming a dog park, it was at times scary. There would be homeless in the bushes, or people in the bushes doing who knows what. I would be on paths, but I didn't always feel safe. As time went on, I began to see more families, most with and some without their pets. Some pets on leash and some off leash. But with time and the increase of dogs and dogs walkers/owners, I felt safer to walk my dog here.

The site should continue as it is. as a dog park to take our dogs to walk, play and socialize, on or off leash, throughout the park without proposed limitations.

Today, it is rare that I see folks behaving badly, and I believe that the use of the park as is, and if it were able to continue as is, would actually be an asset to the site at Fort Funston, as well as the other sites. If it were to be changed as proposed, I believe there would be less visitors to the site, since most of the visitors are dog owners/walkers, and crime would likely return and become the problem. There are visitors who do not have dogs and they are still able to enjoy the beautiful scenery and vegetation the dunes offer. Off trail, or destruction of the plant life, wildlife, dunes would not be the problem. The crime would be the problem and few to no one would be able to use the site safely.

As for the other sites, I also hope that no changes will be made to these sites with regards to dog owners bringing their dogs to the sites. We are responsible owners/care givers to our pets, and take responsibility for our pets.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5635	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:41:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lauren Deane Evans

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5636	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I have grown up at Muir Beach since 1963. My Parents were strong advocates and helped the development of the GGNRA. Their idea was for the land to be a "National Recreational Area" not a National Park or Monument. They did not want the area to be built up like Southern California with roads, houses and businesses. The premise is and was for the land to be used by the people, including pets, horses and other recreational activities! They have always supported the current dog policy as it is today.

After living in the area for 50 Years, I have personally seen way more damage and disrespect to the land and wildlife from humans than from the small amount of dogs.

With that said, I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and The Marin headlands trails surrounding Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5637    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:43:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a San Francisco dog owner and wish to continue to enjoy walking my dog off-leash in some areas of the Presidio as well as at Crissy Field. My dog doesn't stray from the path but needs some freedom to exercise. I hope that the dog management plan will allow city dwellers flexibility on where they can walk their dogs off-leash.

thank you!

Jennifer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5638    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Concord, CA 94520  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Jamie Coughlan and I am an owner of 2 dogs. We frequently visit John Muir Beach and Stinson Beach mainly because we can bring our dogs here. We are originally from the state of Washington where the areas that are dog restricted are far fewer than here in California. We were very unwelcomely surprised when we moved to California and learned how little choice we had in outdoor areas that we could bring our dogs and family. It is important to us as a family to be able to visit outdoor areas and beaches that allow our dogs because it provides our whole family with exercise, vacation, and a community feeling. Especially during the summer months when it is hot out, we cannot leave our pets at home on the weekends, thus restricting beaches and off leash areas will severely limit our ability to travel to Muir Beach and Stinson Beach on the weekends. I know we are not the only one of our dog loving friends and family who will not be contributing to the local economy of Marin county if you restrict our whole family access by not allowing our dogs.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and

human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Thank you,  
Jamie Coughlan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5639    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Baggao and the loveable and gentle giant Buddha the American Pitbull Terrier

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5640    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Napa, CA 94558  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:47:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5641    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:48:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

These park areas are an important resource for everyone, especially those living in an urban area where the city parks are already overburdened. The plan is overly restrictive and serves no legitimate purpose, since there is no problem with the current use of the GGNRA by dogs and people. Over 50% o San Francisco households have dogs, and to implement the plan would adversely impact the use and enjoyment of these areas. Please listen to the overwhelming local response to the issue, which has been in



favor of keeping the off leash use as-is. Those who live in urban areas help the environment by limiting suburban sprawl, but need these adjacent parks for health and recreation. Restoration of these areas to their previous state (before humans and dogs) should not be a goal here. They are and have been since 1979 dedicated to use by city residents. Please keep it that way. Thank you. Best regards, Chris Stuart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5642    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:49:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
William Castellano

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5643    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:49:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I freely admit that I don't know what all the issues are, but as a dog owner whose dog is amazingly healthy and fit because he has a chance to run free at Ft. Funston several days a week, I want to register my firm opposition to the proposed restrictions on off leash at several GGNRA sites around the area. What's the real harm in having these heavenly places for our dogs to run free?

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5644    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** ssf, CA 94080  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:49:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. I support formalization of the Pet policy plus off leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences in the off leash area because they feel like pens and visitors feel unwelcome.

As someone who walks regularly with my dog I think that turning the off leash area into a restrictive area will prevent me from recreating with my dog. It will also be detrimental for my dogs health as I rely on that open space for my dog to run and exercise.

The GGnRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a recreation area for densely populated urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. that policy needs to be formalized and supported with off leash areas in San Mateo county and on new lands the GGnRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Nia Reate-Galarza

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5645    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to

support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5646	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:50:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5647	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:51:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been taking my 3 pound dog to the Dog Park at the Fort Funston and hope that there will be no changes to the site. My dog is very small and is not comfortable when we go to the designated gated parks throughout the City. He is overwhelmed with dogs, many of which are aggressive. While at Fort Funston, we have never encountered any problems. The owners/dog walkers and the dogs are well behaved, well socialized and not intimidating. I believe it is because they are allowed space which is such a rare commodity in San Francisco for humans and pets alike. Our dogs love this site and I believe that it is because we pet walkers are there is why the site is getting so much more attention. There are also folks walking through that do not have pets with them and they do not appear to be intimidated by the dogs.

Please do not take away our Dog Park/s.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5648    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:52:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I hope the GGNRA takes into account the needs of other user groups in addition to dog-lovers. I am an birdwatcher, hiker, lover of beaches and parent of a small child who is tired of being harassed by packs of out of control dogs running loose on GGNRA beaches. "Voice control" is a euphemism for "no control" and unless GGNRA has insufficient funding to provide ranger services during the day, these abuses will continue. Currently, there are typically no rangers present even on popular beaches on sunny weekend days - this past weekend on Rodeo Beach, for example, between 10 and 1 pm, not a ranger seen, and many loose dogs running roughshod over sunbathers, picnickers, and small children. When confronted dog owners are hostile and argumentative and deny any responsibility for their animals' behavior. I have been told at Crissy Field that this is a "dog beach" and children are not welcome (my son was trampled to the point of screaming because a dog wanted his sandwich).

In addition, there is no way "voice control" can prevent dogs from trampling sensitive wildlife in the dune areas which may be critical nesting habitat for Western Snowy Plover, Least Tern and other special status species. Please consider the interests of all user groups, including wildlife, and police the beaches effectively to enforce any new regulations, which dog owners are already vowing to ignore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5649    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:52:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This is a gross example of government overreach. Pets deserve to be able to walk freely without a leash in open air environments. This activity encourages them to be healthy and learn to socialize with other people and animals without becoming violent or afraid.

**Correspondence ID:** 5650    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:52:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Heck no! Please no further restrictions on the right to enjoy our city with our furry companions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5651    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:52:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) dog management plan (the "Plan") because it violates the spirit and intent of the GGNRA, it does not provide a suitable alternative for a significant current user base, and it institutionalizes inequality by unfairly gives some users priority of a common space.

The GGNRA dog management plan violates the spirit and intent of the GGNRA. As part of the original 1972 Act, the area now known as GGNRA was authorized as an area of recreation with the intent of providing green space for visitors and residents alike. The intent was not to restore the GGNRA to it's perfectly natural state prior to civilization as is evidenced by the cultivation of non-native species (palm trees at Crissy Field and Fort Mason, birds of paradise at fort mason, fertilized grass at both areas). Intentionally excluding one aspect of the recreation area in the name of restoration while letting other "nature violations" remain is a clear violation of the original intent of law and a mistake by the NPS.

The GGNRA dog management plan does not provide a suitable alternative for responsible dog owners. Fenced in pens with no open space alternative confine large groups in a small space. Many dogs are fearful or aggressive in confined spaces with unkown dogs present; these pens would encourage irresponsible dog owners to never teach voice commands while simultaneously keeping responsible dog owners away who fear for their dog's health at the hands of others.

The GGNRA dog management plan excludes a large portion of the Park's current user base. Responsible owners who manage their dogs with voice control make up a large portion of residents and visitors. Their animals keep away from others on the beach and do not violate protected zones. Excluding all owners from the area effectively creates a class tier, putting some park users in higher priority to others.

As a 10 year military veteran I understand the concepts of Intent, decision alternatives and equality. I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) dog management plan (the "Plan") because it violates these three major concepts.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5652    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** a proud dog owner and voter Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for the past six years. My husband is a senior citizen and enjoys taking his regular walks with our dog at Ft. Funston. It is a great place to get exercise and to socialize with dog owners and other visitors.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Restrictions on areas such as Ft Funston will adversely affect other off leash areas nearby, such as Stern Grove. There is plenty of room for all. Let's not restrict unnecessarily.

Sincerely,

Laura Birsinger

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5653	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Greenbrae, CA 94904 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5654	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 12:53:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	PLEASE do not get rid of the off-leash play areas for dogs!				

I am a long time SF resident and homeowner. I have a dog and two kids so I see all sides of this issue. We NEED the various GGNRA areas for dogs to run free. Walking on a leash is not the same thing as being off-leash. And dogs need to be able to run free. Ft. Funston is dog heaven just for that reason. And all dogs get along, owners are respectful of each other and the grounds. It all works very well. SO why would we change that?

Chrissy too. A wonderful spot- where everyone is able to co-exist and use the space jointly.

The dog "parks" are not enough.

This city has more dogs per person than children...so make sure the dogs have a place to run. For many people- they ARE their children. For someone like me- who has both- I would consider my dog my first born :)

And my first born needs to be able to run free as much as my other children do.

thank you-

Lauren Schwartz  
home-owner, business owner  
mother of one dog and 2 children

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5655    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Richmond, CA 94804  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:54:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I grew up in San Francisco, taking family walks with the dog at Crissy Field. The dog happily running free on the beach and fetching sticks in the water were what made those walks so very special for me as a child. I hate to think of that going away for the next generation. I do understand that times change, as do populations and recreational needs, and I also understand that some people prefer to walk without dogs around. But in a city where dogs are beloved family members in so many households, I believe the current GGNRA plan does not sufficiently take into account the needs of its dog owning and loving community members.

Please keep more of the GGNRA dog-friendly.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5656    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:55:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We, the undersigned, oppose the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan. The plan proposes to either eliminate or severely limit dog-walking access in 21 locations in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo counties - including traditional off-leash areas like Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Marin Headlands, Mori Point, Muir Beach, Ocean Beach, and Rodeo Beach.

The GGNRA is located in a major urban area with minimal open space, so these restrictions will have a dramatic impact. We believe an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRA's original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan fails to do.

Kelly Clark

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5657    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94017  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---



**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:55:16**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Since I have been going to the Fort Funston Dog Park site, I have seen a great improvement in the families and pets that have been there. Prior to it becoming a dog park, it was at times scary. There would be homeless in the bushes, or people in the bushes doing who knows what. I would be on paths, but I didn't always feel safe.

As time went on, I began to see more families, most with and some without their pets. Some pets on leash and some off leash. But with time and the increase of dogs and dogs walkers/owners, I felt safer to walk my dog here. The site should continue as it is. as a dog park to take our dogs to walk,play and socialize, on or off leash, throughout the park without proposed limitations. Today, it is rare that I see folks behaving badly, and I believe that the use of the park as is, and if it were able to continue as is, would actually be an asset to the site at Fort Funston, as well as the other sites. If it were to be changed as proposed, I believe there would be less visitors to the site, since most of the visitors are dog owners/walkers, and crime would likely return and become the problem. There are visitors who do not have dogs and they are still able to enjoy the beautiful scenery and vegetation the dunes offer. Off trail, or destruction of the plant life, wildlife, dunes would not be the problem. The crime would be the problem and few to no one would be able to use the site safely. As for the other sites, I also hope that no changes will be made to these sites with regards to dog owners bringing their dogs to the sites. We are responsible owners/care givers to our pets, and take responsibility for our pets.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5658 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 941331

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:57:31**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Plain & simple: dogs need to be dogs and running free, at least part time in a big city, is an essential component of their nature...

My dog Scarlett knows the way to ALL of her favorite places and literally starts whimpering & crying in the back seat of the car as soon as she smell the ocean air. Sadly she doesn't get to enjoy that thrill often; I can't imagine her life without ever being able to run free once in a while.

PLEASE preserve a small slice of the natural order for our canine companions!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5659 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** san francisco, CA 94102

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 12:57:45**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I'm writing to let the GGNRA know that I am strongly opposed to the new draft dog management plan. It is a very extreme change to the current plan, and is extremely restrictive to both dogs and their owners. The new plan, if enacted, will prevent me and my family from enjoying the GGNRA areas I grew up with. I was born and raised in San Francisco and have very fond memories of going to Fort Funston and Crissy Field with our dog. Now that I am an adult, I have my own rescue dog. My husband and I love to go hiking and going to the beach early on Sunday morning. We often hike around Marin county,

including Mt Tam and Muir beach. However, our favorite spot is Ocean Beach, early in the morning. Often is is just us and our dog out there at these times. Almost all of our hiking and outdoor activity revolves around our dog, as he also needs to get out on the weekends and it doesn't make any sense for us to go out and hike without him. Furthermore, it will severely restrict our dog walker, who takes our dog to Fort Funston daily. Without this opportunity, our dog would be confined in doors during the week.

The GGNRA has lost sight of the purpose it was created for. Congress intended, when it created the GGNRA in 1972, that "the objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to ... expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972). The draft dog management plan would, for thousands of families, wipe out the opportunity to enjoy the recreational opportunities of the GGNRA. The parks would lose visitors, and future generations would not be able to enjoy the beautiful areas the GGNRA controls.

Furthermore, the new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Dog owners who live in the densely populated city will have nowhere to go. There are very few open areas. When these become too crowded, dogs get nervous and accidents occur.

If the GGRNA wants to limit the impact of dogs in their areas, there are other ways to do it. There should be more opportunities available for people who want to be responsible dog owners, including training classes, workshops, clean up days, etc. The current draft plan only punishes those who want to do the best for our dogs. Banning dogs from GGNRA areas is not a well thought out solution.

Sincerely,  
Elizabeth

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5660	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:00:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please stop making off-leash dogs the problem - there are many more problmes, like vandalism, people who trash our beaches for the 4th of July, etc. Honor your promises in the past to keep off-leash areas available. There are many dog owners in San Francisco and Beyond who need areas to walk our dogs of leash. Fort Funston, Mori Point, etc.				

Thank you,  
Joanna Van Elk

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5661	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Karin Ott

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5662	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:01:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I propose to regularly ticket for off-leash dog-walking where it is not allowed in the GGNRA. Then people will get used o leash ing their dog when they're supposed to.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5663	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94949 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:01:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Respectfully, I think dogs should be on leashes in ALL NPS areas.				

---

Banning them from some areas within NPS properties would be a good idea, too.

Specifically, I think they should be banned from ALL beaches due to potential negative impacts upon Western Snow Plover.

Thank you, Daniel Edelstein  
Consulting Biologist  
Novato, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5664	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Santa Cruz, CA 95065 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:02:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** The only effective way to deal with off leash dogs and their owners is to put them in fenced, designated off leash areas. The use of other natural barriers, rather than the standard 4' cyclone-type fence is just asking for trouble. The off leash dog community has a long history of ignoring rules designed to protect the general public from their uncontrolled dogs. The concept of "voice control" is completely without merit in the context of off leash recreation in public parks. Not only is it irritating to have to listen to owners shouting at their dogs, the lack of formal training in most dogs makes the efforts ineffective as well.

Asking the public to share sandy beaches with dogs that are defecating and urinating on a constant basis goes against all of the historical norms of prudent public health and safety standards. No responsible parent would allow their child's school playground to be turned into a off leash dog park. In fact, state law prohibits this. Why should it be any different in public parks? People and their children use the sandy beaches for many activities that involve close contact with the sand on bare skin. In fact that is one of the joys of beach recreation, feeling the warm or cool sand on your body while you listen to the sounds of the surf or birds or nothing at all. Allowing dogs and their owners, whether leashed or unleashed, to freely cover the beaches with urine and excrement (some of which gets picked up and some that doesn't) flies in the face of commonly held public expectations for clean, safe and secure beaches.

The total lack of any type of training required for dog owners before they are set loose on the public lands coupled with their misplaced sense of entitlement has resulted in a completely incompatible activity which routinely causes the non-dog-owning public to abandon their prized beaches. The unwillingness or inability of law enforcement agencies to control illegal off leash activity has left the general public with no recourse. My recommendation would be for the Park Service to take positive steps to leverage their limited enforcement activities so as to be effective in combating this scourge on our public parks. Bearing in mind that history has shown that if you allow leashed dogs on the beach, those leashes will come off when the owners see fit. Dogs should be prohibited entirely from the beaches. This simplifies the enforcement process. No more cat and mouse game where dog owners carry their leashes for use only when the ranger comes into sight. This way the ranger sees a dog on the beach, he/she writes a citation. Repeat offenders should see sharply escalating fine amounts and/or jail time. Honestly, this has been an on-going criminal conspiracy amongst the off leash crowd, to defraud the public of their unfettered use of public parkland, for decades. When does the public get some relief? People are being maimed and torn to pieces by pit bulls and rotweilers while law enforcement agencies do what? Please protect the people, the environment and insist on fenced parks for dogs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5665	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:02:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am strongly opposed to the "Preferred Alternative" change to the GGNRA policies. I have lived next to the GGNRA and, before it was established, the Presidio Army base. During the 35 years I have lived in this neighborhood, I have owned a few dogs. I have therefore had experience walking my dogs, off-leash, for a long period of time. I OPPOSE the "Perferred Alternative" and it's policies. There is no absolutely no justification for the oppressive policies being proposed.

We the people, lead by Phil Burton, worked to preserve the Presidio Army base as a recreation area for the City. This was a continuation of the open policy the army base had. The City and the GGNRA are safer because of the off-lease policies and, as I have stated before, there is absolutely no justification for the changes the GGNRA has been trying to force upon the residents for the last 29 years.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5666	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Joe Vargo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5667    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Albany, CA 94706

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:04:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose attempts to outlaw off leash dog activities in the areas of the GGNRA which this document addresses. People with dogs deserve access to commonly held land. I believe banning off leash dogs will not work. Criminalizing the historic relationship between humans and canines is a step in the wrong direction. Please, instead, put efforts into programs to educate dogs, owners, and the general public about what constitutes appropriate dog behavior in public space.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5668    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Point Reyes Station, CA 94956

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:05:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support a balanced use of the incredibly diverse lands of Golden Gate National Recreation Area(GGNRA).

I support the preferred alternative F. It adds a lot of good protections and balances wildlife protection with the many uses of the park lands.

I sincerely hope that the plan will not be weakened from pressure by dog walkers and the Marin County Supervisors.

There are good protections of wildlife in Alternative F. I encourage GGNRA to back up the

---

implementation of the new plan with genuine enforcement. That would mean issuing citations to violators.

Thank you.

David Wimpfheimer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5669    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:05:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** WE would like to express our desire to keep dogs allowed in all presently available places, and and would be in favor of any action that would actually increase the options for dog owners to have access to places to enjoy with our dogs on and off leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5670    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Calistoga, CA 94515  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:05:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Most dogs need to run. It is so great to be able to let them exercise off leash. Please don't change this! There are plenty of places that leashes are required for those who prefer that. Let's keep the options open. Thanks for your attention.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5671    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and

human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5672	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:07:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I live in San Francisco and have the pleasure of frequently walking my dogs off-leash/under voice control at Fort Funston. There is no park in San Francisco that can provide the same experience with respect to size and beach access.				

The GGNRA admits that they have not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document alleged impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils. However, the SEIS claims that these unproven impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them. Anecdotal observations made by NPS staff, who may or may not be biased against dog walking, should not be used to set policy.

Since there is no specific evidence which proves these impacts are occurring as a result of dogs, please do not reduce the quality of my life by implementing the NPS Preferred Alternative in the SEIS. Instead, please formalize the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5673	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:07:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of San Francisco with a 10yr old Border Collie. I've been taking daily trips to Crissy Field and/or Baker Beach for the last 5years with my dog. This has been a crucial part of the overwhelmingly positive experience I've had living in San Francisco.

I'm a strong supporter of the off-leash environment because, as many dog owners might agree, the freedom of movement is an integral part of the participating in the outdoors. Requiring a leash limits my ability to enjoy my freedom outdoors and makes my experience seem limited at best.

I understand not every person in San Francisco enjoys dogs. I'm not adverse to building more off-leash areas IN CONJUNCTION with our current off-leash areas. However, I'm not in support of limiting the off-leash areas so severely that there is little form of compromise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5674    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:07:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.  
The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Danesha Vasquez

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5675    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94705  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:07:48

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5676 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Montara Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:08:26

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** February 18, 2014

To the GGNRA:

My name is Nancy Wilder, I live in Montara and am a member of the Montara Dog Group.

I am writing to comment on the inaccuracies of the SEIS document addressing dog walking in the Rancho Corral de Tierra which encompasses Montara and surrounding communities.

The general tone of the SEIS states that dogs are a huge problem in all the spaces that the GGNRA manages for the people of California and wants to greatly restrict access by people with dogs in these areas. That is completely wrong, and an overreaching action.

The SEIS does not give, or link to, any documentation for negative environmental impact on this area from dog walkers. There is no logical reason for banning dogs from this area, no scientific data collected, and since the GGNRA has only been managing this area since December of 2011, there is no evidence for the GGNRA to state that dogs have caused any problems here.

Many people walk here daily, at different times of day, and will attest to the fact that dogs running amok or destroying vegetation is extremely rare. There are so many trails and a few open fields here for dogs to run and play; dogs in general prefer to be near their humans and interact with them or other dogs.

People have been responsibly walking their dogs both on and off leash in this area for decades. Dog walking, and being out enjoying the Rancho, has brought our community together and has actually been beneficial to the area by providing waste cans and bags, and facilitated communication and resolving of issues that arise in the open space (fallen trees, lost dogs or people, illegal dirt biking, etc) I have lived in Montara for almost 7 years and consider walking my dog in the Open Space integral to my love for this area, and to the value of my property. It is an important part of my day to connect with my community in this way, get some exercise, and enjoy the outdoors in a safe environment for both me and my dog.

Much as I love Montara, I have considered leaving the area if dogs are not allowed or even severely restricted in the Rancho. This is not a light decision for me.

Most folks I see on my daily walks in the Rancho Corral de Tierra Open Space have their dogs with them, whether people are running, biking, horseback riding or walking, they are generally responsible and friendly, and care about and respect the natural habitat. What I don't understand is why the GGNRA does not seem to remember the fact that they were formed for ensuring San Francisco Bay Area residents would continue to have areas of open space in which to recreate. Dog walking as recreation, especially off leash, is of utmost importance to a vast amount of residents. Dog walkers, especially in the Rancho, have a decades - long history of off leash dog walking and caring for the habitat. The SEIS dog management plan preferred alternative does not provide ANY off leash opportunities in the Rancho, and bans off leash dog walking completely in San Mateo County. There is absolutely no rationale for this, making it an act of totalitarianism, and is not acceptable.

I would like to point out that the state of Oregon allows off leash dog walking on most of their beaches; some are restricted due to wildlife activity at certain times of the year, but there is adequate signage and updated information available on the State Park website. This is another fact that demonstrates how the GGNRA is being completely over restrictive in the management of the Rancho Corral de Tierra. Yes, the beach is not the same as our Open Space but the comparison lies in the fact that there are environmental and wildlife concerns in all natural habitats.

The fair and just decision to be made in this situation is to continue to allow off leash dog walking in the areas in which it has been common practice for decades, (the Open Space in northern Montara adjacent to the coast, and near El Granada) and allow dogs on leash in other areas such as the trails above Moss Beach. I hope the GGNRA will come to reason and make the decision that the majority of people want in this situation.

Respectfully,

Nancy Wilder  
452 6th Street  
Montara, CA 94037

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5677	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:08:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have already left one comment and I understand today is the last day to comment so I wanted to add a few things.				

1. My original comment was supportive of the preferred alternative, particularly at those location in San Francisco. I continue to feel the same and that providing large areas at Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston for off leash dog use while also providing on leash and no dog areas is a fair compromise to all users.
2. I commend the GGNRA for going through this long/exhaustive process and making an effort to listen to concerns by all parties. I have attended several of the open houses and found your staff helpful and the general tone of the conversation to be positive and constructive even among folks with differing opinions.
3. Most of my dog owning friends are supportive of the preferred alternatives at the locations within San Francisco. They recognize the need for balance in these public spaces. They were pleasantly surprised that large areas would still be maintained for them to run their dogs off leash.
4. I hope that this public comment process is a productive one. I read many non-productive comments after the last version of the DEIS in opposition to making any changes whatsoever. There are very organized groups such as Ocean Beach Dog and Crissy Field Dog actively engaged in trying to sabotage this process as much as possible. Recent comments from Rep Jackie Speier asking for the GGNRA to start from scratch represent ignorance of the history of this subject and a denial of all the hard work and time that has been spent heretofore. This 10 year long odyssey needs to come to a close.
5. However, if there are dog owners making reasonable requests for modification to the plan that have merit, I would strongly request that the GGNRA consider these requests as part of this DEIS process. In particular, there are areas such as Muir Beach, where off leash will be prohibited in its entirety. This doesn't seem fair to me. Providing a portion of the beach as off leash seems reasonable. Perhaps balancing this with a reduction in the off leash area at Rodeo Beach might be a fair compromise.

Thank you again and am looking forward to a day when I can enjoy these places without off leash dogs everywhere.

**Correspondence ID:** 5678    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:10:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly support the Draft Dog Management Plan. It is crucial to have some trails available with no dogs on those trails. At present it is very difficult to find a trail where there are not dogwalkers. Trails should be very well marked and fenced if needed. Visitors should be limited to only two dogs in the park. It is crucial that new dog regulations be enforced.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5679    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:10:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't stop off leash dog areas from existing. We love our outdoors

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5680    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:11:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I frequently enjoy parks in Marin and San Francisco. I am not a dog owner, or even a particular dog 'enthusiast', but I am writing to oppose the Preferred Alternative in the Plan as it is too restrictive. There scant evidence-based justification in the dog management plan for major changes. Further, fenced off areas is an unpleasant solution. Keep recreation, including for responsible dog owners and their dogs, at the heart of GGNRA system.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5681    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

---

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Nancy Shaughnessy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5682    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94705  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:13:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** In addition I would like to ask you to please keep all areas currently open to off leash dogs open forever. Discriminating against dog walking families is wrong.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5683    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:14:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA -

PLEASE do not change the current approach to off-leash dog areas.

Dogs are the children of san francisco, and are known around the world for their friendliness. Those of us that are dog owners are proud of our well-behaved, trained dogs and love that young children (local and visiting) get to learn about pets and dogs when we meet at the beach.

I am constantly impressed with the level of respect SF dog-owners give to our city, keeping it clean, staying outside of protection areas, and in general always keeping our animals under voice control.

We need to keep San Francisco San Francisco. It is a home for US, not for tourists, and we should ensure the decisions that are made are for those of us who call San Francisco home, one we love in part due to our strong and historical dog culture.

San Francisco is a special city, and has always been a leader in allowing its citizens the right to be who they are. With 50% dg ownership in this city, dogs are a part of our heritage.

Have you ever come to Chrissy Field early on a Saturday morning? If not, I plead with you to do this and experience the beauty of dogs playing with dogs and humans meeting, becoming friends and sharing the beauty of this city, our weather, the sea, and good health.

Sincerely,  
Jill Jepson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5684    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:15:05

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Bill Shaughnessy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5685    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Albany, OR 97321  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:15:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My husband and I moved up to Oregon with our rescue pitbull Applesauce nearly 3 years ago. Fortunately our local park allows us to make our own judgment calls about the interactions of our dogs. Applesauce is well behaved and loves playing with other dogs. Some people have dogs who don't love playing with other dogs, or are aggressive, and those dog owners responsibly walk dogs on leash. We put Applesauce on her leash when passing dogs who are leashed, then let her off again. It isn't rocket science, and the majority of owners are responsible and aware. Occasionally Applesauce gets nipped or chased by a little yappy dog who shouldn't be off-leash - but that's the risk that we accept when allowing her to socialize with other dogs. The same was true in San Francisco while we were there, and we felt fortunate that it was so easy to exercise and socialize Applesauce at the dog parks. It is very important to socialize dogs like pitbulls, German Shepherds, huskies, etc. and if all interactions from a young age were stressful, on-leash encounters, I think more dogs would be aggressive when meeting other dogs out for a walk, pulling and barking and snapping. All that aside, the quality of life of many San Franciscans and their dogs will be greatly diminished by strict leash-laws, and the cost of enforcing it seems a bit ridiculous. We'd much rather have the parks nicely maintained, and let dog owners continue to do their own dog management as we have done for many years. Of course there will be unfortunate incidents, as there are anywhere that human beings live in such close proximity to one another. But draconian leash laws aren't going to change that - dogs and people will still get bitten from time to time. Accept that and focus your energy somewhere more productive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5686    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:15:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Montara is a community of dog owners, it would perhaps surprise you how many households here have dogs. Our dogs need the opportunity to run and frolic. I think that a survey of Montara residents would show overwhelming support for off leash areas for our dogs. Please consider the wishes of the majority and the health and well being of the dogs that live in Montara. Thank you, Liam

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5687    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:17:06

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Irene Cahalan & Finn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5688    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:17:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please adopt the least restrictive means for off-leash dog areas in Northern California. There are so few places where dogs can be free and play. These places allow citizens and owners to become a community. Eliminating off-leash dog areas will impact our ability to make use of California's beautiful trails with our entire family. Please do not make a change that is not necessary and will substantially limit thousands of families' ability to enjoy nature with their companions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5689 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:17:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** So, I was hiking Miwok to Coyote Ridge Trail yesterday, in Tennessee Valley, and there were so many dogs. Wildlife viewing is nil. Just a few brave little sparrows. One woman got way ahead of her dog on the trail, and the dog was digging into some little creatures' burrow just off the trail. You can not depend upon owners to control their dogs. These places are special because they are wild. Don't let them become devoid of all wildlife, thanks to the proliferation of dogs.

Sincerely,  
Christine Holmes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5690 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:18:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Let dogs run free.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5691 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:20:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5692    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:20:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** \* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Optional Points to Make (choose as many or as few as you want):

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."



\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5693    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Protect wildlife and meet needs of many people.

The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.  
We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

The GGNRA's proposed plan will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5694    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:23:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Stephanie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5695    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:25:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not ban off leash dog areas. There are already too few that exist and its part of a healthy community to have places to play with your dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5696    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** 84 Buena Vista TR Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Bret Wright

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5697    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:26:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from interacting with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have regularly at Fort Funston for years.

---

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan lacks any acknowledgement of its impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jon Solorzano

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5698	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

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

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

I believe we'd see a huge increase in reported incidents if all the dogs in this city don't have a place to workout off-leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5699    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:27:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Margaret Timbrell Hiatt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5700    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:28:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5701	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or

---

Fort Funston for many years.

I have worked in San Francisco as an Emergency Medical Technician for 6 years. Emergency medical services is an industry that comes with significant stressors, such as long hours, intense situations, and the occasional gruesome scene. As a dog owner I understand and value the freedom that many parts of the Bay Area offer me. I lived in Chicago from 2005 to 2007 and the best legal dog park I could find was a fenced-off, rocky run underneath an overpass. Compare that with the expanse of Fort Funston, Chrissy Field, or Sweeney Ridge, and it immediately becomes apparent (to me at least) the benefit of off-leash. To exercise complete physical freedom - in the form of watching my dog run unbound - is as pure an anti-anxiety medicine as anything prescribed. And speaking unsolicited for the entire dog-walking population of the Bay Area, with the wonderful, stress-reducing freedom we enjoy here, comes a recognition of our responsibility to care for the lands on which we play and walk. I believe dog owners are some of the best custodians of the rich land we have here in the Bay; we value it because we are constantly immersed in it during all the time we spend walking around in it with our dogs. Personally speaking, I can think of no better way to decompress and normalize after a twelve hour shift of wailing sirens, pain, and illness than a morning walk with my dog off leash. Seeing my domesticated beast running free and happy is the best therapy I could ask for.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan lacks any acknowledgement of its impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5702	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Loving Pet owner Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:29:18

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** It is one of the joys of my life and my dog's life and my family to be able to go off leash in designated areas. While I do not understand why dog owner do not pick up their dogs litter or take untrained aggressive dogs to public areas I absolutely do not understand why everyone should pay for their mistakes.

Let's start using the laws on the books. Police should give tickets for not picking up dog poop and for taking an untrained aggressive dog to a dog park. Community service would be the best punishment.

Cesar Millan has awesome videos and a website to help people learn about dogs and how to deal with aggression. The rest of us who are responsible dog owners should not pay for the mistakes of a few.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5703 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:29:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The GGNRA should be a place of recreation and peace for all people (sightseers, hikers, birdwatchers, kids, etc.) and wildlife - not just people with dogs. And the NPS needs to adopt dog management policies to ensure that the GGNRA is preserved in perpetuity for the enjoyment of all people, and wildlife. The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5704 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My extended family of three generations of San Franciscans, along with our dogs, regularly meet to exercise (walking) and socialize in the following GGNRA areas: Crissy Field (from The Warming Hut to East Beach), Fort Funston, and Mori Point. Lacking the ability to get our dogs off-leash exercise (Crissy Field and Fort Funston), will end these outings and affect the health and wellbeing of all of us, but mostly of the youngest and oldest who are of limited mobility.

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Warren Spicer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5705	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Richmond, CA 94804 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:30:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	trongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and GGNRA trails.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5706	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114-3814 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:33:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.



The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Mike Iriarte (and Gracie)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5707    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:34:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please save off leash areas in SF!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5708    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash

---

recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

OFF LEASH IS ONE OF THE THINGS THAT MAKES SAN FRANCISCO GREAT - ACCESS TO AREAS LIKE THE GGNRA SHOULD CONTINUE TO SUPPORT DOG OWNERS AND OFF LEASH AS A POSITIVE.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5709	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:35:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please save the areas for off leash walking. It's important for the dogs, the owners and the people in San Francisco.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5710	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:39:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern,				

---

This is an outrage. This a very short sided thing to do that will affect the lifes of thousands of people and their dogs. If this restriction passed we will be losing almost all areas that we have to give our dogs room to run and be healthy.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5711	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:39:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello All,				

---

I am a resident of the west side of San Francisco, and walk my well behaved dog on Ocean Beach, at Fort Funston, and occasionally on Chrissy Field. Our household is a member of the local Sierra Club, and they do not speak for us. I have been absolutely horrified that this sham of public process you are perpetrating, and cannot believe you are ignoring the wishes of the people who use these pieces of land.

My understanding is that the SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The

SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions.

SEIS still lists impacts that "might", "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. This point was raised in DEIS comments, and should have been addressed but was not. For example, the SEIS admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils (p. 373). Yet they also claim these impacts are currently occurring in the GGNRA and therefore dog walking must be curtailed to stop them (e.g., p. 97). Without site-specific studies, there is no proof impacts are occurring.

SEIS says that, during the last six years, NPS staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. In that same time, they could easily have conducted the site-specific studies that might have shown whether or not impacts are occurring in the GGNRA. Yet they chose not to do them.

SEIS admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An SEIS is supposed to be based on science, not anecdote. The SEIS also says it relies on the "best professional judgment of NPS staff" to determine impacts from dogs and their importance when there are no scientific studies of impacts in other parks available (e.g., p. 396). NPS staff have demonstrated a long-standing, strong bias against dog walking, and the SEIS should not depend largely on their biased judgment and anecdotes for "proof" that impacts from dogs are currently occurring.

I strongly urge the NPS staff hold an \*actual\* public collaborative process to balance the needs of the local population with regards to the use of these areas.

Thanks so much,

Kate

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5712	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Leah L. Nanni

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5713	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:40:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Misha Zatsman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5714	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:41:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I think the GGNRA attempt to restrict of use of public parks by dog owners is discriminatory and unfair. the SF bay area is already biased against dogs with the majority of trails in marin off limits to dogs even on a leash. to restrict places like ocean beach or crissy field for off leash dog walking is taking away our right as tax payers to government facilities we are funding.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5715	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence

presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5716	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:42:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Caroline Wallace

Thank you for your support.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5717	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:44:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Rebekah Kouy-Ghadosh

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5718	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:46:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

Restricting access for dogs is unacceptable.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Margaret Hewitt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5719    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SANTA ROSA, CA 95405-8689  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:46:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't take away off-leash play areas! This is going to be terrible for dogs!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5720    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Pacifica Beach Coalition Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of myself and my partner as dog parents. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my dog, Sweeney (Named after our favorite hiking place - Sweeney Ridge) and our family will be losing one of the many great reasons as to why we live here in the San Francisco Bay Area and specifically in Pacifica.

There is an estimated 120,000 dogs in the Bay Area. It's been stated since 2007, that dogs outnumber the amount of children in our community. This fact alone is reason enough to not deplete our use of the dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA.

Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on my dog and our family, but our entire community. Our dog is not a dog park friend, she prefers open trails, long hikes, or big grassy fields to play catch at. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.

We've been coexisting fine all these years. Let's keep the 1979 Pet Policy. The policy's backbone is recreational and nature based. Nature and recreation are two things the Bay Area is made up of and should continue to be made up of.

Not allowing dogs on most of Pacifica's trails will keep us from these spots or cause us to become lawbreakers when in reality we are stewards of the trails we frequent, always monitoring litter, watching for graffiti, and caring for the native plants.

Please, please, please keep our parks friendly for 2 and 4 legged beings who need each other and need fresh air and exercise. We surely get more together than we would ever get alone!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5721    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---



**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:47:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need more areas in which dogs can be off leash to enjoy the world around them freely with their owners. Please continue to allow dogs to use the space they have enjoyed in the past.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5722    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is IMPORTANT:

I became a Marin County resident 6 years ago. I adopted my first dog 2 1/2 years ago. My life changed in several ways after I adopted my dog, Lucy. This is how:

A dog loves to explore and that's exactly what Lucy and I do. This past weekend we hiked over 10 hours on trails that include Bon Tempe, Alpine Lake, Coyote Ridge and Oakwood. The discovery that Lucy and I have enjoyed has allowed us to not only discover the beauty of Marin, but make life long friends throughout the communities, and in turn, this has made me more passionate and mindful about my surroundings and has increased my drive to engage and improve within it.

A NEW GENERATION is upon us. People are chosing NOT to have children, and like me, we see our animals as extensions to our family. I still pay the taxes for our schools and yet I will never have a child attend one. I pay a lot to live in Marin County and how dare the GGNRA cut off the one privilege that single familes, without children, cannot enjoy. IT'S TIME TO GET WTIH THE CURRENT TIMES.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood, Muir Beach, Stinson and Coyote Ridge.

Unfairly, Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

We will continue action on PR and Federal level, continuing with the media and starting a petition with CHANGE.ORG, then moving our way up to the White House, as these restrictions are not compliant with the Health Acts that our leaders are enforcing.

Stop restricting our lives.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5723    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** South San Francisco, CA 94080  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:48:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner Fort Funston in San Francisco is one of the few places we can take our dog to run free. The number of dogs and there owners who use the park is incredible , and considering the number of dogs, the place is very well maintained. Most dogs are under voice command, and dogs get along well. If you remove this location from dog owners to use off lease, I fear the will simply go to other parks and beaches and let there dogs run off lease where they do not belong. There would be more beaches effected by dogs running off leash and the problem would only become worse. There are many parks and beaches where people who do not want to be around dogs can go, that is there choice, please ensure that dog owners still have the choice to go to a beach where there dogs can run and play off leash as well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5724    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:49:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a frequent user of many of the GGNRA beaches and parks with my dog.

The main reason that these urban beaches and parks feel safe is the frequent sight of other dog walkers and other people enjoying the landscape.

We shouldn't pretend these urban parks are wilderness and they should be managed in a way that provides the most enjoyment for the largest number of users. Empty sand dunes and beaches don't benefit anyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5725    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:49:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** With the millions of acres in the wilderness there is plenty of land to keep dogs out. Fort Funston as a dog area is obviously its best use. It offers a wonderful recreation area to dog owners who otherwise are shoved into inadequate and limited corrals. We (Dog owners) have wants and needs. My dogs are as close to children as I will ever have.. They are a part of the family. As a family, we need

---

safe, convenient space to run, and play and experience beauty. Spend any weekend out there and it would be abundantly clear that the present situation is working fine.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5726	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Linkedin Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern:				

As a local SF native and who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA areas, I'm writing to share my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

This plan is extremely restrictive and unfair to dog owners and dogs as it not only limited the areas available to maintain my dog's health and wellness but also my own health. Being able to access areas such as Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston has been a valuable asset and one of the amazing things that add value to San Francisco.

The new proposed plan does not at all reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I strongly oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like cages and those individuals using them (residents and visitors) feel unwelcome and uninvited in such a beautiful habitat that should be enjoyed by all. Like numerous dog parks across the city, they will give the few owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing significant and unnecessary problems for the thousands of responsible dog owners who have dogs controlled by voice command and who are very well trained.

The proposed plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no sited evidence that any of those impacts that have, are or will occur in the GGNRA. It is also stated in the plan that the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils therefore making all accusations speculations and biased assumptions

The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas throughout the greater San Francisco area. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. Most all city dog parks that have been developed are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing. In addition the environment is often dirt vs. natural surroundings and in such an over-populated area, increased stress levels and confrontations are eminent.

The GGNRA has significantly lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Miriam Libonati

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5727    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:51:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm a dog owner lucky enough to live next to 3 dog-friendly open space parks in San Carlos. Owning a dog builds community- it gets you outside every single morning and evening to see your neighbors who would otherwise only pass in cars or live behind closed doors. It leads to a healthier community, encouraging each other to stay active. But nothing compares to the joy of seeing a dog happily running in his element, joy that is absolutely contagious and makes our community a better place to live. These places are treasured because of this joy, and to take that away would take away some of the greatness of san francisco.

I was particularly suprised to hear about some of these access-threatened locations, because there is very little wildlife in them to protect. Crissy field is a lawn, not wilderness. Fort Funston and Ocean Beach have no plant life. These restrictions feel very arbitrary in the public eye and do not seem to serve the greater good.

From this small voice of one, I urge you to reconsider these closures for the greater good of our treasured San Francisco and its huge population of dog owners. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5728    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94104  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:52:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Crissy Field is where we regularly walk with our dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreational activity with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. This city is expensive and walking our dog 3-4 times per week at Crissy Field is an amazing experience that we cherish. Being able to enjoy, specifically, the Central Beach & Airfield off leash is a draw as to why we continue to live in San Francisco. We also enjoy Fort Funston and Ocean Beach but those locations are inconvenient from our home but we do venture there when we have more time. Taking our dog with us on long walks is a main activity for us in the Bay area.

Specifically, turning Crissy Airfield and the Central Beach into leash required territory is such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. East Beach being a leash required area is understandable since that is used for Kiteboarding and on nice days families enjoy the easy access to the East Beach. Personally, we keep our dog on leash past the East Beach on busy days or we enter via the Airfield. Most weekdays and evenings the beach is desolate void of either families or kite boarders. Losing the entire Central Beach and Crissy Airfield areas (illustrated in Map 10-B) would not only be heartbreaking but an overly drastic

reduction to the purpose of RECREATION AREA it was declared to be and a total waste of accessible space for not only individuals with dogs but the lively hood of dog walkers. On a daily basis the waterfront is not being used by anyone other than those with dogs or a tourist on a rented bike. Please do not restrict access to all the off leash areas around the city. Map 10-E is a compromise.

Other maps that are OVERLY RESTRICTIVE: 11-D, 12-B, 12-C, 12-D, 12-F, all proposals for usage of Sutro Heights Park and Land's End proposals, 16-B, 16-D. The fear is once you start restricting access you will continue to take recreation areas away in the future which is opposite of the spirit of San Francisco.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco and San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kelly Smith

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5729	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94402 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:54:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Greetings! I am writing to underscore how important it is to have off-leash areas for our four-legged canine friends! I am a frequent visitor to Fort Funston, and other areas, with my lab/shephard mix. We are very respectful of the area and pick up our poop. We rely on these off-leash parks to be able to exercise in areas of natural beauty, and also to keep us from adding to dog-parks that are over-crowded and small.

We respectfully disagree with the Dog Management Plan, and would like you to reconsider. We need our off-leash areas to stay open!

Best,  
Audrey Zmuda and Emmy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5730	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94619 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 13:54:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

We love running with our dog off leash in the GGNRA and its one of the reasons we live in the Bay Area.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

KM

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5731    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:55:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5732    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The data does not support the proposed changes and I object to the reduction in off-leash space.

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

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5733    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Kaori Takahashi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5734    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have walked, hiked, and jogged with and without dogs in the GGNRA for more than twenty years, and I strongly oppose GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is far too restrictive and ignores the very important fact that San Francisco, the city, and the surrounding areas are growing in population. Such a restrictive policy in an urban setting will prevent me and other San Franciscans from recreating freely for my own health and that of my dog as I have for these many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Despite these omissions, the GGNRA has consistently further and further restricted access to all users to open space, preferring "native species" restoration over recreation.

I believe that the GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported throughout current holdings and on any new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Penelope Wisner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5735    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 95941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:57:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Rosalie Gearhart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5736 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94019  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Cabrillo Unified School District Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:58:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am the Superintendent of the Cabrillo Unified School District and I have just learned of plans to construct an off-leash dog walk area adjacent to Farallone View Elementary School in Montara. The proposed location is adjacent to this school. The location is on a private road that is very narrow and is not suited for additional traffic or parking. In addition, locating off-leash dogs is problematic adjacent to an elementary school. Care needs to be taken to ensure dogs and their owners have no way of interacting with our students If the Park Service is to move forward, then I request a meeting to discuss how to mitigate our concerns. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5737 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94710  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:58:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** If it weren't for the bad behavior of some dog owners and canines that can not be controlled, I would be opposed to the banning of dogs to the proposed areas. I have seen children feeling threatened by dogs and dogs chasing birds. It is reasonable to regulate access to dogs in National Parks.

Please implement the plan. It is thoughtful and protective.



Sincerely,

Piper Cafferata

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5738    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Simpson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5739    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 13:59:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please make Muir Beach friendly for all - wildlife, humans (including seniors and babies and those who don't want dogs running over their towels and eating their picnics, etc), and dog owners. I understand that Alt E allows for a ROLA on the south side. This seems like a reasonable approach. Little beach must not become the defacto dog park. There are many problems with this idea. Lack of amenities and lack of accessibility will lead to unsafe parking on Sunset Way where there is already not enough parking and too many problems with emergency vehicle access on the long, one lane road. It will lead to a concentration of dogs that will leave no room for other uses for the neighborhood and other uses. There will be almost no enforcement of laws and it will become littered with pet waste and human waste. Little beach should have a leash rule, at least during most of the day (perhaps off leash hours beginning in the later afternoon).

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5740    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:01:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Alex and i oppose the GGNRAs movement to leash dogs widely across a vast majority of our public parks here in San Francisco. I strongly oppose, not solely because I am a dog

---

owner, but also because the irrational nature of the GGNRA. In 1972 the beaches were given to the public by SF congress, and as you know in 1979 the beaches and trails were designed for public use with dogs in the plans. The notion that these parks not allow dogs off leash juxtaposes the initial planning of these parks. I would like to address the following items, the current issues with our parks, the impact of the neighboring communities around the off leash zones, and the allocation of the funds necessary to enforce the proposed Dog Management Plan.

When I visit the GGNRA parks that we frequent, my concern is not an offleash golden retriever, so much as it is the inability to restrict littering and squatting. The fact is, currently it will cost a proposed 2 million dollars to populate all of the GGNRA parks with enough employees to police our dog walking, however that money should be used to address far greater problems first. I will use ocean beach as the primary example here, there is more garbage along the north end of ocean beach than should be acceptable, I surf there many mornings, and the state the beach, a national recreation area, is horrid, this also applies at Crissy Field and Baker beach. Personally, I am disgusted that the GGNRA would even consider hiring rangers to police dog activity and not focus 100% on preserving these areas. The second issue for me is the squatting. Ironically located next to a sign restricting off leash dog walking at the Dunes in front of Judah, you can find on any given day up to 10 squatters polluting in many ways and making it unsafe for people like me who frequent the beach in the mornings. Put bluntly I would much rather come face to face with a dog, even an extremely aggressive one, than any one of those thousands of squatters who inhabit your national recreation area. In fact, so long as I see people squatting in and around our parks, I will refuse to accept a ticket for my dog being off leash. In fact, I will happily redirect your rangers to the problem areas, I will do this free of charge, you will not even have to pay me. Policing dog walking is not the way to spend the budget, when we have far greater problems on hand, please write me any time if you agree with this. In fact, I believe there have been less than 5 accounts of dog aggression across all of your parks, but hundreds of human on human altercations, which should tell you indiscriminately that you are focusing your finances irresponsibly.

Secondly, the congestion that will be caused by dog walking in the proposed areas allocated for off leash dogs will be astonishing. With the heavy concentration of people, comes with it, pollution, traffic, noise ect. 50% of SF residents have dogs, and those people will be heading to these few designated locations on weekdays and weekends. I feel like the proposed Dog Management Plan has not even scratched the surface of what a problem that this could cause. I am not a policy maker, however, if I were confronted with this problem I would handle it in the following way. Have more availability as to not make the dog accessible locations undesirable to live near to. San Francisco presents the amazing opportunity for dog owners, why would you feel it necessary to so bluntly cut this off. The Management does not even call to implement over time, or to allow those hundreds of thousands of inhabitants to adjust, but instead handles this all at once. It is fool hearted to think that this will end well.

Finally, GGNRA beaches and parks can not, and should not be held to the same restrictions as National Parks, such as Yosemite or Yellow Stone, there is not entrance fee to these areas, they are for the public, and planned for dogs. If you would like to supply the infrastructure and man power to give them the same treatment as a national park, please do so, I think we would all benefit. In fact, I could handle a lot of the changes, if you were to charge admission to the parks to ensure a clean and safe experience, but that is not the case. The dog management seems only to limit dog users but not address any of the problems persistent in the parks, like pollution, squatting, and unsafe conditions. I find the idea of even having to write this as silly, since so obviously the focus of the GGNRA should not be on restricting off leash dog access, but on far greater problems. However, that is not where we stand, we need to protect the rights of the inhabitants of SF, we need to keep our parks clean, and safe, and we need a Management Plan that addresses human issues first and Canine further down the priority list. The Management Plan has many

short comings, but for me, the budget to enforce these off leash restrictions, and the impact on the proposed dog parks are the most obvious.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5741    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 941233819  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My letter is to voice my concern over the proposed GGNRA dog management plan. I am a responsible owners of three small dogs.

I do NOT support the GGNRA dog management plan.

- the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there were only a few actual incidents including: only 6 dog bites report, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. There were 2 additional incidents reported where "people were scared." Taken in context of the hundreds of thousands of dog visits to the GGNRA, this data does not support the requested need for a change. Further, the data most certainly does not justify the funding request for \$2M to fund more park rangers.

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes explicitly stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. The GGNRA dog management plan includes a proposal to reduce the off leash recreation area at Crissy Field. This is contrary to the stated intention, policy and principles that were originally used to garner public support for the Chrissy Field plan. This proposed reduction of off leash area is acting in bad faith and without sound basis as the impact on all park visitors will be resulting increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas.

The GGNRA dog management plan is not supported by fact, is ill conceived, and risks imposing greater risks to both visitors to GGNRA parks and costs to the citizen-tax payers that would be required to fund it.

I do NOT support the GGNRA plan as currently drafted and request an alternative planning process be initiated that balances the needs of ALL visitors in a proper context that addresses safety and resource access and enjoyment for all.

Yours truly,  
Hugh McDermott

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5742    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fremont, CA 94539  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:02:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Janet

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5743	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123-2022				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:04:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs: We NEED to continue to have SAFE off leash areas for our dogs. The east beach in the GGNRA has ALWAYS been available for us. This new plan is too restrictive. I have lived here for 30 years and have enjoyed taking my well behaved dog running OFF leash in the presidio. Your new plan is too restrictive and punitive. We were promised this open space for our off leash pets/ (family members. Please do not close out our right to exercise our dogs. They must have a safe space to run.

I ABSOLUTELY disagree with the positions of the executive boards of groups who want to limit our use, these local boards do not speak for their members and they do not speak for me.

AGAIN to reiterate: I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I Support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am concerned about the current move to build fences at the eastern and western ends of Middle Beach at Crissy Field, around the proposed off-leash area at Fort Mason, and around the proposed off-leash areas at Fort Funston.

Unless they are constructed properly, Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens If Fences are secure enough to keep small dogs in they will hinder movement of wildlife.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The MBMS is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions. Although the SEIS says the MBMS will consider impacts on resources from non-compliance, it still is primarily focused on mere compliance with leash laws and the GGNRA can consider changing off-leash status for non-compliance even if no impacts on resources or other visitors are reported.

Thank you, Charna Ball  
LONG TIME resident of the Marina District SF, CA 94123

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5744    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tallahassee, FL 32317  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:04:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a lover of the outdoors and a lover of dogs, who finds the GGNRA one of the most beautiful places on earth, I must say that I am disgusted by the obscenely bureaucratic process that has been created for what appears to be the sole purpose of taking away Americans' freedoms.

It's a fine example of why people should never turn their local freedoms over to the Federal government and why most people in the San Francisco area probably regret ever allowing this land to become Federally-controlled. The Federal code now contains over 200,000 pages and is growing at a greater rate than at any time in history. These "rules" are laws created by unelected bureaucrats in painful, drawn-out processes such as we are seeing unfold with the GGNRA. It's a testament to the creepy resilience and impersonal growth of government bureaucracy that something as simply and broadly accepted by Americans as the 10,000 years old love between humans and their dogs must be quashed.

Chuck this whole process and revert back to the 1979 Pet Policy that has been reaffirmed since 2005, and stop, just stop the creeping omnipotence of government rulemaking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5745    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am DISGUSTED with the thought of the entire beach access being restricted to all 4 legged family members whom have enjoyed going to Crissy Field, and Fort Funston for many years with my family. 2 and 4 legged family members.

This Eminent Domain is WRONG. In SF CITY AND COUNTY within CALIFORNIA- where they have been raised-

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Disgusted in having to petition for the RIGHTS to all RESIDENTS!

When It was a former military base- IT WAS WAY NEGLECTED. Private (Donations) have redeveloped the Crissy Field

Paul

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5746	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:05:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please leave the dog policy the way it is (Version A). I walk on many of the Marin County trails and love meeting dogs and their owners.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5747	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a recent dog owner who strongly believes that dog owners are respectful of the national parks. Furthermore my dog deserves to be off leash. I pay a lot of taxes, enjoy being in the greatest city in the US and believe that there is a balance that understands taht there are more dogs in SF than kids.				

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

â€When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Please do the right thing and maintain what is in place. If it not broke don't fix it. It is not broke.

---

Chris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5748    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94116

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:05:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I have a 120 pound dog that is still growing. The only space for activity our dog recieves is at fort funston and at stern grove's dog park. In these areas we are allowed to train our one year old puppy to be off leash, play fetch, and learn to socialize with dogs of all breeds and sizes. Without these abilities, my puppy will not be able to learn to behave civilized. He needs an outlet to release all his doggy needs and to ban such spaces is good reason for more dogs on sidewalks, placed in dog pounds, abandoned, even worse-confined.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5749    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:06:10

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Joshua Miller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5750    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5751	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:08:59
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog owner and Marin County resident for more than 30 years, I am deeply opposed to adding more restrictions on off-leash dog use in any part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). This is an urban area and should not be treated like a wilderness. More, not less, use of GGNRA land for off-leash dogs should have been considered; did any of the alternatives studied allow more off-leash access? Dogs need vigorous exercise and they can only get such off-leash. I am an active person, but with a bad knee that prevents me from running. My dog needs to run and he can only do that under voice control, off-leash. It is distressing to see so many limitations on where dogs can be off-leash. How is a dog any different from a coyote? I routinely see coyotes freely roaming the Marin hills, and have sometimes initially mistook the coyote to be a dog.
------------------------	--

Additionally, a better executive summary of the plan is needed so that the public can easily see what is being proposed without having to read through a huge volume. I would also like to see a real public notification process, with posting at trails that are affected or having a mailing list so that the public can stay up to date on the changes.

I appreciate your consideration of these comments, and again, hope that MORE (not less) areas will be opened to responsible off-leash dog use. For those that are not responsible dog owners (picking up after their pet, limiting pet to trails only, etc.), consider penalties, but do not punish all dog owners.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5752	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:09:03
------------------	----------------------

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a dog owner but also someone who understands that dogs can be a nuisance and that the needs of the general public should come first, I appreciate the time taken to propose alternative plans for the different park areas. I don't understand why some of these changes are needed, however. I ask that you consider the data released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. I don't feel that data supports the requested needs for a change. Moreover, if you limit the areas where dogs can be off leash, you will have to increase the time and attention of your excellent personnel devoting themselves to enforcement. I would rather they use thier time and resources for more interesting activities such as park promotion and nature conservancy. Perhaps, more aggressive enforcement in areas that are designated on-leash needs to be done, thereby setting some clear boundaries.

With that being said, specific to Crissy field, if your committee does find that there needs to be changes, I strongly suggest that you select Alternative E that limits off leash activities but still provides a balanced and fair division. Alternative B is a really bad idea and I think you are setting yourself up for failure if you don't allow for even one area for off leash activities. C and D seem more fair but I think that for a lot of dog owners, the off leash on the beach is an excellent way to enjoy park. I will say that if you find strong evidence that dogs are impacting the ecosystem in a negative way, then dogs should be limited on the beach. Nevertheless, I strongly believe that dogs and people can coexist.

thank you for letting me voice my concerns.

Diego Castaneda

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5753 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:09:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm a very athlete person that loves to train outdoors. Exercise is key to a balanced lifestyle. It keeps me motivated, focused, healthy and makes me a happier person. I can't imagine working out inside home, with 10sq feet space. So for me it's really hard to imagine my dog on leash at all times. I have a tiny terrier chihuahua mix. The best moment of his day is when we go to the park. For him, interacting with other dogs, run, fetch, jump and have the freedom to move around keeps him in shape, makes him happier, more social and as a result, I have a better dog.

Dogs, as humans, need to have freedom to move around, to run, to socialize. On leash, this won't be possible anymore. A dog can't run on leash, can't fetch on leash, can't swim on leash, can be himself on leash. I find really hard and cruel not to have open spaces for dogs to exercise in the way they have to.

I beg you to consider this initiative. Healthy dogs make better pets. We need this. All. Animals and Humans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5754 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:09:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** the alternative plan is a bad one and is just mean. no reason to have outright bans.

---

i think that fencing off the areas for off-leash dog play is fine as long as the areas are large enough to provide real physical activity for dogs- not just areas to stand around sniffing each other but to really run and fetch and chase.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5755    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:10:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** What are you thinking??? I give you money all the time so I would like to think that as a member of this community and an ardent supporter of yours AND as a dog owner in a city of small spaces that you would take our furry family members needs into consideration.

I am absolutely against banning pets from Ocean Beach, Fort Funston and Crissy Field. I have always been proud of the tolerance my city shows to people and animals and am broken hearted to think that you would make these areas off limits to pets. Before we had a dog, we would take out kids to Fort Funston just to SEE other people's dogs!

Please rethink these ridiculous polices. If you enact these bans, I will forever withdraw my financial support of you.

Sincerely,  
Nanette Kroupa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5756    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:11:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do NOT restrict off leash dog walking areas any more. There truly are not enough of them as it is. Our dogs need this kind of exercise!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5757    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Deanna Tom

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5758	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94551 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:14:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	What could you be thinking? Have innocent animals not suffered enough through this rescission caused by humans? Our funding diminished, shelters full, no processes in place for spay neuter to reduce overpopulation causing millions to die each year, most in deplorable conditions and now we can't even have the space to walk and play with the dogs that are fortunate enough to have homes or be in foster care?				

Please reconsider. This is shameful.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5759	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:16:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please reconsider your decision I beg you! My dog lives for running and swimming along Fort Funston and Crissy Field. It's hard having an animal in such a small apartment, and the only way she can release her pent up energy is to run freely along the shore. Unfortunately, my dog does not enjoy enclosed dog parks so I rely on places such as Fort Funston and Crissy. Again, I beg you to reconsider, and I promise to pick up her poop! :)				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5760	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:17:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My husband and I have lived in the Marina area of SF for almost 10 years. We love Crissy Field and the surrounding beach. We have NEVER owned a dog, and yet LOVE that they are all over- - playing and enjoying themselves. It seems absolutely absurd to deprive the animals, as well as their owners, of the freedom and camaraderie they experience. Even those of us who don't have dogs, enjoy seeing them run around and watching others playing with them.				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5761    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Deckel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5762    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:19:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a dog owner AND A BIRDER I support the GGNRA plan for reasonable regulations of dogs in the parks. The Park Service needs to adopt stonger, more effective dog management policies. On-leash regulations should be more strongly enforced while off-leash areas should be clearly marked with fencing or natural borders.

The proposed plan is an important step towards a more balanced, sustainable use of the park. With appropriate enforcement, the plan will protect wildlife and allow for more equal use of the park.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5763    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:19:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I am against the current proposal.

The proposal to drastically reduce the amount of off-leash areas for dogs in the city is misguided, and a reversal of course set years ago. Where are the driving factors that require such a drastic change to current policy? The data provided by the GGNRA simply do not merit such drastic changes. The impact to dog owners and their dogs will be to eliminate existing spaces and concentrating them into even smaller areas. Dogs need space to run free and the areas selected in the past met the criteria but also protected critical wildlife areas.

Personally I am more concerned with drunk/stoned Marina girls and frat boys behaving badly in these open areas, as well as the people who discard their childrens' soiled diapers into planting area than from any behaviors from the dogs I have seen.

This is an example of over reaching to solve something that is not a problem.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5764	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:19:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please, please, please continue to allow dogs off leash!				

We live as far away from the coastline as is possible in San Francisco and it is such a joy to be able to bring ourselves, our children and our dog on adventures not so close to home.

Many, many dogs are wonderful off leash - friendly to humans as well as to plant and animal life.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5765	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:19:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The draft dog management plan for the Rancho Corral de Tierra is based on conjecture and guesswork. The fact is that dogs have had free access to the Rancho for years and the plan is concerned with future possible impacts. The plan cites no current impacts of the years of dog usage, and thus lacks scientific merit to restrict dogs in the future. The overly restrictive dog use recommendations would be hardship to both dogs and their owners and it in direct contradistinction of the purpose of the RECREATIONAL area. The NPS needs to adopt a plan that is more dog and people friendly.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5766	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:20:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Please do not reduce off-leash dog parks further. San Francisco is becoming a playground for the rich only, with families and productive yet lower-income citizens getting edged out. Please do not further edge out residents with dogs who want to simply run their dogs in a healthy manner. There is room for off-leash dog runs. We need these parks to foster the inclusion of the beauty of San Francisco's outdoors along with the gorgeous buildings and that famous hustle-and-bustle! Dogs need homes. They need homes where they are allowed to run outdoors. While many actual residences do not have such space, they depend on the parks for this need. Please do not reduce these off-leash park spaces! Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5767    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** OAKland, CA 94605  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:20:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have reviewed your preferred alternative F for locations in San Francisco, and while I can understand limiting off leash dogs to certain areas for protection of species, but I am concerned that you are eliminating access to even on leash dogs. I myself, like to take my dog for on leash runs for exercise and I see that 2/3 of Ocean beach is excluded from on leash dogs. I think this is a disservice to tax paying citizens, and I ask you to reconsider keeping on leash access on all/most walking trails in the concerned Federal lands.

Regards,

Candace Kosior

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5768    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Deerness, UN KW17 2QJ  
United Kingdom  
**Outside Organization:** Access and Countryside Management Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:21:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir / Madam

I have professionally specialised for 13 years in the management of greenspaces visited by walkers with dogs. Apart from working throughout the UK, I have also studied, first-hand, management approaches in Australia, New Zealand and Canada.

I also greatly appreciated fact-finding site visits and meetings with GGNRA, SFDOG and SF City Council last summer.

While many local people will comment on the detail of the proposals, without doubt, to me the fundamental thing that needs to happen to improve the current situation for all interests, is an integrated approach to managing the considerable demand for access, particularly off-leash, in and around the GGNRA area.

Without such an integrated approach between GGNRA, SF City Council and other landowners / bodies (eg Harbours authority), the Draft Dog Management Plan will simply displace and intensify problems even more, leading to further conflict for all concerned.

Everyone I met last summer was working with positive intentions, but to do so in isolation, without recognising the reality of how access management plans overlap on an area wide basis is in my view naive, perpetuates conflict and is not a good use of public funding.

In my meetings with city council officials, officers recognised the benefits of an integrated approach. But if public officials and politicians from all organisations cannot seem to work together for the widest public good, then it is hardly surprising that dog owners, parents' groups and environmental organisations will not be inspired to do so either.

At a time when there are ever-fewer resources for enforcement, developing a plan that manages off-leash demand in an integrated way to truly minimise impacts on the environment and all other interests, is the most sustainable way forward.

It's clear that for decades this issue has been festering in and around SF. And from my heart as a specialist looking in from the outside, keeping going with a silo approach based primarily on restrictions - rather than accommodating demand - will not solve or reduce the practical and political conflict that has served no-one's best interests for very many years.

Of all the places I've visited in a professional capacity across the globe, SF is THE place where, more than ever, public bodies need to work together to address this issue. The reality is that demand for off-leash is not going to be suppressed to a significant degree by adding ever more restrictions. It also seems inevitable that restricting off-leash to ever fewer areas overall, is just going to create even more problems and unwanted interactions.

In the UK, interventions to increase wanted behaviours by working with the dog walking community have been found to be the most cost effective ways forward. Sadly, the current approach in SF seems to severely limit the opportunity to develop such ways forward by creating alienation, rather than constructive collaboration.

I hope these external comments are helpful and I remain happy to advise further if helpful and wish you luck and the confidence to develop a step-change approach to the issue.

Stephen Jenkinson MSc PgDip(CABC) FIPROW

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5769	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:21:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please allow dogs to remain free on the land that they share with humans.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5770	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:22:42				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Chistina Martorana

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5771 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:22:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am disappointed that the GGNRA is still considering taking these actions after the fierce criticism and concerns expressed in 2011. As a Bay Area resident and dog owner I support the "No Action Alternative for each of the areas being proposed - Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. The GGNRA is not following the law and is making unilateral decisions regarding public lands. It was also acting against the very reason it was established - to give outdoor recreational opportunities to people.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5772 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Happy Hounds Massage Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:23:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I understand the GGNRA's position of having to preserve native lands but part of the park system's job is to also provide a space for the public to enjoy those lands. Banning over 50% o San Francisco's population from enjoying the public parks is not in line with that.

Please be respectful of your majority population - a population that fuels and generates millions of dollars in revenue through jobs, goods and services, and pays taxes from those millions that help support the park



system.

By banning dogs from the GGNRA parks, or by severely limiting their access, you're essentially denying taxpayers access to a 'service' they've been paying for. We all know the phrase "taxation without representation is unconstitutional" and the reason for that is it's just plain unfair.

No one is asking that dogs take over the parks completely, but that a FAIR plan be devised to treat all parties and concerns respectfully and equally.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5773	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Millbrae, CA 94030				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	DogEvolve Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits

the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5774	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:24:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We need MORE off-leash areas - not less. GGNRA should honor the agreement under which they are managing the land - not waste our money on creating the plans we do not need. Think about how many people have to spend time fighting this plan which should've never been considered!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5775	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:24:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As both a dog owner and a biologist who works with birds and mammals in San Francisco, I encourage GGNRA to work towards a happy medium between allowing dog owners to have their dogs on GGNRA land while also preserving natural habitats. I fully support on-leash areas for dog owners to walk their pets, while not letting them trample through sensitive habitat. If off-leash areas will exist, perhaps they could be fenced in or surrounded by bushes or other more natural materials. Seeing the				

---

damage that has been done on beaches by hundreds of irresponsible dog owners is upsetting, and I know that many species of birds and mammals have been driven out of these habitats due to off-leash dogs.

I own a Greyhound that must be kept on-leash at all times unless in an enclosed area, due to his propensity for wandering. It's frustrating to responsibly walk him on on-leash trails and come into contact with off-leash dogs and their irresponsible owners. More enforcement of these on-leash areas really is necessary to teach people that the rules DO apply and they must follow them. Without proper enforcement, people will constantly let their dogs off-leash and nothing will really change from the past.

It would be unfortunate for all GGNRA land to be completely closed off to dogs. I encourage a compromise to be found - one that allows responsible, on-leash dog use while still preserving natural habitats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5776    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:25:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have always felt that dogs off leash, even if responsive to vocal control, have been a problem. I have witnessed them chasing shorebirds and approaching stranded marine mammals so many times I can't even count. I am the owner of a small dog who is always on leash and has been rushed up on by larger dogs off leash, which frighten both of us. I think having certain beaches open to on-leash dogs is important and maybe even go so far as to designate a couple of "sacrificial" beaches where they can run off-leash, like Fort Funston, which is already pretty much ruined and heavily used by dog walkers. Perhaps the people who use Funston as part of their dog walking business could have a stipulation in their permits (if they have them) to clean the beach once a month or charge them so somebody can walk that beach and clean it up. It's disgusting with all the poop and poop-filled bags. I'm ok with Funston being a dog beach since I don't go there with my dog. I just would like to see it cleaned up a bit.

I would also like to see some of the trails that allows dogs remain open. I like to hike with my dog and would hate to lose that.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5777    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94402  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Concerned Citizen Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:25:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello,

This comment is made in support of the NPS Draft Dog Management Plan. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and in particular, Supervisor Scott Weiner, are of the opinion that requiring dogs to be on-leash, and under the control of their owners, will result in negative consequences for owners and for San Francisco city parks. Moreover, he believes that should this draft plan be put into place as effective policy, more dogs will end up in shelters and rescue centers. None of these are the case.

I lived and worked in San Francisco for eight years and in a variety of capacities, including twice as a summer seasonal employee for the National Park Service. During those years, when I encountered dogs

and their owners, it was often unclear if either or both were friendly and well-behaved or if the opposite were true. On countless occasions, owners have let dogs contaminate waterways by not picking up feces; have actively ignored posted signs pertaining to presence of endangered species; and have created situations in which both humans and dogs could be injured. When a dog is off-leash, it is unknown to the general public whether the animal will or will not listen to voice commands or if the animal is in fact of a more peaceful demeanor or not. The issue at hand is less about dogs than it is about humans. If dog owners were required to undergo training sessions with their animal and if they clearly understood and abided by the requirements of good behavior, than perhaps, there would be no need for this change of policy nor for laws about such basic things as cleaning up after one's dog.

As for Supervisor Weiner's claims that requiring dogs to be on-leash in GGNRA areas will cause undue stress to San Francisco city parks or that there will be a sudden onset of dogs being brought to shelters, both of these would not be an issue if dog owners actually cared for and were considerate of their city and of their dogs.

Best regards,

Andy Keller

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5778	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am not in favor of any legislation which restricts the off-leash areas for dogs.				

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

â€ When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5779	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:26:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the reduction in leash free space because too many dog owners are irresponsible when it comes to cleaning up their pet waste when they allow their dogs to run leash-free in public areas.				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5780    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Karissa Lilley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5781    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:27:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We want dog friendly beaches and areas to have our dogs off leash. Give tickets to those who don't clean up after their dogs and let us walk dogs off leash. So many rules, no this no that, Stop please. It was great before you guys took over. Sick of you and your rules. How many of you even grew up here, back in the good old days of fires, dogs and surfing so much fun, freedom, it's hard to come by. Thanks, patty

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5782    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:28:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Elena Curnyn

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5783	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	UCSF Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom it May Concern;				

As someone who walks weekly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It horribly restrictive and will prevent San Franciscans from enjoying GGNRA lands in the way we have for many years. Recreation is a public health issue- and having spaces where people can exercise with their dogs encourages exercise, which as we know, greatly improves population health.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Every time I go to one of the parks, I see people and dogs co-existing peacefully. I hope that this will continue to be an available space for exercise, recreation, and nature exploration that it has been for so many years. This is a public health issue, and now is not the time to restrict recreation space for people who exercise with their dogs.

Sincerely,

Nicole Wilson, MPH

University of California San Francisco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5784	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94158 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I STRONGLY oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I STRONGLY oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should NOT BE ALLOWED to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Sandra

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5785    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:31:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner in San Francisco and couldn't be against this idea more! If you surround the areas in fences, it will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Nothing better than allowing you and your dog to run free in these selected areas of San Francisco. I so enjoy meeting and talking to other dog owners. We are happy there which creates a happy vibe which means we treat the areas well! Please don't do this to us ~ we need the wide open spaces for our health and our doggies health!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5786    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:31:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and

---

objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Amanda F Swain and Oliver - 9 year old Aussie mix

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5787	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Santa Clara, CA 95050 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:31:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I am 70 years old and have spent my whole life in the Bay Area. Marin, San Francisco, Redwood City, Palo Alto and Santa Clara.

I have had good dogs my whole life.

When I was a boy in the avenues, I would ride my bike to Ocean Beach with my dog. My dad would take my dog and me fishing. Sacky never left my side

My wife and I took our first yellow lab on our first date in the Marin Headlands. We fell in love.

We love the the Bay Area and the GGNRA.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative.

Most dogs and dog people are good. A few bad eggs should not change the laws.

The NRA says guns don't kill people and will not let us change the gun laws because of a few bad eggs.

Please continue to allow me to walk freely in the wind along the bay and ocean with my wife and dog. We meet a lot of nice people.

John C. Ferguson  
408-985-8134

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5788	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Albany, CA 94706 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:32:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There is nothing, and I mean nothing, more enjoyable to our exceptionally friendly 8 year old Corgi (and few things more enjoyable to us, her people) than cavorting in the surf with a tennis ball at the 'dog approved' area of north Stinson Beach.				

---



She loves to say hello to people and, of course, go get that ball. And it really is the highpoint of her existence. Please, please, please don't take that away from her. And from us.

Let's be reasonable here, shall we? Dogs are a huge part of Bay Area life. Let's not shut them out from all of these grand places.

Thanks,

Josh Lebowitz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5789    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602-3006  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Mrs. Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:34:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We are all responsible dog owners  
We need space for our animals to roam  
While parents of children may go everywhere parents of dogs are being further restricted.  
Please allow us some freedom  
Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5790    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:35:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a bird lover AND a dog lover. Please please please save some places for my dog to run. There are already so few. I am hard pressed to say what thousands of dogs (and their owners) in SF will do without a place like Ft. Funston, where they can run and play.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5791    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:35:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

Since I've been a resident of California & Sausalito I've averaged more 2 visits to the GGNRA per month and our well trained yellow lab comes with us every time. We are incredibly fortunate to live in a place that celebrates responsible human enjoyment of what is, in my opinion, the country's most beautiful coastline. What strikes me as incredible is just how well it works - every time I visit I see dogs & humans enjoying the trails and the natural surroundings without incident. What's been completely absent from any visit ever, is abuse of the trail or others enjoyment by dogs and their owners. To me it speaks to what makes this part of Northern California so great, we celebrate and appreciate what we have and don't take it

for granted. I completely oppose this plan that will not allow off-leash dog walking anywhere in the GGNRA. This plan is sad and irresponsible to the people that enjoy these parks the most - the typical Marin residents that have been bringing their dogs on trails in this area for decades.

I just don't find there is enough specific evidence of negative impact compelling enough to punish us for what has been (to date) completely responsible enjoyment of these parks.

Please don't move forward with the plan.

Sincerely,

Chris & Brisby Dog

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5792	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Vallejo, CA 94590-3027 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Napa-Solano Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:37:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Napa-Solano Audubon Society				

February 18, 2014

Mr. Frank Dean  
General Superintendent, GGNRA,  
Fort Mason Bldg 201,  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Attn: Dog Management

Dear General Superintendent Dean,

I am commenting today on the Dog Management in GGNRA as a member of the Conservation Committee of the 985 member Napa-Solano Audubon Society (NSAS).

NSAS feels the key is the Organic Act, which is the law that created the National Park System: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/16/1>, and the key part of that is "the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. "

Management of all parks must be in accord with the Organic Act, regardless of the Enabling Legislation for a specific park unit (i.e., law that created the park unit) or the management guidance for the type of unit that it is designated as. In other words, everything tiers back to the fundamental conservation mission. That is explained in Management Policies on p. 2 in the underlying principle that states "ensure that conservation will be predominant when there is a conflict between the protection of resources and their use."

As explained in chapter 1 of the Management Policies in your NPS regulations, preserving park resources and values unimpaired is the core or primary responsibility of NPS managers. The Service cannot conduct

or allow activities in parks that would impact park resources and values to a level that would constitute impairment. To comply with this mandate, park managers must determine in writing whether proposed activities in parks would impair natural resources. Park managers must also take action to ensure that ongoing NPS activities do not cause the impairment of park natural resources. In cases of uncertainty as to the impacts of activities on park natural resources, the protection of natural resources will predominate. The Service will reduce such uncertainty by facilitating and building a science-based understanding of park resources and the nature and extent of the impacts involved.

Natural resources will be managed to preserve fundamental physical and biological processes, as well as individual species, features, and plant and animal communities. The Service will not attempt to solely preserve individual species (except threatened or endangered species) or individual natural processes; rather, it will try to maintain all the components and processes of naturally evolving park ecosystems, including the natural abundance, diversity, and genetic and ecological integrity of the plant and animal species native to those ecosystems. Just as all components of a natural system will be recognized as important, natural change will also be recognized as an integral part of the functioning of natural systems. By preserving these components and processes in their natural condition, the Service will prevent resource degradation and therefore avoid any subsequent need for resource restoration. In managing parks to preserve naturally evolving ecosystems, and in accordance with requirements of the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998, the Service will use the findings of science and the analyses of scientifically trained resource specialists in decision-making.

GGNRA has threatened or endangered species for you to protect along its beaches. These animals and plants have no spokesperson to defend their needs. So NSAS feels there should be NO area in the National Park that dogs should be allowed to go off leash to protect them, people, and some other dogs themselves. We are sorry to take such a tough stance on this, but wildlife, especially those rare and endangered species as stated above are in your charter to protect. Dogs and cats have an excellent sense of smell and can find and disturb nesting birds and loafing animals. So do those animals. If they get a whiff that there are predators, they will not use that habitat. It is very unfortunate that these pets have been surrogate children for some of adults that use GGNRA. And it is also irresponsible for those that unleash their dogs in a LEASHED zone. In our opinion they care more about themselves than anyone (wildlife, other people and other dogs). It is very understandable why they want their dog (who of course can do no harm) to go unleashed. However we think they truly do not understand the issue here. Responsible dog owner have alternatives to take their dogs to a place where they are allowed to roam unleashed, not a National Park where they are not allowed. If they want to enjoy this National Park, do it without your dog. It is disturbing to NSAS that the policy on dogs off leash can be made by your administration which would set a precedent to other parks, monuments, etal under the National Park Service jurisdiction.

Perhaps an analogy might work in this case. How many humans would feel comfortable with trained lion or tiger walking around unleashed? Probably NOT. Well, wildlife, certain visitors to the GGNRA, and certain smaller non aggressive dogs would most likely not feel comfortable with dogs roaming unleashed.

How your preferred alternative will be administered and enforced is another matter. Thank you for allowing NSAS to comment on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Robin L. C. Leong

Member of the Napa-Solano Audubon Society Conservation Committee.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5793	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94708				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:39:56**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a lifelong outdoor enthusiast, retired ornithologist, and aspiring 'Master Birder,' I urge you to establish the highest level of protection for birds and other wildlife. The habitats in GGNRA are among the most sensitive and most important for birds. In particular, snowy plover populations are declining in California and elsewhere. As a CA Species of Special Concern, the NPS is will within its authority and is, frankly, duty-bound to afford the highest possible protection for the plovers. Not only will the plovers benefit from strictly limiting access for dogs, rare plants, amphibians, and microhabitats well benefit, too.

The very reason people enjoy GGNRA is the same reason the NPS must protect the high quality of the Area's natural systems from overuse and abuse. Please don't let people 'love this park to death' ie to the detriment of all those elements and beings that make it a rare and exceptional resource. Please be guided by Golden Gate Audubon: "Harassment of birds protected by the Endangered Species Act is against the law (5). It is also inhumane - birds and other wildlife deserve to have space in the GGNRA where they can rest, forage, and live without constant disturbance and fear of death."

I am a dog owner and dog lover. I take my dog hiking in the hills every day. She has plenty of legal off-leash time in safe areas. I obey the law and keep her leashed or out of forbidden areas as required. She and other leashed dogs are perfectly fine following the rules and staying where they belong. It's their people who have a problem - not the dogs. I personally witness the frequency of scofflaw conduct among dog owners on a regular basis. The only way to protect these areas is to keep dogs out entirely. I urge you to protect wildlife and keep dogs out. The dog-fanatical humans are a minority with an oversized, overfunded sense of undeserving entitlement. Don't let them kill the GGNRA.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5794	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94110 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:40:49**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Robert Patrick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5795    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

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

Lastly, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Sincerely,

Justin Rocks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5796    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Leandro, CA 94577  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I take great care to leash my dogs if there are any birds or wildlife around and also pick up any waste my dog might make. I must admit that people are much more destructive and disrespectful of the environment. I picked up quite a lot of garbage on Stinson beach yesterday and the dogs were all well behaved.

Sincerely,  
Barbara DeGaetano

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5797    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:42:02

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We are a senior disabled couple who live in the Mission. Despite the distance and our general disinclination for exercise, one or both of us have walked our dogs off leash at Fort Funston every weekend and holiday from 1989 to 1995 and daily ever since. Our lives have been enriched by the community of friends we have made there - friends from all social, economic and ethnic backgrounds, people we would never have met otherwise. Our dogs have always been active and the too small city dog parks do not afford them or us the opportunity for enough exercise. Our dogs have passed the canine good citizenship test, come when called and served as SF SPCA animal assisted therapy dogs.

1. The City of San Francisco gave this land to the GGNRA "in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment." The enabling legislation specified historic and recreational uses. That's why there's "recreational" in the name. Fort Funston is an urban park and should not be treated like pristine wilderness. It's not as if the GGNRA does not have enough land in its 80,000 acres to maintain historic patterns of use by dog walkers, horse riders and hang-gliders.

2. Fort Funston should not be turned into Asilomar, with fences restricting people to paths, so that only tourists will visit.

3. The preferred plan scapegoats dogs. When you look at the GGNRA's own statistics and consider the hundreds of thousands of dog visits annually at Fort Funston, the number of problem dog incidents is astoundingly low. This should be a case of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" instead of throwing \$2 million at a bogus problem.

4. There is no justification in the proposed plan for such drastic changes -- citing only "potential" conflicts, without any objective site-specific and scientific studies to prove that it's dogs and only dogs that change/harm the habitat. So this is a political decision made by the GGNRA - and political decisions should be made by the people who use the land and pay the salaries of the bureaucrats.

5. Then there's the lack of the required peer-reviewed scientific studies. The GGNRA isn't even following its own rules.

6. As for the monitoring-based management plan: It's like banning all driving because there are a few bad drivers. Cite the people who cause problems, don't punish the victims.

Yes, we oppose the preferred alternative as too restrictive and think that the 1979 dog policy should not be changed. There should also be off-leash access in San Mateo County and any further acquisitions of the GGNRA.

Sheila Mahoney and James B. Frame

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5798	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94703 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The GGNRA Draft EIS is a very well reasoned and balanced document. The GGNRA is striving for a balance - balancing unsustainable recreational practices with the need to create a national park and habitat for wildlife!				

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off lease areas should be marked off with fencing or natural vegetation borders. Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously. Visitors to the park should be limited to a maximum of two dogs per person.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I am a dog owner and would happily follow these rules.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5799	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Woodside, CA 94062 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:43:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I live in Woodside, San Mateo County, and I also spend a lot of time in Bolinas, Marin. I do not own a dog.

I emphatically oppose the proposed further restrictions on the amount of dog-friendly access lands in the Golden Gate National Park.

I don't know if you have had the same feeling that I have had lately, that the world is getting in more and more trouble, in many dimensions. Democrats and Republicans seem to have increasing difficulty in finding means of civil discourse as do so many different factions in our society, be they religious, cultural, class-based, or just the 1% trying to communicate with the 99%.  
Young people seem further and further divorced from nature. Their life experience seems based on what they interact with on a screen rather than what they see and feel and taste and touch in the real world.

And our relationship to the environment is out of balance. Climate change is appalling, and undeniable, and to city dwellers, who have little connection with the land around us, there is a hopeless sense of inability to control this change, a feeling that no individual action can be taken to affect change, to save the planet.

I think that we need to increase our access to nature, to reawaken our sense of connection to nature. I think we should be encouraging more people to have dogs (and cats) because through that connection with animals I believe our sensitivity to the planet, to our place as caretakers of the planet is made vivid and tactile.

It is astounding to me how people with serious philosophical differences will often be brought to a common and very cheerful discourse, when the topic is shared enthusiasms about dogs and cats. This is no small thing.

I realize that there are a number of people from other cultures newly arrived to the US who are afraid of dogs, as their only experience of dogs has been slum dogs, dangerous, untrained, wild creatures. We don't have many of those in the US, but I have seen a number of immigrants who react with fear to the laziest yawn from a Golden Retriever. While wishing to respect people's cultural beliefs and backgrounds, and while I don't believe that everyone needs to have dogs in their lives, none the less I don't believe that the rights of people who are dog-lovers should be restricted.

And children need that animal connection to nature as well. So little of their life is allowed to simply flow, and be a piece of the exploration of nature, in all it's chaotic and busy wildness. The opportunity to take a dog on a walk in the GGNP is a wonderful experience, revitalizing, inspiring, rich.

The number of trails which do not allow dogs on them today, especially in the counties of San Mateo and Marin, is, in my opinion, a crime. I think that the reason for this is that legal advice has been given that if any bad incident occurs of a bad owner who has a badly trained dog in a national park, then it will be the park that will be held liable. Of course the job of lawyers is to advise one on how to mitigate risk. But if you were to follow the most extreme of all legal advice, wouldn't parks be safer with no access for bikes? Or skateboards? Or actually no access for young men (who are the cause of most violent crimes)? Life does involve having some risk. I would far prefer to read a board at the entrance to a park that tells me if anything bad happens to me due to some ill-trained animal, it is not the fault of the park, than lose access to many, if not all of the trails I would have otherwise used with my accompanying dog.



I think it is far more important for our culture that the recreation areas which have been paid for by my tax dollars, are free and open to everyone, including responsible people with their dogs.

And even if the off-leash areas are to be restricted, why on earth must so many trails be designated as NO DOG trails?

I don't own a dog, but I have friends with dogs. There are a number of trails I have never been on, because they are "no dog" trails, and my friends inevitably have their dogs with them. I specifically resent the restrictions on the trail to Bass Lake in lower Point Reyes Natl Park. That trail, by the way, is almost always in use by people with dogs on leash, against regulation.

I'm sorry this is so rambling a note to you, but I am not a great writer. But I do know that so many of our problems today come from our alienation from nature. Restricting access to nature for our dogs is yet another step in the anomie of urban life. Deny this step, please! As the Superintendent, I would think your job success would be measured by the number of hours people spend on the trails, engaged with nature. Don't implement another restriction on those hours, a way which will reduce them further.

Thank you for listening to my thoughts in this matter, Superintendent Dean.

Now I think I'll go take a dog for a walk.

Cheers,  
Sheila Brady

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5800	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hammondsport, NY 14840 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:43:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a member of the GGNPC and the Sierra Club I am disappointed to read that off leash areas will be further reswtricted in the Recreation Area. It seems that the burden should be on the Park Service to explain why restrictons must be imposed after decades of use by dog owners and their companions. When I visit the area beaches in particular, I am always happy to see dogs and their owners enjoying themselves and that is one of the attractions of the area for me.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5801	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Matt O'Connor

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5802	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent Building 201, Ft. Mason San Francisco, CA 94123				

February 18, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Jane Green, and I have been a resident of San Francisco since 1999. Almost every day, I walk with my dog in areas such as Crissy Field and the Embarcadero, as well as other dog parks in the city, because these are wonderful recreational places for individuals, families and their pets to enjoy the beauty of the environment together and help to create a sense of community.

I am writing today to express my strong opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative that would greatly limit where I would be able to walk with my dog in the near future. Additionally, the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed. In addition, I believe that the vast number of people who use these areas for recreation enjoy the fact that individual and families with dogs also populate them, and that the number of people who would seek to restrict or limit these areas to dogs is very small, and not representative of the majority point of view.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years for come. I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off-leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to

believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Jane Green  
50 Lansing Street #703  
San Francisco CA 94105  
jane@jmgcomm.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5803	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:46:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The GGNRA was established to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space," according to its enabling legislation. I am opposed to proposed restrictions on off-leash recreation with dogs in the park, now and at future sites. I will oppose expansion of the GGNRA to new lands if this will mean the exclusion of off-leash use.				

I do not have a dog now, but I walk weekly with friends who have their dogs under voice control. I also visit areas, without a dog, just to enjoy the dogs playing. I frequent Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Mori Point and other areas. The exercise I gain from these walks is not obtainable in the vastly smaller space of my local city parks.

I believe that the National Park Service should honor and formalize the 1979 Pet Policy, a reasonable plan for allowing off-leash recreation in a small portion of the GGNRA.

I am against placing fences and pens on the beautiful land of the GGNRA. This is not necessary and may limit wildlife, as well as marring the views.

I am opposed to the Monitoring Based Management Strategy and in favor of site-specific studies, not general, anecdotally based reports, when it comes to showing the impacts of dogs on the environment.

I disagree with the concept that every area that allows off-leash use also must have no dog areas. This is not feasible or needed.

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

Please allow citizens to use their park for off-leash recreation in the few areas where it has been allowed.

- Michael B. Goldstein

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5804	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:46:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ryan Adams

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5805	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:46:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Catherine

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5806    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123-5172

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:47:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's dog management plan. As a resident of the cow hollow neighborhood with a high-energy needs dog, I rely on big open spaces like Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston to properly exercise my dog. Proper exercise is very important for a dog's health, and my companionship with my dog is an important part of my own pursuit of happiness as a resident of San Francisco. I believe the new plan reduces my right to enjoy living in my city, for reasons that have not been scientifically substantiated or are simply administrative over-reach.

The GGNRA was designed to be a place for urban residents to enjoy nature, these new restrictions are contrary to that charter when considered from the perspective of a resident who finds most enjoyment in experiencing these lands with their canine companion.

I am a responsible dog owner who practices safe voice command. I and others like me should not be punished for the misdeeds of less responsible owners in a large action such as the one under consideration. Fines and fees for irresponsible behavior should be levied at the offending individuals, not the innocent population at large.

Sincerely,

Michael Zimmer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5807    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:49:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5808    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:50:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Off leash dog parks/beaches give dogs and owners happiness and freedom. I have been an SF resident for 10 years and have held such great pride in SF for its off leash dog opportunities. Pls don't take this freedom from the people and their beloved families and animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5809    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:50:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please! Please Please  
San Francisco needs it's public off leash dog walking areas!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5810    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:51:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to support the Preferred alternative, however I would prefer if the alternative include these provisions:

require all off-leash areas be enclosed to protect park users, wildlife and other dogs;  
limit off-leash recreation to areas where it will not have negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats;  
provide more trails that are free of dogs (currently, only 1 trail in San Francisco will be available for those who do not wish to interact with dogs);  
limit dog walkers in the park to 3 dogs and to not permit commercial dog walking; and  
implement compliance-based adaptive management that requires at least 95% o dog walkers to comply with the new regulations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5811    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Letter #1  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jill HEnderson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5812    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:52:39

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Bay Area Resident

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5813    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:52:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to voice my opinion about leashed dogs in San Francisco/Bay Area. There should be no reason to have well-trained dogs off-leash; however, I have been witness to off-leash dogs killing or chasing birds.

One particular instance stands out while at Ocean Beach, San Francisco. While surfing I noticed a cormorant playing on the inside of the breaking waves, which caught the attention of an off-leash Labrador, I think. The dog chased the bird as it bobbed in and out of the water, ultimately, catching the bird. The owner's threats and commands to stop we're futile. After the bird was fetched back to the owner, I showed my disguised, and in response, the owner berated and hit his dog. In the end, the bird died.

Responsible and well-trained dogs should be allowed off-leash but how does one regulate this?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5814    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94209

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:55:08

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off leash areas are essential for dogs - please do not ban off leash play

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5815    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for extending the public comment time so that additional people can weigh in on this issue of such importance to us in the Bay Area.

I am both a dog owner and a supporter of protections for natural environments and wildlife. I am an avid hiker and find hiking with my dogs adds to the enjoyment of the outdoors. I also strongly support having some outdoor recreation areas where no dogs are allowed or they are only allowed on leash but I believe the preferred proposed plan (alternative F) bans dogs in WAY too many areas of the GGNRA.

The Negotiated Rulemaking Committee worked very hard to come up with a plan that had consensus among the many GGNRA stakeholders. Alternative F disregards the majority of the consensus recommendations from the Committee. I support Alternative C as the best alternative for revising the plan. I am strongly opposed to Alternative B which severely limits my ability to participate in GGNRA outdoor recreation.

The GGNRA is over 80,000 acres of precious open space with amazing natural beauty in a densely populated urban area. The preferred proposed plan (alternative F) does not even come close to fairly balancing the needs of people who wish to walk where there are no dogs, the needs of people who wish to share their outing with their dogs and the needs of wildlife/natural resources. It unfairly limits the percentage of areas where people are allowed to take their dogs compared to the other competing needs.

I have seen reliable surveys indicating between 30%-40% of Bay Area families have dogs. Many of these same households have children. And many of these families routinely do outdoor recreational activities together. We are some of the strongest supporters of funding and political support for outdoor recreation. I find it challenging to understand why the GGNRA is proposing a plan that essentially limits my enjoyment of this national treasure so drastically that I would rarely use it. Currently I play in the GGNRA 1-2 times a week, almost always with my dogs. This plan would take away one of my primary outdoor recreation areas.

The GGNRA is unique. It was not created as a National Park like Yosemite where recreation activities, including dog access are extremely regulated. Nor is it in the remote back-country of the Sierra. The GGNRA was created as a "National Recreation Area" rather than a "National Park" with the understanding that the broad recreational uses in place in the 1970's for urban Bay Area residents would be continued. Please keep this promise to Bay Area residents.

Thanks so much.

Kate Clayton

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5816	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94709 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5817	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkely, CA 94710 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Loteria Films Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5818	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 14:58:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Delainya Kazarian

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5819    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94710  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Loteria Films Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most

people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5820	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 14:58:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear National Park Service,				

I am writing to express my displeasure with the proposed plan to prohibit dogs from most of the trails and beaches within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I live near the Oakwood trail. I take my dog, Gilda, for on the Oakwood trail several times a month. I love the fact that this trail is so close to where I live. Gilda gets so excited when I take her to this trail.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my feelings concerning the proposed plan.

Sincerely,

Robert

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5821	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:00:09				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Diane Mibach and Grace

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5822	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san rafael, CA 94912 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:00:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	/Users/marthawalters/Desktop/mrw_ggrna_ltr_final.pdf				

February 17, 2014

Frank Dean, Superintendent  
GGNRA  
Building 102, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 91423

Dear Mr. Dean,

I am writing to you regarding the DSEIS for dog management in the GGNRA.

As you are aware, I have been personally involved in the dog management issue for over twelve years as the chair of the Crissy Field Dog Group. I participated as a member of the Negotiated Rulemaking for Dog Management in the GGNRA and have been one of the few people who have visited all 22 areas under consideration for dog walking in the GGNRA. I am writing to you as a very concerned citizen who has lived in the San Francisco Bay Area for over thirty years.

Just remind you again, this is a recreation area. This is NOT a national park. It was established in 1972 to improve the quality of life in a major urban area, namely the city of San Francisco and its two neighboring counties, Marin to the north and San Mateo, to the south.

The issue of dog management in the GGNRA is not a contest to see what party will outlast the other party but rather should be about a thorough land use process that objectively evaluates the impact of dogs in the GGNRA and creates a viable and workable plan that creates a balance that will accommodate dog walking as originally intended by the GGNRA enabling legislation.

Unfortunately, this newest version of the GGNRA's DSEIS is far from adequate and is unduly restrictive about where dogs and their owners may continue to walk in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo counties. There is no justification to warrant such draconian measures other than to force out dogs and their owners in the long term. It seems like that is what the GGNRA wants to accomplish here. We will never let that happen.

So far, Congresswoman Jackie Speier, San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, the Marin County Board of Supervisors, the President of the San Mateo Board of Supervisors, the San Francisco SPCA, and the Marin Humane Society have expressed concerns opposing the restrictive nature of the GGNRA's preferred alternative and highlighting the GGNRA/NPS need to acknowledge or incorporate many of the public comments that were submitted in the DEIS in 2011.

Around 4700 public comments were submitted for the DEIS in 2011. A forensic accountant took the time to do a count of these comments and found that the people who were in support to retain the status quo of the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy (dogs under voice control in certain areas of Marin and SF counties) plus including the new San Mateo county lands was a clear 3 to 1 majority. We are tired of the GGNRA spin of saying that the dog supporters had a little over fifty per cent support for this issue. That is simply incorrect.

#### The DSEIS - - General Comments

I have read the DSEIS document several times and I will let our NEPA experts convey their specific NEPA concerns on behalf of the Crissy Field Dog Group, and from our present and former attorneys, as articulated in Ashley Miller and Ken Weiners letters. I concur with everything that they have written in their letters. I wish the GGNRA would take NEPA more seriously and produce an objective environmental analysis and follow the letter of the law. To date, that has not happened. In addition, I encourage the NPS/GGNRA to actively engage with relevant stakeholders to create a dog management plan what is workable and reasonable. NEPA encourages this type of dialogue and the NPS/GGNRA has flatly refused to collaborate with relevant stakeholders.

The DSEIS proposes too many restrictions with too little analysis and factual basis. There isn't any reliable scientific data to form a foundation for this plan. These proposed restrictions (only 7 of the 22 areas proposed would allow dog walking access on GGNRA lands in all three counties), in turn, will likely increase user conflict because of the limited remaining space for dog recreation. For example, the proposal to have dogs on leashes at places like Baker Beach or Muir Beach will simply not work and is unrealistic. And there is no factual or scientific basis in closing off leash dog walking at East Beach or the Grassy Airfield at Crissy Field nor at any of the areas under consideration. What dog can you take to the beach and not have them romp and have fun? Dogs and people need socialization for a healthy and happy lifestyle.

This DSEIS is clearly biased against dog walking. According to the 1972 GGNRA enabling legislation, the GGNRA should be protecting one of its core values, recreation. Both the House and Senate reports identify dog walking as a popular recreational activity but the benefits for dog walking are not properly recognized in this document.

When Crissy Field was restored in 2000, one of the purposes was to create more space for off leash

recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. The proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in a smaller area (Central Beach and a small portion of the Grassy Airfield). This makes no sense and is setting up the dog management plan for failure.

Concerns identified from Chapter 2 (Alternatives):

" The GGNRA makes the assumption that there needs to be a no dog experience at all of the 22 areas under consideration for dog walking access. Where and how did the GGNRA make a unilateral rule that mandates such an action?

" The GGNRA manages around 80,000 acres and already less than one per cent of GGNRA lands in all three counties are being considered for dog walking access. People who do not want a dog experience can go to the other areas of GGNRA lands to have a dog free experience.

" Many visitors (including families and seniors) to the GGNRA who do not own dogs actually go to places like Crissy Field so they can enjoy watching dogs having fun. For a variety of reasons, some people cannot afford dog care, are allergic to dogs, or are simply too busy and understand that they do not have the time to take care of a dog but enjoy the opportunity to watch the playful doggies.

" The notion that dogs and their owners and other visitors to the GGNRA are incompatible is erroneous. The GGNRA uses the phrase multiple user groups with a negative connotation as if co-existence does not already occur. It occurs successfully everyday in these specific areas and has for years. A fact to consider: in the year 2012 to 2013, (data I received from a GGNRA staffer) out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs; there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. While I am troubled that these dog-related incidents occurred and want to prevent any type of further dog incidents, I believe that expanding the San Francisco SPCAs Off Leash Open Space dog-training class would help to reduce such dog related incidents in the future. Also, it is my understanding the human incidents rate in the GGNRA for the same time period is much, much higher. This data does not support a need for change to further restrict off leash dog walking.

" The descriptions of places like Upper Fort Mason, Baker Beach, Ft. Miley, and Lands End are identified as low to moderate use but there is absolutely no factual or scientific basis to restrict voice control or off leash in these areas. There are a large percentage of people who use and have used Upper Fort Mason, Baker Beach, Ft. Miley, and Lands End for generations. These are people who live in San Francisco and consider the GGNRA to be their backyard, naturally. The same concept holds true for areas under consideration in Marin and San Mateo counties. Literally, the GGNRA is near or adjacent to peoples backyards.

" Two plant species (Marin dwarf flax and the SF Lessinga) have been identified at Baker Beach and the adjacent high bluffs as an endangered species. Yes, we want to protect them and this could include implementing mitigation measures like appropriate post and cable fencing and appropriate signage. However, the DSEIS omits analysis of the design of the built environment altogether. Again, there is no factual or scientific basis to restrict dogs under voice control at Upper Fort Mason, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Ft. Miley, Lands End, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston or the other areas under consideration in Marin and San Mateo counties.

Real and Significant impacts not addressed in the DSEIS:



The year round special events at Crissy Field present the most significant environmental impact as many as several million people impact this area. It is not the dogs that have a significant impact here; it is the people and the heavily attended events such as Fleet Week, Americas Cup, corporate fundraisers, etc. that have a deeper and lasting impact on the environment. Additionally, the biggest safety concern at Crissy Field is the bicyclists, primarily tourists who blindly run into people along the promenade. The dogs and their owners are not a safety issue- -there isnt any empirical data in the DSEIS that supports that. I am not saying that there arent any situations that need attention, but the DSEIS is so biased against off leash dog walking you would think dogs present a daily hazard, which they do not.

And unfortunately, there were thousands and thousands of fireworks casings (made of cardboard, metal and plastic) that washed up on Baker Beach and Crissy Field as the result of the celebration of the Golden Gate Bridges 75th anniversary. It was the dog walkers who cleaned up this mess at Baker Beach and Crissy Field for several days running.

It would be helpful if the GGNRA would place signs about where people can walk their dogs under the 1979 Pet Policy now so everyone can understand the boundaries. This would also give the US Park Police and NPS Park Rangers an idea about where to enforce or not on GGNRA lands. These immediate possible mitigation measures should be given a chance to work before the GGNRA implements any significant restrictions as are proposed in the DSEIS.

The SDEIS states that dogs harass marine mammals at the beaches. However, the Marine Mammal Center has relied on dog walkers for years to inform them about stranded marine mammals on beaches - - these beneficial aspects of dog walkers should be taken into account in all fairness. The TMMC wrote an email letter to Jane Woodman in 2006 stating this information and is attached for your information. The dog walkers are the first responders when these marine mammals wash up on beaches because of illness or injury and TMMC depends on these sightings so if possible, they can help the distressed marine mammal in a timely manner.

#### Misrepresentation in the DSEIS

Boulder Green Tag Program: The DSEIS reported that the Boulder Green Tag Program wasnt successful and therefore the GGNRA dropped any consideration in pursuing the program as a viable enforcement tool for the GGNRA. Clearly the GGNRA did not do its homework. I personally spoke with the Green Tag Program Director and in fact, the Green Tag Program is highly successful with a compliance rate in the high 80% to low 90%. They have made some recent enhancements to the program to make it more effective - - but in short, it works. This program model would be an excellent model as a clear enforcement program.

Consider Urban Design to accommodate changes for Fort Funston:

The GGNRA should consider innovative structural solutions that were dismissed from the DSEIS entirely for Fort Funston (e.g., vegetative barrier, post and cable fencing). These are concrete ways to manage the protection of natural resources and dog walking at Fort Funston.

#### Workable Solutions

I believe that a workable and reasonable dog management plan would include:

- 1) Maintain the status quo of recreational dog walking areas: the 1979 Pet Policy plus designated off leash areas in San Mateo lands, with additional enforcement and mitigation measures identified here.

- 2) Implement variation of the Boulder Green Tag Program for clear enforcement
- 3) Educational Outreach: partnering with the SF SPCA and Marin Humane Society in developing and expanding an Off Leash Open Space Training Program.
- 4) Mitigation Measures: Vegetative barriers, post and cable fencing to protect plant species, clear signage
- 5) Recreational Roundtable: Community stakeholders who are committed to resolving on-going issues within the GGNRA (public private partnership)

#### Creating a Workable, Representative Plan Based on Public Comment

This is not simply a paper trail process but an opportunity to create a workable plan for the future. You are affecting ordinary citizens whose lives will be greatly affected about their ability to walk their dogs off leash in a responsible manner. This issue was highlighted for me recently when I looked at some older documents relating to this issue and found a resolution from 2006 from some members of the Negotiated Rulemaking committee sent to the Committee facilitators and it struck me that the same issues that we were concerned with in 2006 are still relevant today. Clearly, this failure to incorporate substantive comments into the preferred alternative indicates that NPS/GGNRA is focused on what outcome it wants, not what the public at large is saying. I hope that the GGNRA/NPS really listens to the people who use the GGNRA on a daily basis and incorporates and takes the public's comments seriously.

Crissy Field Dog Group has been collaborating on constructive solutions for many years in the GGNRA. For example, working with SFSPCA and GGNRA, Crissy Field Dog Group helped develop the Off Leash Open Space Training Program. Working with the San Francisco Board Sailing Association and the GGNRA we were part of the building of the dog rinse station at Crissy Field. CFDG has purchased and distributed dog waste bags on a daily basis throughout Crissy Field for many years.

We wish to take this spirit of collaboration into the next phase of this process, so that we may truly work together to develop a workable solution to dog management.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation and protection of important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this critical document.

Martha Walters

**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:01:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please let pet owners have a place to allow our pets to run free and happy. It is important that as long as the world has domesticated dogs, that we treat them the way they were intended to live- running fast and free. We can not do this on streets with cars, in schools with children, at parks with people and kids and food, but we can at Fort Funston.

Taking our dog to Fort Funston has been the best thing not only for our dogs mental and physical health, but it also brings our entire family together. We have 3 teen aged boys who will go with us anytime we offer to bring our dog to the beach. They put on their grubby clothes and we head to the beach. The only other activity that warrants that kind of enthusiasm for a family day out is when we are in the mountains skiing as a family.

Please keep kids close to their families. Please keep dogs running free.

Thank you.  
Linda Spira  
650.703.5253

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5824    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:01:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I visit either Ft Funston or Crissy Field almost everyday. About 95% o visitors to Crissy field and Ft funston are people with dogs or wind surfers. Only on rare bright sunny days are there many other beach visitors. The preferred plan seems not to take into consideration how the parks are currently used. I support less restrictive plan. Leash required in parking lots , the beach adjacent the lot and the promenade to the fort and picnic area makes sense.

I have seen no study that documents the positive effects of these restrictions. I can see major noncompliance and civil disobedience if the principal users of this urban park are restricted for no clear purpose.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5825    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely, Danny castillo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5826    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:02:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is a recreation area within a city. This is not a pristine wilderness. 99% o the GGNRA isn't enough? The main 'argument' of the GGNRA seems to be that 'dogs make birds fly away'. This happens when runners pass birds. This happens when children approach birds. This happens when NPS employees drive past on ATVs. It would be helpful to see ANY numbers that indicate that bird populations have been affected by these dogs- but, after spending 3/4 million USD on the proposal, GGNRA has not been able to provide any compelling evidence against dogs. This proposal is pushed by data from the GGNRA that does not in any way support the proposal. As a middle-school science project, this study would most certainly fail.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5827    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:02:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need these spaces for our dogs. people really do look after the environment, and clean up after our dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5828    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Novato, CA 94949  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:02:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not change the current rules for off leash dog use. Dogs are not a menace to nature and have very little freedom to run in Northern California. The use of places like Muir Beach and Rodeo beach has been a weekly part of our lives for years. I clean up all their waste and leave the nature as we found it unharmed. Imagine all the pent up energy and not being able to run and play. If you change the current rules my dogs who love to swim will be unable to do so. They are hurting no fish and no nature when they swim and cannot see any damage they do to sand on a beach. Incidents of bad dog behavior are very infrequent and most mean dog owners do not bring their animals to places like this.

---

I would even consider paying a fee yearly to be allowed to continue to allow my dogs to run free. Please consider keeping off leash available to the public.

Thanks, Will Shore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5829    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:03:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. I could support an alternative which did not close any areas currently open to dogs but did institute on-leash requirements in all areas. Unfortunately, GGNRA did not include that as an Alternative. (Alternative B is misnamed, because it does eliminate dog access in some areas.)

The changes that GGNRA made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately respond to the concerns expressed by the public in 2011. Recall that public comments in 2011 were 3 to 1 against further restrictions of dog access to GGNRA. Like every branch of the federal government, the NPS has a statutory obligation to heed public views with regard to administration of the resource.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley, the currently dog-legal stretches of the Miwok trail, Crissy Field and Ocean Beach. My use and enjoyment of these areas would be entirely curtailed if I could not take my dog with me. Since dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, I would no longer have any reason to visit or use the Recreation Area. There isn't a compelling reason to eliminate my access to the remaining 1%. GGNRA hasn't conducted peer-reviewed, site-specific studies to prove that the impacts of dogs on the habitat and public enjoyment of the small areas still open to dogs is severe enough to justify such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. I believe such studies are required in an SEIS under the law.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. Unlike wilderness National Parks like Yellowstone or Yosemite, the communities surrounding GGNRA existed within stable boundaries before the creation of GGNRA. Marin residents have relied upon this open space and specific areas for exercising our dogs for decades. As such, GGNRA requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

GGNRA was and is an area preserved for recreation. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. People who wish to visit GGNRA without encountering dogs have vast areas and miles of trail where dogs are already prohibited.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5830    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:03:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I'm disabled with a mobility service dog and this is the only way to exercise my dog while she's not working. Please expand the off leash areas, not limit them. The coyotes are more damaging to the birds than any dog I've ever seen in 20 years of going to Ocean Beach or Chrissy Field. The birds can fly away when anything goes near them. Duh.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5831    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94912  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:04:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** /Users/marthawalters/Desktop/TMMC.doc/Users/marthawalters/Desktop/Issues\_and\_Resolutions.pdf

attachments for my letter

martha walters

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5832    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits

the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote. The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5833	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

William Rompf

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5834	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:05:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I am a proud 16 year resident and dog owner in San Francisco. I live in the Mission but visit Chrissy Field, Ft Mason, Ft Funston and especially Ocean Beach with my dog Annie. She loves being off leash (though under voice control) at these beautiful natural areas, sharing them with my family. We are always very respectful of the natural area (almost every dog owner I see is) and we make sure to keep a close watch around other people. We are also very respectful in places where on-leash is required.

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

Please do NOT restrict off leash access for Annie and other dogs. Nor do we think fenced in areas are the right solution. Of all places in the country, San Francisco Bay Region dog owners are responsible and nature loving people who understand the balance that needs to be kept.

Thank you for looking out for Annie, an important member of my family.

Geoff Garinger

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5835	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
L. Daniels

---



**Correspondence ID:** 5836    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:06:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Yuna Portnoy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5837    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:06:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I visit Fort Funston at least a few times per year with my 4 kids and two dogs. We have limited options in our area to enjoy a beach walk this way and never have seen any issues with dogs are people. I strongly encourage the GGNRA to maintain its current policy regarding dogs and let us continue to enjoy this benefit.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5838    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:07:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 18, 2014

As someone who walks regularly with my dogs in the GGNRA, I write to express my exceedingly strong opposition to the preferred idiotic alternative as described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. Folks who drafted the idiotic alternative clearly are not dog people nor do they appreciate the joys that comes with walking your dogs in nature.

As a resident of San Francisco and a native to the Bay Area, I pay taxes from which GGNRA supposedly utilizes for the upkeep and maintenance of the parks. This includes Crissy Field which is a favorite of my three dogs.

Instead of targeting dogs and their parents (owners), target the children and their parents (owners)! They don't clean up after themselves nor do they respect the boundaries set to protect native plants. Garbage in the plants and/or the ocean/bay are directly attributed to their disregard for the environment. Target the smokers who dump their cigarette butts all over the place! Butts are not environmentally friendly by any means! Target the tourists who have no understanding of the history of each park under GGNRA. In their stupidity, they trample all over native plants. Target the cyclists who speed or barrel down the paths harming the plants on the paths.

Responsible dog parents promote the environment every time they clean up after their dogs. Dogs that run contribute to the joy we feel when in nature. People who have dogs in their homes, are committed to maintaining a healthy environment, inside and outside their homes.

Wise up and back off. Or rather, bark off.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5839	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Jess Clifton

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5840	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica , CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:08:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Patrick Hogan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5841	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94158 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:08:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Just not fair to SF doggies. They need room to run, it's good for there posture and health.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5842	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Los Gatos, CA 95033 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:09:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Laurie Okuno

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5843	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:10:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I just wanted to add to the voices in favor of maintaining off-leash areas for dogs. Please count me as yet another person who thinks eliminating off-leash areas is a mistake and a disservice to the citizens of San Francisco.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5844	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	el cerrito, CA 94530 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:11:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am opposed to the proposed 2014 GGNRA Dog Management Plan (based on the 2011 GGNRA DEIS and the 2013 GGNRA SEIS) for the following reasons:				

1) The GGNRA/NPS is basing this plan on limited anecdotal complaints by biased organizations (GGNPC, etc) and individuals rather than on sound science consisting of site-specific, peer-reviewed studies.

2) By enabling this arbitrary disenfranchisement of a specific class of GGNRA users, the GGNRA/NPS is violating the 1972 Congressional enabling legislation and the mandate to manage the GGNRA lands for public recreation. Repeat; public RECREATION, not conservation, not habitat restoration, not development, just public RECREATION.

GGNRA/NPS appears to be exhibiting a bad case of "mission creep" or "mission slippage" on its substitution of "conservation/habitat restoration" and "park visitor experience" for "recreational park user".

3) By reducing the number of GGNRA users and limiting their "vistor experience" to what is considered a "properly regimented visitor experience" by the elitist GGNRA/NPS, general public emotional attachment to the GGNRA will decline. With declining public emotional support, declining financial support will inevitably follow.

To paraphrase Baba Dioum: In the end we will conserve only what we love; we will love only what what we understand; we will understand the GGNRA lands only by our joy in being in them.

4) If GGNRA/NPS cannot or will not comply with the 1972 enabling legislation and the original 1979

GGNRA Pet Policy (upheld by the 2005 Federal Court decision), it should transfer the lands back to the Forest Service or the Department of Land Management and/or the cities and counties (such as San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin, etc).

I live in the East Bay so it is a special treat for me when I can come and enjoy the GGNRA. I routinely bring foreign or east of the Rockies visitors to the GGNRA, and they all have been awed.

Please maintain inclusive access to the GGNRA lands for public recreation.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5845	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:13:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** The preferred alternative seems to strike the proper balance between dog owners' need to get outside with their dogs, wildlife's and vegetation's need for protection against rampant trampling and defecation by dogs, and the rest of the public's (and other dog owners') need to be protected against unwanted interactions with dogs. Requiring dogs to be leashed does not constrain dogs; it requires dog owners to move along with their dogs, thus enabling both to exercise. Allowing dogs to be off leash, even under voice control, is a prescription for deposition of feces unseen by owners, and thus that remain in place until stepped on by the unwary, even if bags are provided. Even if bags are provided, unless waste receptacles are placed and convenient intervals, bags of feces will be left scattered.

One aspect of the preferred alternative needs improvement: all fire roads should be open to leashed dogs, and there should be at least some trails that provide unbroken linkage between dog-legal trails, making both loops and point-to-point trips feasible. Bags and barrels should be provided at trailheads that either have parking lots or road access.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5846	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:13:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Please, please, please keep the off leash areas as they are today. There are so many dogs in the bay area who love to run free. I love to take my dog to Fort Funston several times a month.

Where are we supposed to go if we loose all these areas?

I really hope we can keep on going to Fort Funston and run around free.

Anne & Indie Rock

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5847	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in the Inner Richmond district in SF, near Mountain Lake Park and the Arguello Gate of Presidio National Park. I walk with my dog (on leash) on the trails of the Presidio every day. I love exploring the trails with her, and typically hike to Baker Beach or Chrissy Field to run off leash on the beach 2 - 3 times per week. About once a week we explore the off leash trails at Fort Funston.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5848	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:14:57**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a father of two young boys living in the city, I get very frustrated by how a city of people is over run by dog owners and dogs who have abused the lack of signage to allow all sized dogs to run free without a leash. Many times a week when one approaches my kids, I am told 'he is friendly'. That doesn't matter to me...maybe my 1 year old isn't friendly because he hasn't spent a lot of time with an 80 lb lab and will poke him in the eye because the dog is pushing his mouth in my sons face; and who knows how friendly that un leashed dog will then be? I have been biten and harassed by all kinds of "friendly" dogs. My wife also enjoys it when off lease large dogs come up and shove their nose in her lap. Imagine if my 3 year old ran up to a women and shoved his head in her lap...pantingâ€..?

I have owned dogs and am fine with them as a part of our city however, dog owners need to see and heed to clear signage as to where they can be off lease. When I lived in Atlanta, there was a huge fenced in dog park in Peidmont Park that both dog and non dog people loved. Everyone knew that is where you go to take your dog off leash. It will take a long time for dog owners to get used to any changes as they feel entitled so some kind of enforcement will unfortunately be required. If I see the proper signage and am trying to enjoy family time in a leashed zone, I will say something to the owner of an off leashed dog but the number of times I have seen owners bring non-service dogs into say a grocery store - which is obviously not allowed - everyone looks the other way. No one likes confrontation and dog owners are very comfortable asking for forgiveness rather than permission. The word I hear dog owners say non stop is - "I'm sorryâ€"

Thank you for understanding a father's perspective.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5849 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:17:22**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence

---

that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Richard Francoz, MD

---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5850	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94611 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:17:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern - I am a dog owner who lives in Oakland but frequently visits San Francisco. We love to take our dog for walks in parks. I really think banning off-leash dogs may be necessary in some cases, but is overkill here. Please reconsider. Thank you.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5851	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:17:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a long-time San Franciscan who is both a former dog owner (dog died last year) and a parent of two young children, as well as an emergency physician who sees the consequences of dog attacks on children, I am writing to voice my strong support for any and all measures to place reasonable limits on dogs in this city. I'm sure many other letters you've received have detailed all the ways in which dogs restrict people's use of public spaces and often prohibit children from safely and freely playing. When children (often 2-4 years old) are attacked by dogs, the resulting lacerations (often on the face) are often large and deep and leave scars; they can lead to serious infections. In the worst case, dog attacks can				

---



be fatal, as happened years ago here in an infamous and gruesome case.

I've lived by Duboce Park, where dogs dominate and children are essentially excluded from the best field in the park (the dog feces scattered everywhere are just one reason for this), and now the Inner Sunset, where the Big Rec Ball Field places limits on dogs: the difference between these two parks is night and day. Dogs still have plenty of play space in GG Park, but having fewer dogs off-leash (some run free because certain owners break the rules) means a totally different experience for people/families/children. I hope we can place similar limits, including as much dog-free space as possible (on-leash rules are often flouted), in all the park space under consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5852    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Vallejo, CA 94591  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:20:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We take our dog Otto to Fort Funston at least once or twice a month and have been going for the past two years. We also take him to Ocean beach. My observation is that the dogs at Funston are well behaved and do not damage the environment. I have never seen dogs harass birds or other wildlife, and the overwhelming majority of people at Funston are meticulous about cleaning up after their dogs. Birds on the beach will move or fly off to a slightly different location if approached by dogs or humans. Feral cats are far more damaging to bird populations in the Bay Area than dogs walking on the beach. Controlling feral cat populations would be a more effective way to help ensure healthy bird populations in the Bay Area.

I thus see no justification whatsoever for banning off leash dogs from Fort Funston or Ocean Beach. It will be a huge loss for dogs and their owners. Without beach access the only area dog owners can let their dogs roam free also places them at grave risk for a large part of the year: The majority of non-beach dog parks I have visited in the Bay Area are heavily overrun with foxtails from the late spring to early autumn months. Allowing dogs to roam free in these environments puts their health and life at risk. A colleague lost her dog due to secondary infections resulting from an inhaled foxtail that punctured the dogs lungs. Our Otto suffered from an infection due to a foxtail that migrated underneath his skin last year.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5853    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Fort Funston, Muir beach and others.

Dogs and their humans need off leash time and deserve to enjoy the beauty our area has to offer. The health of dogs and their humans rely on this. Dogs that are under control cause no problems and laws are already in effect for out of control dogs, so please don't add more restrictions.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. Our tax dollars support these areas too.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. Please don't take this away from us and from my patients.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5854	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi,				

I live one block from the Presidio. I have visited Baker Beach at least twice a week every week for the last 7 years. Every time, my dog Ripley has visited with me. I have been going since I was 25. I'm now 33 and I take my two sons along with my dog with me. Baker Beach, San Francisco, my Dog, and my Family: these are some of the most important things to me. I own a business in San Francisco and employ 8 people who live in San Francisco with their families.

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Thank you,  
-Zach

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5855	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94141 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:20:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a transplant to this area, I am consistley surprised at how difficult it can be to own a dog in a place that is supposed to be so dog-friendly. This is the most beautiful place I've ever lived and all I want to do is take my best buddy with me to enjoy it and to help keep me safe. There are already restriction sufficent to make it more diffucult than I would expect to accomplish this. My dog can't come in most stateparks and our hiking and camping options are severly limited, when I do distance trail running I have to create ridiculously complicated maps to try to stay off access limited trails. Please don't create any additional limitations to where I can bring her.				

---

Every years tens of thousands of dogs are put to sleep becuase they don't have homes. Dog friendly people are working hard to bring this number down, but making it more difficult to own a dog by further restricting the places their owners can bring them, is in direct contradiction to this goal. Please don't make this work harder than it already is, please don't give more reasons why saving a dog isn't worth the trouble.

What I do support in terms of regulation is enforcing the basic rules that are already in place. It seems to me that a lot of restrictions are born out of visitor complaints about people who are not following the rules which are already set. The parks create restrictions as a result and then create furhter restrictions when the rules continue to be broken - skipping the step where the current restrictions are inforced. Typically, people don't like dogs around because of the waste or becuase dogs are not behaving. Waste removal and basic behavior skills are already an expectation but I can't say I've ever seen them inforced. Before we re-draw boundaries and create hardship for people who are just trying to give a full, active life to their k-9 friends, let's work on getting people to follow the rules that already exist.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5856	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sonoma, CA 95476 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:21:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly and urgently support the Preferred Alternative of the Dog Management Plan, because Dogs must be balanced with the wildlife and precious natural resources as well as the many other users of public land.				

I am a native of San Francisco, and I have been visiting the GGNRA lands since before the park was established in 1972. I am an avid walker, cyclist, and beachgoer in both San Francisco and Marin Counties (more recently exploring San Mateo lands) and I remember cycling through the abandoned warehouses of Fort Mason before the Great Meadow, on my way to the Golden Gate Bridge.

Recently, however I have witnessed something like dog anarchy at Crissy Field and at Fort Funston, and seen trails blocked by the professional dog-walkers with packs of a dozen or more dogs. I have seen unsanitary, smelly waste left by a few irresponsible owners.

I even talked with a neighbor who had a dog jump on her back while she was jogging in Fort Funston, only to have the owner blame her for the attack because she was running!

The Regulated Off Leash areas are a fine compromise allowing this use, while regulating pet's impact on nature and people of all ages, genders, and abilities.

Sincerely,  
James Osborne

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5857	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Thank you for soliciting public comment on this important issue.

I am writing because I am both a dog owner and a supporter of protections for natural environments and wildlife. I am a walker, hiker, and cyclist and greatly value my time spent in the outdoors as a way to recharge, refresh, and reduce stress. I value my canine companions for the same reasons and spend many hours per week enjoying the outdoors with them. I greatly appreciate the opportunities currently offered for places to hike with my dogs in the Bay Area, including GGNRA sites, which I utilize about 2X per week. I strongly support having some outdoor recreation areas where no dogs are allowed or they are only allowed on leash, but I believe the preferred proposed plan (alternative F) unnecessarily bans dogs in too many areas of the GGNRA.

The Negotiated Rulemaking Committee worked very hard to come up with a plan that had consensus among the many GGNRA stakeholders. Alternative F disregards the majority of the consensus recommendations from the Committee. I support Alternative C as the best alternative for revising the plan. I am strongly opposed to Alternative B which severely limits my ability to participate in GGNRA outdoor recreation.

The GGNRA is over 80,000 acres of precious open space with amazing natural beauty in a densely populated urban area. The preferred proposed plan (alternative F) does not even come close to fairly balancing the needs of people who wish to walk where there are no dogs, the needs of people who wish to share their outing with their dogs and the needs of wildlife/natural resources. It unfairly limits the percentage of areas where people are allowed to take their dogs compared to the other competing needs.

I have seen reliable surveys indicating between 30%-40% of Bay Area families have dogs. Many of these same households have children. And many of these families routinely do outdoor recreational activities together. We are some of the strongest supporters of funding and political support for outdoor recreation. I find it challenging to understand why the GGNRA is proposing a plan that essentially limits my enjoyment of this national treasure so drastically that I would rarely use it. Currently I play in the GGNRA 1-2 times a week, almost always with my dogs. This plan would take away one of my primary outdoor recreation areas.

The GGNRA is unique. It was not created as a National Park like Yosemite where recreation activities, including dog access are extremely regulated. Nor is it in the remote back-country of the Sierra. The GGNRA was created as a "National Recreation Area" rather than a "National Park" with the understanding that the broad recreational uses in place in the 1970's for urban Bay Area residents would be continued. Please keep this promise to Bay Area residents.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5858	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:22:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

Please clarify the map/poster showing the access route for dog walkers accessing the Sweeney Ridge Trail from the end of Sneath Lane in San Bruno onto SFPUC lands up slope to Sweeney Ridge. The current map shows access for dog walkers beginning at the inner gate at the intersection of the SFPUC service road and the trail at the northerly terminus of the GGNRA parcel number APN 018170010 (latitude 37.6166 longitude -122.4524). This location is approximately 350 yards short of the existing SFPUC gate at the end of Sneath Lane. The map should show access for dog walkers to the Sweeney

---

Ridge Trail beginning at the end of Sneath Lane southwards across SFPUC parcels APN: 093910040 and 093010010 connecting up with the Sweeney Ridge Trail as shown on the existing map/poster.

In addition we request that the GGNRA continue providing facilities (trash cans) at the Sneath Lane Gate and the toilet at the top of the Ridge to receive dog wastes collected by dog walkers.

Many thanks, John Fournet, Community Liaison, SFPUC Natural Resources and Land Management Division  
650-652-3207

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5859	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:23:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Seeing that I am a local Muir Beacher, with a dog, that can't imagine not being free to take our daily beach runs which would not have the same effect if on a leash. How does a dog run freely and swim in the ocean on a leash? I grew up looking forward to the myriad of dogs on Muir Beach. When I did not have a dog, I could always count on MB to fill my doggie needs. It is pure pleasure and joy to watch all shapes and sizes of dogs playing in the sand, running like the wind, jumping the waves. Please keep dogs being dogs on MB. It would be a great loss to the dogs, owners and non dog owners who benefit from seeing these creatures in their glory.  
I am happy to supply doggie poop bags, contribute financially in some way or what ever it takes to keep my pup and all other dogs leash free anytime on Muir Beach.

I think there are more dogs than people in our small community. Muir Beach is a great place, a perfect place, a beautiful place, a safe place to gather our dogs and meet old and new neighbors and friends while the dogs play and get good exercise. I enjoy the exercise I get with my dog too and I don't have to drive to do it. It would be a sin to see dogs banner or put on leashes...i just can't even imagine it so....

Sincerely,  
Denise Landucci

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5860	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:23:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,

there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Melanie Barti  
Sausalito, California

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5861	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Tiburon, CA 94920 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:24:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Henry W Cadle Jr

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5862	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:24:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My family moved to Montara 10 years ago. One of the main reasons we moved here was because of the open space and off leash laws. An "off leash area" on Tamarind St. would be awful. It is close to my childrens' school and would be nothing like walking the trails. please keep the trails open for my dogs and children. allow for off leash areas on the trails.				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5863    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Hayward, CA 94541  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:24:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Actually as a dog owner myself I would feel more comfortable to have my dog on-leash. I have no idea what predatory animals would be out there who may consider making a snack of my Poms. Also as an individual who was personally attacked by an off-leash pit bull, I would strongly recommend providing more areas where I can walk my dog on-leash. Perhaps if there were more areas in the park where dogs were on-leash, it would make it easier to understanding the pet policy, rather than have all of these wishy washy rules. I understanding that the policy as it exists is receiving pressure from off-leash dog owners, but not all dog owners are responsible. Heck I'm getting sick of those who do not pick up after their pets and giving the rest of us a bad name. I also know that the ones who are mostly irresponsible are in the minority, but generally speak the loudest. I implore for more regulations for on-leash laws so I can enjoy the park with my pets responsibly.

The only other option would be to provide enclosed areas for dog owners, but I know that would never be considered a compromise, since it is not something the park service would ever entertain.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5864    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:25:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Since 1978 I have been a daily user of the lands now know as Rancho Corral de Tierra. I have walked my dogs on the Rancho off-leash for 35 years without incident.

I have enjoyed the only means of interacting with my neighbors in the rural community of Montara. It has been our mutual love of our dogs.

We have built bridges into the Rancho; we have picked up trash, cleared trails and placed trash cans at key points on the Rancho. This is where the community meets, where we gather the news of our neighborhood.

I live at the corner of Edison and Tamarind. On any given Sunday I can count 30 to 40 of my neighbors with their dogs pass my house to cross a bridge we built to enter the Rancho. Many of us live in Montara for the benefits of the Rancho which we share. This area has been used by equestrians with dog's off-leash and by hikers with off-leash dogs for decades.

I am writing to urge GGNRA to continue off-leash dog waking in the lower portion of Rancho Corral de Tierra of Montara and El Granada as well as on-leash dog walking in Moss Beach section.

This is our community, our home. We are the eyes and ears of this section of the Rancho. We know these lands better than anyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5865    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:25:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Anita Yip

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5866    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:26:11  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** San Francisco has many dog owners and lovers. The city cannot afford to ban off lease law. Be reasonable!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5867    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** dogsofsf.com Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:28:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've reviewed the GGNRA draft dog management plan, and in particular the 'Preferred Alternative',and I am quite unhappy. I am an environmentalist first, and a dog lover second, but I see absolutely no reason that the two should clash here, let alone to such an extent as to leave the GGNRA a complete loss for dog owners. I am aware there were supposedly changes made to it to make it more palatable to dog owners, but I suspect that they were mostly limited to spelling corrections because it is horrible.

---



Possibly the involved parties are not dog owners or dog lovers, or possibly they all are wealthy and have large yards and easy access to any park in the Bay Area, and all the time in the world to get there. (I know which I suspect to be the case.) But these changes would literally change the lives of thousands of dog owners in significant, perhaps even dramatic, ways. Many of them might even have to get rid of their dogs entirely. And if you don't care about that, you really do have no dog owners of any kind on your committees, and your members have entirely lost touch with any shreds of empathy you might once have possessed.

Even those who won't have to get rid of their dogs will lose a very valuable resource, one for which there is simply no other alternative anywhere in San Francisco. Nor, for those who live in the city and work long hours, or don't have a car, is there any credible replacement for it outside the city.

And to cause that kind of unhappiness to people, for the skimpiest of reasons, and on absolutely no evidence that it will significantly impact the environment? I can't help but wonder what the actual motivation for these changes are, because it is clearly not what is put forth in the official document. Do most of the decision-makers in this case simply hate dogs, and wish to see less of them? Is there some kind of back-office deal going on here, some kind of money to be made off of this prohibition? Are you simply irrationally terrified of a lawsuit? (Thus proving the old notion that humans are HORRIBLE at risk analysis... did you know that many schools spend an order of magnitude more on preventing lawsuits than they could reasonably be expected to ever be sued for without such preventative measures, even if they were in the top 5% most sued schools in the country?) Or possibly you are simply operating on the gut instinct of some people that this will do something helpful for the environment, without studying it? In which case need I remind you that 'gut instinct' environmentalism is no more reliable than 'gut instinct' risk analysis?

I wish I could understand. Because it looks like you guys do not give the faintest hint of a shit about what the public thinks. It is obvious you will go ahead with this despite all the public outcry. You will damage people's lives simply because you have the power to do so, and because nobody has the power to stop you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5868	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:29:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jason Root

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5869	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:29:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sam

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5870	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Burgess

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5871	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, VT 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:31:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Burgess

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5872	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:32:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any

compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5873	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco Bay Area, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:32:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

Stop the madness and this terribly unfair proposed restrictions!

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Heidi Youn

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5874	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Richmond, CA 94805 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:32:35				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have two dogs of my own who love to play outside. Having areas for dogs offleash means that not only do I get to enjoy my walks but so do my dogs. They get to socialize which also keeps dogs from getting violent.				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5875    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:33:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Dog Management Plan.

Please keep adequate areas for off-leash dogs and their owners.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5876    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Richmond, CA 94805  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:34:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Having offleash dog areas is great for me and for my dogs to socialize. It gives us the ability to get away from home with the dogs and not have to have them attached to our sides at every single moment.  
Dont reduce the offleash dog friendly areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5877    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:34:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I must implore you to cancel all drafted plans to change the off-leash dog parks to a leash required dog park. As more and more urban development takes place in our community, the only area where a dog can be a dog are at these off-leash dog parks. I do not pay taxes to the state in order for me not to enjoy a national park. It is already difficult to find hiking trails where dogs are allowed off-leash. I am especially bias towards fort funston as that is the closest and biggest dog park around. It is where I take my two dogs to enjoy the sun and other dogs. As a parent would fight for their right for their children to go to school, I fight for my right to have my dogs go to dog parks. It is unnecessary to spend this kind of money trying to enforce an leash required dog park. I understand that we are trying to preserve the natural state of the park, but no one tried to preserve its natural state when we were placing military defenses at both forts. It does not make sense and is a double standard.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5878    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I will be especially upset if Muir Beach, a Beach I have taken my dogs to for the last 30 years, will be confined to leashes.

Sincerely,  
Earl Burgess

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5879	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose, CA 95132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. It is restricting dogs and their owners from something they have enjoyed for centuries. A man or woman with their best friend (their canine) should not be restricted from their pursuit of happiness: the ability to enjoy life with one another. Whether it be playing fetch or going on walks, it is ultimately necessary and just simply cruel to restrict pets and their owners from doing so. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Yip

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5880    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I will be especially upset if Muir Beach, a Beach I have taken my dogs to for the last 30 years, will be confined to leashes.

Sincerely,  
Sandra Grant Burgess

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5881    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:37:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please DO NOT reduce dog play areas in SF!!! Our animals need space to run and play.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5882    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Chicago, IL 60601  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dogs and people need space. Let 'em roam.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5883    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Mike Lazarus

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5884    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I come from a state that has many off leash areas for dog walking (New Mexico) and I was so pleased to find off leash areas in San Francisco when I moved here. I regularly walk my dog in the GGNRA, and I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. My dog is very sweet but gets incredibly nervous when on a leash. Furthermore, it is important that she (and I) get enough exercise, which can be very difficult since I can work long hours. Fenced in areas never allow for enough exercise, for either me or my pup. Fort Funston and a few of the other off leash areas in San Mateo county are the only places I have found to serve my, and my pup's, needs.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Mantissa Johnston

A tax paying, national park loving, citizen of San Mateo county

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5885    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Oakland, CA 94607  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:39:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a regular volunteer who not only enjoys working nearly 200 hours a year restoring and enhancing natural areas of the Presidio, I'm also a frequent user of the park, I inline skate, hike, bike and often simply sit in peace and quiet, watching and listening to the beauty around me. All of the activities listed above, including the volunteering, have been disturbed, interrupted, and or threatened by unleashed domestic pets on countless occasions. While many poorly trained, leashed pets are just as bad, at least they are somewhat constrained.

Aside from harrasing humans and leashed dogs, I have observed uncontrolled pets chasing birds, running through and pooping in naturally sensitive areas, digging for gophers and voles in erosion vunerable trail banks, attacking ducks at El Polin, and herons, seagulls, and numerous shorebirds at Crissy field as well as on the beaches. I once saw a large dog get dangerously close to a great blue heron at Ft Scott, ending the magnificent bird's patient and graceful hunt for a meal.

No dog owner, lover, or walker can guarantee the good behavior of all off leash pets, let alone their own. I strongly support the dog management plan as proposed by the National Park Service. Please adopt it as is.

Andrew Morrison

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5886 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael , CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:39:36

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please reconsider the off-leash prohibition on our national parks and beaches. I have two service dogs which I take to Crissy Field and Stinson beach daily. These places give my dogs and myself pure bliss and fun. I suffer from fibromyalgia and anxiety. These areas allow my dogs to get the proper exercise they need to fulfill their happy yet short lives. I am a responsible dog owner. I pick up after them, make sure they don't chase the birds or disturb wildlife and fauna and that they respect other people and dogs. I moved back to California three years ago from Jackson Hole Wyoming. I loved it there but many of those parks did not allow dogs. I have found absolute solitude and happiness from the Golden Gate park system because the dogs are allowed in certain areas. I have discovered at lease 100 trails in Marin and SF counties that dogs can roam. This area is most definitely the most dog friendliest of all counties and states. That is something to be very proud. Please don't take away our off leash privileges. There will be way too many unhappy dogs and owners. If anything, set up a reform on off leash laws not take away it all together, please!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5887 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94601  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:39:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Cathleen Valentine

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5888	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:42:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Sohn  
Mom to Caleb, 8 and Livia, 4, who love to walk their dog, Lola in the GGNRA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5889	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:43:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As senior resident of San Francisco who is also a devoted dog owner who uses the GGNRA parks several times a week to exercise my dog responsibly, I am insulted by this attempt to impose these restrictions on my freedom and enjoyment of these areas that have traditionally been used by thousands for this purpose. I would venture that 98% of the dog-accompanied visitors to these parks are at least as responsibly behaved as are any visitors to any parks. A much less drastic solution is needed to address any real problems the NRGGA is experience that avoids needlessly punishing the vast majority.

As a taxpayer, I am appalled by this study and its recommendation. The NPS and GGNRA administration have been pouring resources (my tax dollars) into pushing their patently inappropriate agenda for this urban recreation area and they have been doing this for well over 10 years. I only wish the same money had been spent on efforts improving the paved areas in Fort Funston, for just one example. Who knows, Fort Funston could have become more widely ADA accessible, although I do see many physically challenged people enjoying the paths along with their pets off-leash in spite of the poor state of repair the GGNRA maintains. I think that speaks to the appeal the current use that this resource offers everyone who chooses to avail themselves of the pleasures of sharing open spaces with well-behaved dogs.

As a taxpayer, I am also appalled to think that in over two years, all the proposal writing team could manage to provide in this "updated copy", was several more pounds of pages pushing their last recommendation, often with irrelevant or imprecise detail, while failing to document or even to acknowledge appropriately the many opposing points of view voiced since the last go around. What are we paying you guys for? You need to think a little more about what the "S" in NPS stands for and a little less on having every property you manage fit in the same tidy little rule box when you set the management goals for anywhere and, most especially, for the GGNRA.

As a consulting and business professional who has developed many proposals and project justifications, I am appalled by the very approach taken to creating the proposal. Starting with narrowness of the focus of and options considered all the way through to the shallowness of research supporting either the motivation for the "project" or the efficacy of the proposed changes, how can one take this document seriously? I would be embarrassed to present such a document to any client or executive management team; I expect that I would not have been given a second chance.

Consider, for example, the motivations as stated in the document for needing to take action. Basically it says the very differences for which GGNRA was formed cant really work anymore if it doesn't fit in the mold for NPS rules in general. It also states that sometimes problems occur in these GGNRA areas.

As to the first motivation, why not acknowledge the existing anomaly in the NPS governing rules and be done with that motivating issue?

In terms of the incidents that sometimes occur, the sparse documentation provided vis- -vis the incidents reports in the document imply less than one dog-related incident per 20,000 to 30,000 visits. Not bad. People dont behave that well in shopping malls. As to the environmental issues, the case for any serious consequences has not been made. Concessions in use by dog walkers for environmental considerations have already been made and, I am sure more would be made with compelling education. The time spent counting occasional bird chasing by certain dogs would be better spent making attractive national park quality signs that could educate visitors on why they should discourage such activities? Sadly many of our visitors remain undereducated in this regard and the NPS is doing virtually nothing about it other than pushing to ban responsible dog access drastically. Does this really serve NPS goals?

As to the stated purpose of the GGNRA, I think it fine as is written. The problem with the proposal,

which starts with a "solution" and then strives to justify a need (which it fails to do) is that the proposal also fails to recognize that national park experience is only a small part of that mission statement. More time needs to be spent rereading the second part of the statement and incorporating the servicing of those objectives in any plan.

In the document's stated objectives, I see much more of an objective to push consistent and narrow policies and much less of an objective to provide service in the form of access to local residents as they have chosen to use it traditionally. Is that service to the GGNRA users by the NPS? No one disputes how dog use has grown at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and other places over the past decade. This speaks exactly to the popularity of its current use and to the necessity our residents have for this traditional use. The objectives, as stated, sound more representative of an inward looking bureaucracy than like a customer facing service organization. Even as the document examines the various properties under GGNRA management and the alternatives, it is a complete cookie cutter approach of presenting the same options and same ultimate restrictions across the board. Even within the GGNRA, these are vastly different parcels in each way. Meet the dog people enthusiastically by renaming the big three to be National Dog Parks, and you may find less resistance in areas where your case for change may be more compelling. Sadly, your objectives don't even begin to show any desire to meet in the middle. Perhaps, this same inflexibility is reflected by those opposing the plan. Have you considered leading toward compromise by example?

I have only begun to address my concerns with the document but I don't think it really warrants such an effort. What is needed is a complete reexamination of why the GGNRA was formed, what service it provides to its current users, and what can be done to improve their experience while addressing some of the inherent problems that you perceive. Yelling Stop may be the easiest solution, but it is neither the best nor the most enforceable.

I suggest shelving the current document in its entirety rather than spending a few more years and who knows how many dollars trying to revise a fatally flawed premise and document. Start by revisiting the origins of the GGNRA and the 1979 use documents and then try to move forward on accomplishing conservation and administrative objectives appropriate to the GGNRA charter using baby steps. Recognize the lands that you manage are each unique in their geography, use, and importance for conservationist protections and stop beating a dead horse in the name of uniform policies. Improve education of your visitors. Sell them on the worthiness of those goals dearest to you and your visitors will try to help you accomplish them. Yell Stop without respecting current use and your visitors will fight you forever. Please be reasonable and try to lead by example.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5890	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:45:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Do not understand why GGNRA would want to do this. Walking dogs off leash is what makes these outdoor spaces appealing!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5891	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Moraga, CA 94556 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:45:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern-

Regarding the proposed GGNRA ban on off-leash areas for dogs, I am strongly against this ban. Furthermore, I consider this issue a relatively high priority for my own family since we regularly take advantage of these areas with our dogs, and my voting preferences will reflect this.

The bay area is world-renowned for the many things it has to offer, not least among which are the many natural areas set aside for preservation and shared use. Many people frequently make use of these areas. Also, nearly 50% of homes in San Francisco have dogs, and the areas set aside for off-leash use are an important part of what makes this possible. In taking this away you would effectively be reducing the value of these areas to a large percentage of the population. If you want to maintain a world-class standard of living, you must attempt to provide world-class resources to the people who live there. This includes providing a variety of opportunities for dog owners to make use of natural areas.

As any dog owner will tell you, there are many protected areas where dogs must remain leashed or are banned altogether. In fact it is already quite difficult to find nearby opportunities for off-leash walking in most places. Further reduction of these areas will cause suffering for both dog owners and dogs and are unnecessary. Raising healthy dogs requires giving them opportunities to roam and explore in a natural fashion.

Please do not let short-sighted politics erode the value of our beautiful bay area. Please continue to allow dog owners the opportunity to have these areas where they can let their pets off leash.

Thank you,  
/Stefan Amshey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5892    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:45:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live in San Francisco (the northern section of Western Addition) and I am a proud and frequent visitor and supporter of the GGNRA. I am providing a view that takes into account both, my visits without my dog (only with my family) and also now with our young dog that responds very well to voice commands. I am quite disappointed to learn of the restrictive nature of the new dog management plan being considered by the GGNRA that restricts off-leash areas, and strongly wish to voice my opposition to this preferred alternative plan described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

This plan does not take into account the numerous concerns of the San Francisco public who have submitted their feedback and will also prevent me from taking part in the various benefits that the GGNRA offers and is intended to provide. I also oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel restrictive, and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like some current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing problems for other dogs under voice command, and for others in general.

The most recent data (2012-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have been very few negative incidents involving dogs as

compared to the many more reported negative incidents involving people. This data therefore does not support the request or the need for a change as proposed in the draft dog management plan.

Crissy Field was created, to also create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. Congressional reports referred to dog walking specifically as one of the uses for the space when the GGNRA was created. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a change of course without much basis. Furthermore the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes little sense and I would urge you to reconsider.

The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I used to also frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command, less now, because they are too crowded, my dog feels more tense, there's not enough room to exercise, and they cause more stress to both me and my dog, rather than relaxation.

Instead of having a bold inclusive vision plan for dog walking, this management plan allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash). I also notice that, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I urge the GGNRA to reconsider implementing this restrictive draft dog management plan and instead take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come. Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,  
Sanj Madan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5893	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear National Park Service,				

I strongly oppose the dog management plan for many reasons. These off-leash areas are critical for the health and welfare of San Francisco dogs and citizens. As a taxpaying citizen of Cow Hollow who chose to live to San Francisco in part due to its dog-friendliness, I feel that the proposed legislation is damaging and unfair, and will be an expensive endeavor that the residents of the Bay Area DO NOT WANT and SHOULD NOT HAVE to pay for. A few facts to support my belief that the proposed changes are entirely unnecessary:

1. I am concerned because the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not

support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for \$2,000,000 for more rangers.

2. When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Again, for these and a multitude of other reasons, this legislation is a waste of time & money, and will prevent dogs from getting the essential exercise and interaction needed for them to continue to live happily in the San Francisco area. As a taxpayer, it is unacceptable that these essential areas that are enjoyed by the masses could be negatively impacted by the complaints of a few. The complaints are unwarranted and it would be unfair to penalize hundreds of thousands of people because of the personal biases of a few.

Thank you,  
Anne Schnobrich

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5894	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fairfax, CA 94930 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:49:15				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kim Burggraf

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5895	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte Madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:52:17**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about proposed reductions in off-leash accessible areas in the GGNRA.

These proposals ignore the interests of the community. There are more dogs than children in San Francisco. For many pet owners, their animals are an integral part of their family. Excluding dogs from access thus excludes their owners as well.

Please protect off leash access in the GGNRA!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5896 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:52:27**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** You know, everything really is fine the way it is, in regards to dogs, children and adults enjoying open spaces together. Of course you will get individual dog haters and their personal unfounded fears of violence and dirt that they project onto dogs and their owners, but the vast majority do not have any complaint, and you won't hear from them. Please, this is an urban area, and National Park policy that is appropriate for remote full parks is not necessarily a good match for the Bay Area. There is plenty of room, and we all need open and free space to enjoy, dog lovers included. To deny this is hostile to the freedoms and liberties we are supposed to have in this country. Please, do the right thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5897 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:54:19**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I am highly opposed to the effort put forth by the GGNRA to limit off-leash dog areas in San Francisco, specifically areas such as Fort Funston and Crissy Field and other parkland areas. In the case of Fort Funston, almost 100% of visitors to this beach are dog owners with their dogs. It seems that it would cost the Par Service much more money to enforce such restrictions than it would to keep this service intact as is. Where are dog owners supposed to go? There are nearly 100,000 dogs in a city that already has limited space.

We demand that the GGNRA provides a factual report before any legislation is passed.

thank you for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5898 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form



**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for all too few years - since my dog is now only 2 years old. I had hoped to have been able to walk him on-leash and play fetch with him in appropriate areas of Golden Gate Park, Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Mori Point for years to come.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

There are lots of dog owners in the Bay Area who count on these locations to safely exercise their dogs (and themselves.) These places are where we have adventures with our dogs, meet new friends (both canine and human) and enjoy the bond of sharing nature together. If the only places left for us are over-crowded dog parks, so much of the joy of dog ownership will be taken from both dog and owner, because both dogs and humans need exercise and the joy of variety of experience for health and happiness. Please keep to your original purpose of taking care of those of who want and need recreation with our "best friends."

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5899	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Alison Zampino

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5900    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94113  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:56:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider this. Fetch and dogs go hand in hand. This needs to be allowed in certain places.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5901    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:57:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm concerned about the GGNRA plan to severely limit where dogs, and their people, can exercise within the park. The title of the park itself states that it is a recreation area, and I don't understand why a park that contains major highways and dozens, if not hundreds of buildings, is considered too pristine to accommodate dogs. San Francisco donated land to the park with the understanding that it would remain a recreational area. If the restrictive GGNRA dog management rules are enacted, San Francisco's parks will be flooded with all the people and dogs that currently use GGNRA areas. Also, there are only a limited number of rangers available whose time could be better spent on more serious matters. This dog management plan is going to put the park in conflict with a significant number of people who they are supposed to be serving, resulting in bad publicity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5902    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94133  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:57:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to implore you not to cancel all off-leash accommodations in San Francisco. I am aware of the not-so-proud tradition of city agencies bowing to the whim of each and every loud group of malcontents that approaches with a complaint, but in this case, please recall that this city has more pet dogs and more public parkland than any city in the union. This is one issue where the wheels that is squeaking has no bearing on the actual state of the wagon . Please do the right thing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5903    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:57:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA,

---

I am totally against your dog management plan. You are heading in the wrong direction. More areas of the park should be open to dogs off leash - not fewer. Walking in nature with an unleashed dog at your side is one of the most natural activities that humans can do. We should be encouraging this activity - not putting ever more restrictions on it.

Of course there are some unruly humans with uncontrollable and even dangerous dogs. But laws already exist to deal with these idiots and their stupid dogs. Why should a few of these morons ruin a beautiful natural activity for the rest of us?

The vast majority of GGNRA users and their dogs are well behaved. In 9 years of using the park (usually the Rodeo area) on a weekly basis, I have NEVER had a bad experience with any dog or human.

Let's face it, the NPS is full of people that hate dogs. Many of them hate humans too (although someone at GGNRA sure loves the Ghilotti Brothers). It seems that the Park Service is all about law enforcement these days.

Please do not criminalize one of the most basic human instincts - to walk in nature with our canine friends (unleashed).

Thank you.

Joseph Hughes

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5904	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:58:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It's incredibly important for us to have an area where our dog can be off leash. When living in a city like San Francisco there are few areas where our dog ran cut loose and run around and enjoy himself. It's vital to their well being that these places stay off-leash.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5905	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 15:59:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello,				

---

I would like to voice my strong support of the proposals to limit the off-leash areas for dogs in the GGNRA. I am an animal lover, however, I feel the area is completely overrun by dogs and is negatively impacting the area. I am an avid runner and have had several incidents with dogs including being chased, scratched, and nearly bitten on three different occasions. This has happened along crissy field, baker beach, batteries to bluffs, and throughout the presidio. The reactions from these dog owners has varied from apologetic, to laughing, to outright hostile and confrontational. The last being an incident involving a young man with a large male pit bull off- leash which I reported to the park police. The situation has become so bad that I have resorted to carrying dog spray while running. Although these incidents have

been rare, they have the capability of resulting in grave bodily harm or even death.

This land is for the use and enjoyment of people first and foremost and there is no reason that dog owners cannot leash their animals for the protection and respect of others. This is a major public safety issue as there are several incidents throughout the year. I strongly support the entire area being leash only, with a few specific fenced areas where dogs can run off leash.

Thank you for the time,

Kavan Manson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5906    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:59:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why fix what's not broken. There is diversity of options in the Bay Area. I moved to Muir Beach for that diversity and now that is being threatened to be taken away.

Please respect the request for diversity!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5907    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 15:59:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Do to become like Los Angeles. Dog friendly beaches is why we moved here.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5908    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:00:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please save the off leash areas! It's so important to a happy healthy city. A

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5909    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:00:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose this bill!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5910    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Resident Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.  
The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.  
Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5911    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:02:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Elly Gibbs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5912    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:03:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not take away the biggest off-leash dog walking area near to my home. The few remaining off-leash parks are going to be severely impacted by the large dogs that need space to run on a daily basis. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area covers a lot of territory across several

counties. It seems unfair and arbitrary to prevent dog owners from walking their dogs without a leash on so much public land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5913    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Emerald Hills, CA 94062  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:03:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My wife is a physician at Stanford medical center and has limited time off from work. Taking our dog to Fort Funston is our main weekend activity when she is able to, and we strongly oppose any plan to reduce off-leash access, or access in general, for dogs in areas in and around SF. The off-leash dogs at Fort Funston make it a special place that we share with our friends and family and it is central part of our recreational activities in the bay area.

There is no justification for major changes proposed by the dog management plan. Adding fences will just make the parks feel like the tiny terrible dog parks we experienced while living in New York City and are a completely different experience than what we are able to enjoy now. We moved to the bay area to be able to enjoy the outdoors and go out of our way to do so with our pet. We oppose the monitoring-based strategy in the dog management plan. Just because some people are not complying with leash restrictions does not mean the GGNRA should be able to change policy and ruin it for everyone.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5914    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941-2103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Yosemite Conservancy Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:06:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA Dog Management Plan

This is certainly an exhaustive (maybe exhausting!) study and I congratulate you on your efforts. My dogs and I are only affected by a small portion of it: Rodeo Beach and surrounding trails, and on occasion Oakwood Valley. So I'll limit my comments to those areas.

I'm not sure of the distinction between off-leash under voice control and ROLA. They sound very similar, so I'll treat them as such. The present red status of Rodeo Beach (6-A) is fine with me and fellow dog owners. Your preference (6-F), changing the red area to yellow, seems okay, although the yellow ends before South Rodeo Beach. Does colorless mean no designation, so off-leash is permissible? Similarly, the cliff trail to the north of Rodeo Beach that I walk with the dogs every morning - usually entirely on our own - has no color or text designation. I hope it remains that way.

I can't see any reason to change the Old Bunker Fire Road from off-leash to leash required. It is closed to traffic, except for bicycles, and they are a rarity, particularly at the time we hike. So I prefer 7-A or even better 7-B or 7-D, to your preferred 7-F. As far as I know, it ain't broke so why fix it? Similarly I don't understand why the Batteries Loop Trail is designated on-leash, considering how few people use it, at least in the morning when we climb up from the beach to wander round the loop.

On to Oakwood Valley. We walked it over the weekend, meeting a number of friendly people with off-leash dogs. Your preferred Map 4-F has a ROLA color bar under Alternative F, but there is no ROLA marked on the map. Just an On Leash on the Fire Road section to the juncture with the Oakwood Valley Trail, which has no color-coded designation. I don't understand why the wider fire road should not be a ROLA. I've walked there for many years and people seem to get along just fine with off leash dogs. So my preference here would be 4-E.

In closing, I would like to add that while walking the dogs on Rodeo Beach and the trails I also pick up garbage. Probably tons of it over the past decade, including items that other dog owners have overlooked. It's my way of thanking nature for its beauty, and making life more pleasant for visitors and wildlife. We couldn't be more fortunate.

Cheers!

Martin Russell  
Mill Valley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5915	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:06:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

I request that you do not go forward with these new dog leash laws.

I am a gay male with no children. My dogs are my children and my immediate family. My family and I have spent countless hours at Fort Funston and Chrissy Field enjoying the outdoors and exercise that off leash activities allow. This update to your leash laws will without a doubt reduce my quality of life.

I do not get a federal tax credit for my dogs as people with children do. I do pay additional property taxes for the local schools that I send no children to. This is an insult from my government to even be considering this update to the laws when my tax monies are being used, yet do not address my needs.

Let me remind you that the GGNRA is not a National Park, but a recreation area. Therefore, the correct thing for you to do is to take the local citizens recreational needs into greater consideration than the other priorities that the environmental groups are touting.

I am a member of the Sierra Club and have environmental concerns. I would support limiting access in certain areas to allow endangered species to flourish if that was the case. But to close down 90% of the current space is an over-reach of the needs of wildlife over the needs of citizens.

Please consider my my family when making your decisions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5916	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94608-1466 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

P.S. PLEASE SAVE OUR DOGS! THIS WOULD BE DEVASTATING FOR OUR DOGS AND OUR COMMUNITY!!! Keep San Francisco a beautiful, enjoyable place for all creatures!

Sincerely,

Christina McNeill

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5917 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:07:06**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:**

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

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5918 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:07:13**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Personally, I would hate to lose the beach access my dogs go gaga for (Stinson and Muir Beaches). Fort Funston, Chrissy Field and others are also due for restrictions.

---



---

**Correspondence ID:** 5919    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:08:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please save off leash areas- they are part of the culture and history of this beautiful city and are absolutely necessary for us to maintain a healthy life for our pets in the city. I am an urban planner living in San Francisco with a small dog and I do NOT support the ban on off-leash parks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5920    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94608-1466  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:08:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Peter Brechler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5921    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:10:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

---

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Josh Wills

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5922	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:12:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Superintendant Dean,				

Please keep Ft. Funston and off leash experience for our dogs and people. We need this area and have always relied on its beauty and openness for an amazing day out with our dogs and emotional well being. We have all worked together as owners and handlers to make Ft. Funston an ALL INCLUSIVE place to go!

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

Taking Ft. Funston away from us as dog owners would mean squeezing hundreds more dogs into city parks which has already shown to create stress for the dogs and owners resulting in more fights between dogs AND owners because of confined space and lack of room to run and be free.

I don't want to have to tell my dogs that they no longer can go to Ft. Funston and run because it has been part of their daily routine now for 12 and 14 years!

PLEASE KEEP FUNSTON OPEN TO DOGS OFF LEASH!

Thank you!

Steve Baechtle  
San Francisco resident for 26 years

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5923	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:13:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** i have written detailed comments related to ggnra dog policy multiple times in the past and have attended numerous informational meetings, etc. you can cross reference those carefully considered and written documents for my point of view on off leash dog policy within the ggnra. i am finally profoundly disappointed in the ggnra leadership team. there are numerous successful models available for developing respectful consensus between stakeholders. san francisco dep't of public works facilitated such a process in the run up to the refurbishment of sigmund stern grove. after a series of public meetings which spanned approximately two years, a respectful plan was developed and all stakeholders signed off. over 10 years later, that plan continues to be adhered to with excellent, measurable results. the lake has been restored to health as witnessed by the presence of year round and migratory birds and other wildlife, the day camp functions in peaceful co-existence and interaction with those enjoying the off leash dog areas. the theater area continues to boast a healthy, ecologically sound infrastructure. native plant advocates (including n.a.p.), children's advocates (inc. coleman's), wildlife advocates (inc. sierra club and audobon), dog advocates (inc. sf dog and sigmund stern dog) and the citizens of s.f. have successfully cooperated in creating and maintaining a valuable urban outdoor resource. off leash dogs are allowed in significant portions, with linking off leash trails, of sigmund stern grove.

if san francisco, a city which is known for its contentious, passionate, activist citizenry can succeed in respectfully adapting and nurturing collaborative change the ggnra leadership should be able to do the same. i am appalled at the ongoing lack of respect shown for all stakeholders by an apparently incompetent leadership team. i am using trust as a measure of competency. it would seem that no stakeholder group has evolved trust in the ggnra leadership during the prolonged planning process. i respectfully suggest that a new leadership team be assigned to this project. that team needs to confer with local leaders, who are the experts in evolving successful collaboration between stakeholders, to learn what processes can be successfully applied to the planning process for our beautiful national recreation area. i would suggest that both phil ginsberg, director of sf recreation and park dep't, and mohammed nuru, director of sf dep't of public works, may provide invaluable insights to, &/or training for, the ggnra leadership team.

in the absence of respectful collaboration regarding the future of the ggnra, i will actively advocate for the removal of san francisco lands from the ggnra and for significant changes in oversight of the administrative processes and civil servants in the national parks service. while i am a frequent visitor to our national parks, i am sadly accepting the fact that, based on our experience with ggnra leadership, the national park service does not possess the appropriate credentials or personnel for managing urban recreation areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5924    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

Sincerely,  
Hayley Alexander

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5925    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pleasanton, CA 94566  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:16:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a family who walks regularly with our dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

We walked with our little "Surfer Girl" Clara (small dog) 3 or 4 miles at Fort Funston this past weekend, February 15th, and absolutely loved every blissful minute.

I just cannot imagine this Freedom being taken away. The health and well being that a relationship with a dog brings is immeasurable.

Please consider that we who need and benefit from our dogs are already restricted from the NATIONAL PARKS.

PLEASE, please, do not take away our access to the GGNRA lands too.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5926    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:16:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** having lived on the San Mateo County coastside for for 39 years, I have spent many wonderful hours walking with dogs on the slopes of Montara Mtn.

Our area is now within the boundaries of the Corral de Tierra section of GGNRA, and we are told that soon dogs will be banned.

GGNRA is a recreation area, not a highly sensitive pristine wilderness or national park. It is adjacent to residential and commercial property in a very popular tourist area. Recreation is the opporative word here.

I am a responsible dog person. I clean up after him and do not let him bother people, other dogs, or wildlife. As an elderly woman with arthritis and cancer, I feel more secure having my German Shepherd with me when I walk.

I have yet to hear a good reason why dogs will be banned from most or all of GGNRA.

Jean DeMouthe, Ed.D.  
Registered Geologist

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5927    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:17:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I read about this in the Pacific Sun. It sounded like the dog-owners would not be able to walk their dogs if Plan F were approved. But that was hysteria. Looking at the maps, I gather that all the dog-friendly places are preserved. The major differences among the plans is that some of them allow for "voice control," while others limit the dog access to on-leash. Although I understand that some people would like to have their dogs run on the beach, I personally would be happy if my dog could go with me at all. We went down to Tennessee Beach the other day and couldn't bring our dog, because dogs are prohibited there - but horses are okay! Please explain that from an environmental or any point of view. Oddly, midway down the trail, there was a section where dogs were allowed. What are you supposed to do, drop your dog down by helicopter???

My idea is, allow dogs everywhere if they're on-leash. It's simple and doesn't require people to read maps to know where they can bring their dog. If they want their dogs to run free, take them to a dog park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5928    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:17:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep Bernal heights and Fort Funston off-leash parks. Dog owners use them responsibly (and joyfully!\_)

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Liz Homans

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5929    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:17:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5930    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Belmont, CA 94002  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Andy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5931    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:20:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am fully supportive of proposed language to limit or abolish allowing off leash dogs.

I have been negatively impacted by off leash dogs almost every time I go to GGNRA beaches and parks. Areas are fouled by dog waste - - regardless of signs and bags being provided. People do not take responsibility to manage their pet or follow existing leash restrictions. I love dogs and appreciate the desire of owners to have an off leash experience - - however that experience should not be at the detriment of others or diminish my rights to safely enjoy the area.

There are a lot of dog owners that feel off leash use is a right. It is not. It is a privilege. Resources spent managing dogs and related waste could be better spent on other costs within GGNRA.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5932	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:21:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Mark Khoury

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5933	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Belvedere, CA 94920 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Marin Pet are Association Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. Additionally, I feel that by virtue of the fact that I along with other Marin and San Francisco residents pay taxes, we should be able to use the land for which we are paying and supporting.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5934	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:25:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have always enjoyed and appreciated the offleash areas provided by GG National recreation area. I would be incredibly unhappy if they went away.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5935	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94209 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.				

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred



alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Paula Cunningham , CTC 4084894194 (SF resident )

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5936	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:27:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been walking my dogs in GGNRA for over 25 years. I'm opposed to the new regulation you propose. Retain the 1979 pet policy. Enforce mountain bike rules instead. They are the outlaws.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5937	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Corte madera, CA 94925 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:27:51				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5938    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:27:54

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like to voice my support of restrictions on off leash dogs in the GGNRA. Habitat degradation, the stressing of wild life, the trampling of restored areas and numerous incidents of having off leash dogs jumping on or barking at me has curtailed my enjoyment of this national park. There are already areas where off leash dogs are banned but dog owners ignore the rules and there seems to be no enforcement of them. I would urge that enforcement of off leash dog regulations be enforced. Off leash areas should be clearly demarcated with signage and natural or artificial barriers. I also feel that there should be areas where there are no dogs, leashed or unleashed.

The dog population in San Francisco has dramatically increased in the last decade and dogs are everywhere. As the population in the Bay Area increases, natural areas will become more valuable and to avoid them from becoming de facto dog parks will require strict enforcement of the current laws.

Please keep the GGNRA a park for everyone and not just dogs and their owners.

Sincerely,

Rob Cullison

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5939    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94111  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:30:13

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Francisco, San Mateo County, and Marin County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Doug Lloyd

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5940    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:30:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Frank Dean,

I am writing today to officially oppose the National Park Services preferred alternative for their Dog Management Plan to restrict on and off leash activity in the Golden Gate National RECREATION Area.

I support Alternative A - the No Action alternative.

As a Muir Beach resident, I take my 4-year-old rescue dog Wanda to the beach a few times a week. It truly is a high point of my day - and certainly a high point for Wanda. I often see other neighbors there with their dogs and it is a chance to not only get exercise for my dog, and myself but a chance to socialize with neighbors as well. My husband moved to Muir Beach as a baby and my children are third generation Muir Beachers and have always enjoyed the great character of Muir Beach with dogs. We must keep Muir Beach open to dogs off leash. Furthermore, to suggest that people be able to take their dogs to an area of Muir Beach called Little Beach with absolutely no parking, no trash cans or restrooms, would leave a giant mess for the residents.

Right now dogs are only allowed on 1% o the GGNRA land. To reduce what remaining access we now have by 90% wuld be awful. So far, I have not seen any scientific evidence produced by the NPS supporting the fact that dogs are detrimental to the wildlife in the area. There is no basis for such drastic restrictions. This is not a National Park - it is a National RECREATION Area.

Please keep Muir Beach and other current dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA unchanged.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5941    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:32:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

This sweeping plan indicates that all the NPS is interested in is to bring this park in line with all the other national parks. It is bureaucracy gone mad!

Congress created the GGNRA in 1972 to: "to provide public access along the waterfront and to expand the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available to the region." The proposed dog plan appears to be in direct opposition to that mandate.

Please consider:

1. This park is in a city, not a wilderness. It should be treated differently from other parks.

---

2. This park is mostly used by LOCALS who live here and cherish the open space in their city, not tourists.
3. Dog owners are the ones who use the beaches most. In all weathers and on all days. Other beach users are only there on warm days. (Rare in San Francisco).
4. Dog owners report all sorts of problems to the NPS authorities, dead and injured animals, wash outs, leaks, crimes. Dog owners are the only people I have ever seen who pick up random trash on the beach and dispose of it. Not the runners, not the sunbathers, not the mothers with kids, not the kids drinking beer, not the fishermen.
5. The beaches are empty most of the time, even on the weekends when the weather is cool. What is the problem here???
6. All of the "problems" cited in your ridiculously long report can be addressed by signage( i.e. educating the dog owners) and fencing (a lot cheaper than paying a park employee to police this).
7. If it is birds you are worried about fencing and signage are the answer. The complaints from the Audubon Society and the Park Service that dogs are somehow a threat to the coastal areas is ridiculous and vastly overblown. Any instances of dogs harming birds are very rare and unusual, this can be addressed by proper dog training. As for disturbing the nesting sights this can be addressed through education and signage. The FERREL CATS are the problem here, please spend your time and MY money on addressing this much more significant problem.
8. If it is non dog owners using the beach you are worried about then ask the people with dogs not to come on to a crowded beach on a hot weekend.....most will comply. SIGNAGE!
9. If there are too many dogs at once then reduce the number of dogs one person can bring. The professional dog walkers are allowing many families/individuals to have dogs even though they are not home to be with them. Make it very expensive for the dog walkers to operate their businesses, at the moment they operate for free. It will reduce the number of professional dog walkers and dog owners and therefore dogs!
10. People who walk dogs are in better physical shape than other people (new study out of England). They are less of an expense on our health care system. We should be encouraging this!
11. The NPS does not appear to be interested in making dog owners responsible for the behavior of their dogs and insisting that off leash dogs are well trained. More legislation against off leash dogs is not the answer.  
Put up signs asking dog owners to always be respectful of the other users of the beach and not allow their dogs into the areas where the shore birds nest....an education campaign. Even a license system for owners to have their dogs off leash where they have to prove that the dog is properly trained (rather like a drivers license) might be a solution.
12. Dog owners are law-abiding citizens who by their presence on the GGNRA lands discourage crime of all kinds. It is in the interest of anyone who cares about open space to work together - with the people who use that open space most often - dog owners. **DO NOT MAKE AN ENEMY OUT OF YOUR GREATEST ALLY.**

Surely PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY with freedom is better for our society than yet more restrictions

and legislation!

Dogs provide so much love and support to humans in so many ways; they need places to run free. And remember A TIRED DOG IS A WELL BEHAVED DOG.

Yours truly,

Vivien, who walks her well trained dog on Baker beach every day and is most often there with only a handful of fishermen and a few other dog owners!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5942    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:33:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** There are far too few places that people can take their dogs off leash. Please, please don't make that list even longer.

Thank you,  
James King

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5943    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94704  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:33:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We have been bringing our dog to Muir beach for a long time. We meet other dog owners and dogs and always have a wonderful time. Most dog owners are responsible, and when we see others not doing the same, we usually speak up. Muir beach is not the nicest of the MANY beaches in Norther California so why can't you just continue to allow people to bring their dogs there? PLEASE consider this so our northern California dogs can also have a beach )that has always been there for them) to swim and play.

Sincerley,

Maryclare McCauley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5944    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:34:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my STRONG

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Nichole Berger

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5945	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

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

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

I also feel that the concerns of those who walk with and exercise dogs are being brushed over, because it's just easier to take this away and slap "No Dogs" signs everywhere than to put real thought and research into this, and to understand just what kind of an impact it will have on the many good people of San Francisco and the surrounding areas who want to enjoy the beauty of the area with their dogs.

Thank you,

Carla Kozak  
San Francisco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5946	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:37:12  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please either expand access to off-leash dogs or at a minimum keep it as is. About half of all SF homes have a dog, we are your constituency !

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5947    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:38:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a lab owner I feel it is tragic to not let dogs run free on the beach. I strongly oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative for dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5948    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:38:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
AW

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5949    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."



The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5950    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:39:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The off-leash areas are a valuable resource for those of us with canine companions, and we all endeavor to maintain a respectful relationship with other park users. Animals certainly also deserve consideration in use of public spaces; conservation efforts are a clear global good, and so is maintaining awareness that even 'domestic' creatures have certain needs to maintain emotional and physical health and well being. The goal should be for safe and respectful co-use, rather than simply dismissing the needs of our beloved companions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5951    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern:

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach, Oakwood Valley Trail, the Rodeo Beach Loop and the Coastal Trails. Two years ago I was diagnosed with stage 3 breast cancer. To this day, the only exercise I can do is walking which I only do with my two dogs. I cannot take them on leash because I cannot have them pull me and risk complications. Me, my entire family and our dogs would be significantly limited in our exercise, exposure to wilderness, and our outdoor family time if we are not able to take our dogs to these areas. I feel VERY strongly that this legislature cannot take place.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. Last summer when I was looking for trails to take both my children and dogs to get the kids away from any screen and exposed to trees, birds, landscape and overall nature, I was astounded at how limited the possibilities are. It was very difficult to find a trail where we could explore areas we had never been before.

We live in an area where the outdoors is essential and a large part of why we have chosen to live here. IN addition, Marin families are families with dogs who bring so much delight and love into the family. The dogs are happiest when they can walk outdoors with their owners and be off leash. I strongly urge you to keep the remaining dog friendly off leash trails available for our use. Not doing so will greatly families and dogs to less healthy choices.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

With Respect and Hope,  
Lori Fineman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5952	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:41:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please keep Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, etc. available to dogs to run off leash! This is necessary for all San Francisco dogs to stay exercised and socialized.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5953	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:42:31				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

---

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. There are virtually no open spaces left for individuals and families with dogs to enjoy off slash activities. Recently, my husband died after a long illness. Being able to take him to open spaces with our dog and watching our dog chase a tennis ball unencumbered by a leash was a joy that made his last year easier. Rarely rarely have we had problems with other dogs or their owners. We have seen more problems with poor drivers than dog owners in our lifetime here in the San Francisco area.

Thank you for your attention to this matter

Maria Burrington

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5954	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:42:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** We take our dogs to Fort Funston at least twice a month and love the fact that they can run around 'free' without their leash. It is one of the few, beautiful places in the Bay Area in which we can do this!

Please do not pass legislation that would take this freedom away.

Best,  
Leslie Goldstein

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5955	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	South San Francisco, CA 94080 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Elaina

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5956	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:43:27				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	please do not change the leash laws at Crissy Field. We very much enjoy it as one of the few places in the City/County of San Francisco where we can RFID the family and let her run free under the understanding that we are responsible for watching her and picking up after her. I have not experienced the off leash dogs as interfering with non-dog owning patrons of the park in any significant way. thank you for the opportunity to leave comments on this before any decision is finalized.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5957	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:44:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I wish to formally and firmly oppose the new GGNRA draft dog management plan. I am a frequent user of local park areas with my dog, who is always well behaved, and who I always clean up after. These outdoor recreational areas are what makes life in the city possible for my family and my dog, and it would be severely restrict our ability to happily and healthily live in this city we call home.

Sincerely,  
William Geddes

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5958	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:44:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on proposed regulations for GGNRA ONLY in Rancho Corral de Tierra, in which I have extensive hiking experience. This is based on the Draft Dog Management Plan/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement published online. I can say with significant experience that your proposed alternatives badly miss addressing the real needs of the Rancho area. Here are the details:

1. The dog walking plan is missing and overlooking the erosion and public dangers caused by other factors, which are individually and collectively more stressful to the environment than dog walking. Those are:

a. Mountain bikes:

The vast majority of erosion on the Rancho and Montara mountain is caused by mountain bikes going off-trail. That is patently obvious to anyone who hikes these hills. Also, my personal safety has been threatened numerous times by speeding mountain bikers, but never by a dog. In a recent event, a mountain biker came down a ridge at about 50 mph - and fortunately yelled in time for me to jump out of the way.

b. Horses:

The major source of excrement on these trails is from horses, not dogs. Dog owners seem to clean up regularly, but I've never seen a horse rider do so. Note that dogs, but not horses, are native species in this area. Horse tracks also cause far more disruption of vegetation than dogs.

c. Cars and motorcycles: Both types of vehicles have climbed to the top of the eucalyptus ridge southwest of Montara Mtn. Extensive tire-based erosion is visible in the wooded gullies east of this ridge.

Motorcycles occasionally continue down the ridge to the old San Pedro road.

d. Mountain lions: My dog has found enough parts of adult deer to make it clear that a large predator forages in this area. The S.F. Chronicle has reported mountain lion sightings in this area, and the local paper again on Nov. 13th. <http://halfmoonbay.patch.com/groups/breaking-news/p/mountain-lion-spotted-on-montara-mountain-trail>

e. Human safety:

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

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

3. There are no dog-related smells at the Rancho site in my experience. The weather is cool. Horse manure can be smelled, especially in concentrations near the horse ranch.

---

4. Voice control of dogs is a sensible regulation, and should be authorized at Rancho.
5. If there are valuable, sensitive areas within Rancho, then mark them off-limits and apply those restrictions to mountain bikers, horses, and humans, not just dogs.
6. Creating a narrow off-leash park for dogs is an invitation for intensive use that will concentrate erosion and dog smells - thus creating the problem that is cited for elimination elsewhere. The NPS is well aware that spreading use over a larger land area where vegetation can recover if damaged is a lower impact strategy. Similarly, restricting dog walking to concentrated areas will intensify any impacts thereto.
7. If there is evidence at Rancho that dogs are creating erosion or environmental damage, please refer me to those reports - because I do not see dog-related impacts.
8. Take a poll or vote of local residents on whether your proposed dog restrictions are merited. Posting signs and websites is not sufficient outreach for a change this impactful on the lives and health benefits to local residents. I submit the local users of Rancho will deny the need for dog restrictions - but might heartily endorse restrictions on mountain bikes,

**CONCLUSION:**

Something has motivated the NPS to narrowly focus on the dog issue at Rancho, while ignoring the far more damaging safety and environmental impacts of mountain bikes, horses, predators, and vehicles. Further, with these institutional blinders on, the agency has not sufficiently weighed the benefits of unencumbered dog walking to local citizens. Address the real problems, please. You're spending our tax dollars.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5959	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Half Moon Bay, CA 94019 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:45:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As well as wildlife and natural habitat there are other things to be preserved in the Ranch Corral de Tierra acquisition: among them recreational opportunity and civic responsibility.				

Recreation: In the dog management plan the issue of off leash is presented as "off leash dog walking". Off leash dog hiking better represents the issue from the viewpoint of many off leash proponents. Hiking is a form of human recreation; a hike is generally recognized as taking place over a distance on unpaved trails and through varied terrain. That's what I do in the Rancho. Hiking with one's dog off leash is an excellent form of recreation with the great benefit to the human. Walking the dog connotes a benefit for the dog. Hiking is a human activity I value. Hiking with my dog adds to my pleasure as well as my sense of safety. I urge GGNRA to preserve this form of recreation within the newly acquired Rancho Corral de Tierra property in San Mateo.

Civic Duty: There are long established off leash areas bordering Montara, Moss Beach, and El Granada. The area in Montara is currently well maintained by a neighborhood volunteer group. Civic participation and stewardship is well worth preserving. I hike there frequently with my dog and maintain one of the waste collection cans. I meet other hikers with off leash dogs, hikers on leash dogs, bicyclists, some with off leash dogs and hikers without dogs. Off leash hikers are attentive and control their dogs when approaching others. The trails are clean. Montara's community effort benefits the GGNRA. My refuse can contains dog waste, but also contains beverage cans, food wrappers and even a discarded tee shirt.

Wildlife: I suspect wildlife in this region also benefits from off leash hiking areas. It should be recognized that GGNRA is part of a very large contiguous area of protected wild lands in San Mateo County. Abundant wildlife roams free here including mountain lions, coyotes, bobcats, and other predators. Human activity including responsible off leash dog hiking create a buffer between wild lands

and the small discontinuous but densely populated communities adjacent to Rancho Corral de Tierra. When wildlife venture into town it seldom works out for wildlife. A buffer protects wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5960    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sunnyvale, CA 94087  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Breanna Rutherford

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5961    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:45:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Teri Miller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5962    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Audubon Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:46:41  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am both a bird lover and a dog person. I am writing to say that after thinking about this from both sides, I fully support the plans for limiting access to important natural areas to dogs off leash. When we think about how little open space in San Francisco actually offers shelter to the few wild species of bird, plant and animal that call this home, I am happy to put my dog on a leash. There are enough options for off leash dog play in the new plan. I wish that my fellow dog lovers would think about the big picture and value the natural areas for what they are, truly natural and rare.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5963    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** berkeley, CA 94703  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:48:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support all forms of stronger control of dogs. Dogs interfere with wildlife in all parks, and interfere with me when I picnic, bicycle, and jog. Dogs owners delegation of walking to professionals makes bicycling difficult. I am often confronted with a trail full of unleashed dogs, left right and center. I am concerned about the effect of dogs on wildlife, such as bobcats and birds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5964    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94403  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service:  
Please consider adopting stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes. Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously. The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

Thank you,  
Anne

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5965    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:49:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a senior diagnosed with osteoporosis, I am constantly fearful of being knocked over by dogs running at large in areas where they are supposed to be leashed or are not allowed at all. So many of my favorite beaches and parklands are now areas I am forced to avoid due to the impacts of dogs off-leash. I fully understand why people like to run their dogs off-leash but it should not be at the expense of other parkland and beach users.

The only solution is to have fenced dog parks where no other activity is allowed. Where there is the expectation of other users, then dogs should be leashed. Given that the leash laws are routinely ignored by so many dog owners and enforcement is unable to secure compliance, separate places for dogs, well outside of sensitive habitat areas, is the only reasonable solution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5966    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:49:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Two years ago, I wrote you about the General Management Plan. Looking at the new Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS, I feel that the same points apply:

â€ I very much appreciate the access to the parks you provide, the access to California's beautiful coast, and the joy our family can have at Funston, Lands End, Ocean Beach, and Crissy Field.

â€ At the same time, I wonder if the GGNRA sees it as part of its mission to support urban parks. Both plans seem to me more designed to keep people out of the GGNRA - - to make them more like native plant musuems - - than to serve the recreational needs of the many bay area residents.

San Francisco has something like 340,000 households out of which 110,000 to 160,000 have dogs. Dogs need exercise every day and urban residents with busy schedules may not have more than one opportunity to exercise outside. If that time is with a dog - - under your plan - - it will be less likely to be in the GGNRA By reducing access to dogs, you are reducing access to over one-third of San Francisco households. Is that your intention? I firmly believe it will be a consequence of this plan.

I cannot help but feel that the kind of balance you seek is one of fewer people and more plants.

There are many ways I would be willing to help the GGNRA accommodate dogs. A permit system could help fund whatever extra efforts required to support them. Encouraging training programs would reduce the already very small number of annual dog incidents (wouldn't it be great if such training worked for the much larger number of human incidents the park faces?). And in multi-use parks like Crissy Field, some segmentation could be helpful. But, the restrictions in Funston, Ocean Beach, and Lands End are too severe.

Consequently, with the exception of Alternative A, I find none of the options you propose to be acceptable. That doesn't mean that there aren't other options which could work. It means that your proposals are not designed to support the a large urban population.



On January 9, Newsweek published an article about how demand for family and pet recreation is expanding and how government agencies are responding in support. The number of such parks more than doubled in the last five years. It saddens me that the GGNRA is out of step with the rest of the country.

Respectfully,

Gary Beberman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5967	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Wild Equity Institute Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:50:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	[A more detailed version of this comment letter in hard copy with citations and attachments has been submitted via mail]				

#### COMMENTS ON THE SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR PET MANAGEMENT AT THE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Dear Superintendent Dean:

We submit the following comments on the National Park Services (Park Service) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for Pet Management at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA or Park).

We do not support the Park Services preferred alternative in the SEIS because it does not adequately address the clear environmental threats and visitor impacts caused by the presence of off-leash dogs in the GGNRA. The Park Service has presented several objectives, including providing a clear, enforceable dog management policy; preserving and protecting natural and cultural resources and natural processes; improving visitor safety; and reducing user conflicts. However, the SEIS still does not achieve the level of management necessary for the Park Service to meet its stated objectives.

The evidence is clear that off-leash dogs must be heavily regulated in the Park, and that areas where off-leash dogs are allowed must be fully enclosed by a fence or natural boundary. This comment letter analyze the issues associated with off-leash dogs in the GGNRA, including wildlife disturbances, visitor impacts, and safety, and highlights areas where the SEIS is inadequate.

Unless the Park Service makes the necessary changes to the preferred alternative in the SEIS, it will fail to fulfill its fundamental purpose to conserve park resources and values, and will not be in compliance with its mandate prohibiting impairment of park resources and values.

#### SEIS Does Not Adequately Assess Impacts on Park Users.

It is well documented that off-leash dogs create problems for various park users including people with guide dogs, ethnic minority groups, children, picnickers, and on-leash dog walkers, among others. Over the last few years there have been numerous accounts of dogs negatively impacting visitor experiences. A woman visiting Crissy Field reported that her five year old son was attacked by a dog, which also gouged the leg of another child, and complained that other dogs were harassing small children in the area; a park

visitor at Ocean Beach reported a dog being attacked by three off leash dogs; a hang glider at Fort Funston was bitten by an off-leash dog; and an off-leash dog harassed a guard on horse patrol to the point of having to be pepper sprayed. These are just a few examples of the conflicts that can occur with off-leash dogs.

Offleash dogs pose a particularly significant challenge to individuals who rely on service animals to help them enjoy the GGNRA. As stated in previous comments to the Park Service on this issue, a 2003 survey conducted by a national guide dog user group indicated that 89% of individuals with service animals had their guide dogs interfered with by offleash dogs, and 42% of graduates of the groups training programs had their guide dogs attacked by offleash dogs.

Thus, the failure to enforce the leash law in the GGNRA has exposed those with service animals to a highrisk of interference or attack, and in most cases has precluded these individuals from enjoying the park altogether. This is a disproportionate impact on accessibility for individuals who rely on guide dogs to traverse the park: and since dog management and accessibility planning will impact many of the same locations within the GGNRA, if this disproportionate impact isnt addressed the GGNRA may unwittingly exclude guide dog users from the very places that it is trying to make accessible.

Off-leash dogs and dog waste also create barriers for ethnic minorities who want to use the park. There are already disproportionate rates of general park use between white and ethnic minority users, as GGNRA visitors are still much more likely to be white than city or state residents. In addition, recreational opportunities for those with lower incomes have become increasingly more difficult as income inequality rises and income gaps between White citizens and Black and Latino citizens have also continued to increase. These economic constraints create even further barriers for ethnic minorities to use public parkland. Although some have argued, as noted in the SEIS, that park use by ethnic minority populations would increase with more available off-leash areas, several reports and studies show the opposite is true. (SEIS pg. 330). A 2007 study conducted by Nina Roberts of San Francisco State University found that Asian and Latino park users consider uncontrolled dogs and dog waste to be a barrier to visiting the Park. The Park Service acknowledged those findings in the SEIS; however, the Park Service also cited to a 2002 Northern Arizona University study in an apparent effort to discount or downplay those findings. But a review of the 2002 studys relevant data in fact confirms the concerns regarding off-leash dogs discussed in this letter, and the Final EIS must reflect this.

The Park Service stated that the 2002 study found that Hispanic and non-Hispanic populations supported off-leash dog walking by almost the same percentages; however, the fact remains that the Hispanic community is already underrepresented in the Park. Thus, it is inappropriate for the Park Service to compare the response rates of the two groups in light of the later 2007 findings, and importantly, in light of the fact that the 2002 survey was conducted only in English with no available Spanish translation. Moreover, the 2002 findings show overwhelmingly that ethnic minorities oppose off-leash dog walking in the Park, particularly in light of the Park Services mission, and support regulations that prohibit off-leash dog walking.

Three relevant questions that were asked in the 2002 survey include questions 11, 13, and 17. Question 11 asked [c]urrent regulations allow for walking dogs on-leash at most GGNRA sites and prohibit any off-leash dog walking. Do you support or oppose this current regulation? 70.5% of respondents of Hispanic origin, 69.3% of Asian Americans, and 72.8% of African Americans responded that they either strongly or somewhat supported current regulations. Question 13 asked [d]o you support or oppose allowing off-leash dog walking in GGNRA sites? 52% of respondents of Hispanic origin, 49.2% of Asian Americans, and 49.6% of African Americans responded that they either strongly or somewhat opposed allowing off-leash dog walking. Question 17 asked the same as question 13, but explained the mission of the GGNRA beforehand. Knowing the GGNRAs mission, 56.6% of respondents of Hispanic origin, 59.7% of Asian

Americans, and 67.5% of African Americans responded that they either strongly or somewhat opposed allowing off-leash dog walking in the Park.

The SEIS does not provide enough consideration for the negative experiences park users have when confronted with an off-leash dog. Even on-leash dog walkers have expressed discomfort with off-leash dogs. In 2005, Congresswoman Jackie Speier stated, after having worked with dog owner organizations and GGNRA officials regarding off-leash behavior for years, that:

Off-leash activity should be in areas that do not involve interaction with leashed dogs, or a fragile environment; i.e., the area should be fenced and properly noticed as to its use. For example, according to dog park experts, canine dominance factors preclude the placement of tables in dog parks—dogs jump on tables to be dominant—and problems will arise when a leashed dog is confronted by a free dog.

Recently, at a meeting organized by Congresswoman Speier, she stated that her position on this issue had not changed. It is clear that in order to accommodate all park users, off-leash dogs must not be able to roam free and bother, harass, and even injure other visitors and their dogs. Enclosing all off-leash dog areas is the only way to sufficiently deal with this issue, as discussed below.

#### Wildlife Disturbance.

It has become abundantly clear throughout this environmental review process that the presence of dogs in the GGNRA negatively impacts wildlife, including federally protected species. Wild Equity and others have previously submitted substantive comments and provided evidence on the issue, and the Park Service has acknowledged this. Plovers and other birds are often disturbed by dogs, which they see as natural predators, and disturbance triggers reactions that can lead to death of these birds. Disturbance of wildlife by dogs has been recorded within the GGNRA and documented in several published studies and reports.

For instance, incident reports show that dogs often chase, and sometimes kill, birds and other wildlife. One incident report states that three different dogs chased shorebirds at Ocean, and in two cases dogs chased the federally protected Snowy Plover. At Crissy Field, a ranger witnessed a dog kill a western grebe. In another incident at the Marin Headlands, a ranger witnessed a dog chasing a herd of deer in a wildlife protection area.

These are just a few examples of the problems that occur for wildlife in the GGNRA. The Park Service has provided no evidence that off-leash dogs respond to voice control, and the difficulty of controlling a dog in the presence of wildlife is insurmountable. To account for this problem, off-leash dogs must only be allowed in an area that is fully enclosed, either by a fence or natural boundary.

#### Failure To Consider Alternative of Enclosing All Regulated Off-Leash Areas Is Arbitrary.

If off-leash dogs are to be allowed in the GGNRA at all, the Park Service must implement a plan that more adequately addresses the growing number of conflicts between off-leash dogs and wildlife or other park users. Such a plan necessitates that off-leash dog play areas be fully enclosed with a physical barrier—with all entry and exit points double-gated—to ensure the safety of park users and protect park resources. Fully enclosed dog parks are standard and even recommended by dog safety advocates. Wild Equity and other commenters provided valid arguments as to why all ROLAs should be enclosed by physical boundaries during the DEIS comment period. However, the preferred alternative in the SEIS still does not propose to fully enclose all ROLAs. Enclosing ROLAs will not unreasonably restrict dog use in the

GGNRA, but failing to enclose them will result in more user conflicts and will create more risk for off-leash dogs. If the Park Service feels that it is not appropriate for a ROLA to be enclosed, then the ROLA should not be proposed for that particular area.

Hundreds of dogs have been lost, injured, or killed, while roaming the GGNRA off-leash. This is because voice control is not an effective means to protect pets from getting lost or hit by cars. Enclosed off-leash dog play areas ensure that our dogs do not fall off cliffs, run into traffic, or are lost while visiting the GGNRA and they ensure, when properly located, that wildlife will not be harmed or harassed by dogs.

Furthermore, enclosing ROLAs would empower park visitors, giving them the ability to choose if and when to have off-leash dog experiences by entering an enclosed area, rather than having the experience imposed upon them whenever they visit the GGNRA. The Park Service acknowledges in the SEIS that dog walking under voice control may be more of an 'exclusive than a shared use . . . [for reasons that include] visitor safety and experience. (SEIS pg. 19). Although the Park Service suggests this is a debatable point, it is clear that when dogs are allowed to roam free, other uses are severely limited as evidenced by visitor complaints of dogs interrupting picnics and other activities. In the minds of park visitors, off-leash areas are already characterized as exclusive use zones, and consequently an argument that incorporating physical boundaries creates an exclusive use zone on its own is unacceptable.

Enclosed ROLAs would also increase compliance of regulations, as visible fencing details clearly identifiable boundaries and reduces public confusion on where a ROLA begins and ends. This also benefits GGNRA operations, as the Park Service can reduce spending its limited staff and financial resources on addressing matters such as illegal off leash dog-walking and visitor conflicts caused by off leash dogs.

In addition, enclosed areas are solidly grounded in the non-impairment mandate that governs the National Park System. An enclosure, like seat belts, bicycle helmets, safety goggles, and other safety devices, allow us all to participate in activities that are inherently risky while reducing the probability that drastic consequences from those risks materialize. The Park Service promotes the goal of ensuring that today's activities do not degrade existing resources or future recreational opportunities, and, accordingly, it should not permit risky activities without adequate safeguards in place.

As Wild Equity and other commenters have stated previously, this design principle has been adopted by animal welfare organizations and park managers around the country. The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals urged dog owners to [k]eep your dog on a leash when you are outside, unless you are in a secured, fenced-in area and recommends fenced-in dog parks because even if your dog reliably comes when called, its safest to take her to a securely enclosed area to play off leash. The State of California concluded during a dog management study in 2001 that off-leash dog parks should [b]e enclosed, unless located in areas where there is clear and functional topographical or other significant boundaries. The San Francisco Recreation and Parks Departments (RPD) dog park policy states that off-leash dog parks require adequate delineation, natural or man-made, to protect dogs from vehicles, steep cliffs, and other hazards as well as to prevent conflicts with other park users.

The Park Service has stated that enclosures are undesirable because of aesthetic concerns and because an enclosure of sufficient construction would hinder or prevent wildlife movement. (SEIS pg. 95). The justification by the Park Service is arbitrary and should not preclude an alternative for enclosing all ROLAs from consideration under the SEIS alternatives section. Off-leash dog parks can have a variety of physical barriers, including features from the natural environment. Many of these can be designed in such a way that allows the movement of small wildlife through those areas. In addition, the aesthetic issues can be addressed simply by being creative. For example, a fully enclosed off-leash dog park proposal for Lake Merritt included butterfly garden draped around the enclosure. Furthermore, the San Francisco RPD

dealt with aesthetic concerns over physical boundaries by promising that all barriers will strive to be aesthetically pleasing using landscape features such as shrubs and vines.

If the Park Service still feels that physical barriers are not acceptable, then it should revert to the National Park Services leash law as the preferred alternative, because the Park Service has failed to demonstrate in the SEIS that voice control is sufficient to keep dogs from encountering dangerous situations and impacting wildlife and visitor experience.

#### SEIS Does Not Have Adequate Enforcement Mechanisms.

The SEIS incorporates a monitoring-based management strategy that allows Park Service staff to monitor noncompliance and impacts to natural resources, rather than the initial automatic triggers that were originally proposed. This strategy allows management actions to be implemented when the level of compliance is deemed unacceptable based on violations and/or impacts to resources.

However, this leaves the door open for limited enforcement by the Park Service. There must be some kind of demonstrable commitment of enforcement from the Park Service, rather than simply a wait-and-see approach. If the Park Service must use adaptive management, it still needs accountability mechanisms in place that guarantee effective management of the GGNRA.

One change that should be made is a lower percentage of compliance triggering further review for an area. The Park Service previously admitted that it was only striving for 75% compliance, and now it does not even have a specific threshold at all, only what will be deemed unacceptable. Even if there are no measures that apply automatically, there should still be a clearly defined compliance rate in place that triggers further review. The SEIS states a 75 percent threshold could trigger restrictions in some areas by only one hundred violations, while other sites might require several thousand violations before a change was implemented, despite greater impacts to resources and values in the latter case. (SEIS pg. 64).

The same amount of review that would be required to determine what is unacceptable for a site could be done during the current planning phase. This would promote transparency and allow for public review of the Park Services plan to address non-compliance in each area. The environmental review process is intended to be comprehensive and failing to set specific goals thresholds does nothing but further delay the inevitable.

#### The SEIS Does Not Adequately Justify Commercial Dog Walking.

One of the established objectives of the SEIS is to evaluate commercial dog walking (SEIS pg. 2). Though the SEIS does provide some information pertaining to commercial dog walking, the evaluation is lacking and it is unclear how conclusions were drawn that justify the inclusion of commercial dog walking as a component of the Preferred Alternative.

Evaluation shortcomings include the following:

The SEIS fails to adequately describe the existing condition or reference point baseline condition for commercial dog walking within the GGNRA. While the SEIS states, Under current management, commercial dog walking occurs, but is not an authorized use (SEIS pg. 8), it fails to disclose that this unpermitted commercial activity is prohibited under 36 CFR 5.3.

The SEIS fails to make clear that the 1979 Pet Policy pertains to dogs that are being managed by their

owners and makes no provision for commercial dog walking.

The SEIS fails to disclose that commercial dog walking does not meet the criteria to qualify for Commercial Use Authorization (16 USC 5966).

The SEIS fails to include 36 CFR 1.6 and 36 CFR 5.3 on the list of relevant sections of the Code of Federal Regulations. (SEIS pg. 47)

The SEIS fails to include Directors Order #53 on the list of relevant National Park Service Directors Orders. (SEIS pg. 48)

The SEIS fails to evaluate the range and types of activities for which Special Use Permits are typically issued throughout the National Park system.

The SEIS fails to evaluate the precedent setting potential of issuing Special Use Permits for commercial dog walking within the National Park system.

The SEIS fails to evaluate the impacts that are specific to commercial dog walking including: impacts to visitor experience, impacts to recreational activities, impacts to parking availability, impacts to management resources, impacts to aesthetic qualities, and impacts to Park Service values. These omissions of fact and failures of evaluation leave the SEIS lacking as a properly transparent and adequately informative document.

As a decision document, the SEIS fails to articulate a rational connection between the facts and the final decision. As commercial dog walking has never been legally permitted within the GGNRA, it must be clearly demonstrated that all Park Service criteria will be met prior to sanction as a valid activity. However, this is not the case.

The SEIS does not demonstrate that commercial dog walking is an appropriate activity for national parklands, meeting qualifications under the Organic Act. The Organic Act clearly indicates that the granting of use permits shall be for the accommodation of visitors. The SEIS proposes to grant use permits not for the accommodation of visitors, but rather for the accommodation of the commercial dog walking industry.

The SEIS does not demonstrate that commercial dog walking is an appropriate activity for the GGNRA, meeting qualifications under the GGNRA enabling legislation. The enabling legislation provides for public use of the Park for recreational and educational purposes and makes no provision for commercial uses that do not support or enhance the established park resources and values.

The SEIS does not demonstrate that commercial dog walking meets the criteria to qualify for Special Use Permitting under NPS Directors Order #53. Commercial dog walking will not support the mission of the Park Service, will not add to the public understanding and enjoyment of the GGNRA, will not promote a sense of ownership and stewardship for the Park and its resources, will not enhance the protection of park resources and values, and will not provide for an increased level of visitor safety. Furthermore, commercial dog walking is contrary to the purpose for which the park was established, may create impacts on park resources and values, may disrupt the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, may create an unsafe environment for other visitors, and may result in conflict with other existing uses.

These points of reason demonstrate how the SEIS has not achieved the objective of properly evaluating commercial dog walking, and therefore, commercial dog walking should not be included as a component of the Preferred Alternative.

## Conclusion.

The preferred alternative for the Plan in the SEIS is more accommodating to dogs than any other park in the National Park system, offering extensive on- and off-leash dog recreation in the GGNRA. Moreover, San Francisco's city park system has ample space for off-leash dogs, with 28 off-leash dog parks in 47 square miles for over 800,000 residents. There is no evidence that dog owners or dogs will lack for open space to recreate, yet off-leash advocates continue to push for more space. However, off-leash dogs should not be given precedence over safety, visitor experience, and environmental concerns.

For all the reasons stated above, we urge the National Park Service to revise the preferred alternative in the SEIS on the issues of ROLAs, enforcement, and commercial dog walking to better accommodate park visitors and protect natural resources in the GGNRA. In addition, we refer the Park Service to previous comments submitted by the undersigned groups during the DEIS process and by Charles Pfister for both the DEIS and the SEIS, and to comments submitted by the Wild Equity Institute and the Center for Biological Diversity during the ANPR process, the NEPA scoping process, and the numerous other hearings that have occurred on this issue over the past decade, and incorporates those documents here by reference.

Sincerely,

Laura Horton

Signed by:

Wild Equity Institute

Neal Desai, Pacific Region Field Director, National Parks Conservation Association

Matthew Zlatunich, San Francisco Resident

Bob Planthold, Member of GGNRA Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, Disability Access Advocate

David Robinson, Stakeholder Representative to GGNRA Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, Coleman Advocates, Representing Children, Youth and Family GGNRA Users

Jan Blum, Community Volunteer

Charles Pfister

Arlene Gemmill

**Correspondence ID:** 5968    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Wonder Dog Rescue Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:52:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** This is SO wrong.

I am a dog rescuer of 24 years, with profound respect for all living beings.... closing off leash areas in the way you are proposing is unfair to the thousands of San Franciscans who exercise their dogs.

Off leash play is essential to the well being of the animal. PLEASE reconsider your measures.  
thank you  
L. Beenau

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5969    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to express my strong opposition to Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, of the published alternatives, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I am a resident of Central Marin. I regularly take my dog to the following areas under GGNRA control: Muir Beach, Oakwood Valley Trail, Oakwood Valley Fire Road, Alta Trail, Rodeo Beach and Rodeo Beach Loop. Most often, the only encounters we have on these trails are other people walking their dogs. I believe this use by my family and my dog and other dog owners is completely consistent with the founding goals of the GGNRA - to provide recreational opportunities for both local residents and visitors.

I've never encountered any hostile or destructive dogs, though I accept they must exist. As do hostile humans, and other predatory wildlife - they can all be controlled via existing enforcement mechanisms. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, so using logic and mathematics alone one can conclude that they cannot possibly be having a detrimental impact on the area as a whole. There does not seem to be any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. It would appear that the NPS has failed to conduct any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. The public as a whole must agree since their comments in 2011 ran 3:1 against the plan as proposed back then.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite and it is most certainly not a wildlife preserve or sanctuary such as the Mojave National Preserve or the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.



Further, restricting access in this manner will force Marin residents to have to drive further afield in order to exercise their dogs off-leash. This is not a particularly green alternative, and will increase traffic and pollution.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. So again I reiterate my support for Alternative A.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5970	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:55:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Brad Vaughn

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5971	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Anselmo, CA 94960 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:56:34				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I find it incredible that this issue rages on year after year with no apparent resolution and increasing acrimony. I have traveled all over the United States and know that environmentally sensitive areas can be developed, maintained, and preserved in locations shared with dog recreational use as long as there is mutual respect, cooperation and accountability from all interested parties.				

I suggest two ideas that could be key elements to peaceful coexistence.

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

2. Equally important is educated, aware, responsible, reasonable and cooperative enforcement personnel. The NPS has some distance to travel before attaining this status. NPS' goal must not be perceived as the eradication of dogs and their owners. Doing little to improve a perceived problem, then using inaction to justify the need for change is not acceptable. For example, in clearly-identified, controlled access areas with dog feces pollution, such as Marin's Upton Beach, why haven't fines paid for staffing and enforcement to correct the problem?

Hefty fines and other penalties should be levied on irresponsible dog owners. However, penalties must be applied with the goal of education of both owners and park staff's efforts to eradicate improper behaviors.

Legislation must be factually-based, defensible, and perceived as fair and beneficial to all stakeholders. It appears the draft Dog Management Plan has not reached anything like consensus within the communities where NPS proposes to levy it.

Allowing so much time with so little resolution has added exponentially to rancor between the parties. It is very apparent, no matter what Alternative is chosen, heavy-handed adherence to any action is unwise and will fail in the face of continued resistance. Alternative F is far less likely to succeed than Alternative A.

This is a People problem: the public and the NPS. Without willing cooperation to achieve widely-understood goals that are supported by fair and sensible measures, it is wasted time to enact any regulation change.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5972	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94129 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 16:57:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Bias alert: I'm a Presidio Trust intern, and am in favor of dogs being leashed in all areas, if not totally banned.				

Honestly, this policy doesn't strike me as terribly restrictive of dog walkers at all, unless it's compared to the current situation in The Presidio. I think any amount of regulation would be beneficial in high-use areas, especially long West Pacific near Mountain Lake. Hundreds of off leash dogs are walked through that area daily, and I wouldn't be surprised if the volume of urine and feces contributes to nitrogen and fecal coliform levels in Mountain Lake.

Eight dogs is a pretty high limit and wouldn't significantly impact the current level of use in dog walking areas - maybe that limit should be lowered or commercial dog walkers should be charged a fee or banned.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5973	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 16:59:03**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Katherine Ramp

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5974 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:01:07**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I walk my dog in the GGNRA and I oppose the Preferred Alternative plan. It is too restrictive. I support formalization of the 1979 pet policy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5975 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:01:39**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I am San Francisco resident, homeowner and dog owner in the South of Market neighborhood. I beg you: do not restrict our access to off-leash recreational areas. We are responsible dog owners who love spending time with other responsible dog owners in the off-leash park areas in San Francisco. Without a place for my dog to run around safely, our quality of lives (and our neighbors) will plummet to an unacceptable level. Inadequate levels of exercise lead to behavioral problems, which will ultimately disturb the peace for many San Francisco residents (barking, property destruction, etc.). Please don't take away our ability to create happy lives (and happy dogs) in San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5976 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:02:09**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you very much for your attention to this vital matter.

Sincerely,  
Sally Farr

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5977	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:03:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

We and our dogs need your help.

Sincerely,

Mickie Lloyd, Sausalito, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5978    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:03:30

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing to oppose in the strongest possible terms the Preferred Alternative as TOO restrictive. I have recreated with my dog for many years in GGNRA parks and beaches and see no benefit in these needlessly restrictive changes in the dog management plans.

Sincerely,

Walter Fernandes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5979    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Rohnert Park, CA 94928-5002  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:03:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have lived in the bay area my whole life, 64 years, and in that time I have owned many dogs. Dogs are amazing companions and there is nothing more wonderful than taking a dog for a walk. Even more wonderful for the dog and the dog owner is watching dogs play off leash. Dogs need to be socialized as they are pack animals and want to be with each other. Playing together gives them exercise, enjoyment and lets off tension and stress, just like it does for humans.

Fort Funston is a treasure for dogs to romp and play and has been for decades now. I have taken my dogs and friends dogs to this place and never have I seen problems with playing and getting along. The oppoisite is always true, more fun and play here than any problems. Even the people get along which is another benefit, socialization of both dogs and people...a win win.

We need more places like Fort Funston where dogs and their people can play off leash. To cut these areas out of our lives is not only short sided but detrimental to the enrichment and enjoyability of everyone. At Fort Funston and other places like Crissy Field dog owners are responsible and polite. Yes there are some exceptions, but mostly things go really well. Dogs like to romp, play, swim in lakes and the ocean, walk and bark in delight.

If you are planning to close these places to dogs and their owners then where are we all supposed to go to get exercise, socialize and let go of stress?

DO NOT close Fort Funston, Chrissy Field, the beach, parks or other places where dogs and their people go to play. If dog poo is a problem, that can be fixed by people who are always willing to make sure there are garbage cans and bags for pick up. If dogs fight that can be fixed by banning the people who bring these dogs to the parks and do not take care of thier dogs. We can make these places safe and accessable for all if you will just keep them open and stop trying to close off leash play areas in the Bay Area. We want them, we need them and we demand they stay open now and forever.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5980    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:04:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** These off-leash areas are very important for our community. Most families with dogs search for areas to be able to take the whole family to (the dog is often considered part of the family). Thanks to these areas, families can take their whole families out to exercise and see nature. It is awesome to be able to see so many happy dogs running free off-leash. It is great socialization for humans and dogs. Not only that, but these areas increase the home values of surrounding areas. The Bay Area is known for being dog friendly and this would go against that. Most owners are responsible in picking up their animal's poo. If this is a problem, bigger penalties could be imposed. Also, you could start charging day use for these areas. I would not mind paying as it is a great experience for the whole family. It makes one appreciate nature more as one is often restricted from many trails that are not dog friendly. It is truly a gem to have off-leash areas. Please do not take these away from us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5981    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:04:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the proposed 'Regulated Off Leash Area' (ROLA) in the area between Le Conte St. and Tamarind St., Montara in the Rancho Corral de Tierra area of the GGNRA. I spend a great deal of time in that area, visiting friends, taking walks and working there. The area is quiet and beautiful and a real asset to the community left as is. How disruptive a dog park would be then, very much out of step with the area. There's already the school nearby which deals with a large number of cars on a regular basis. I believe a dog park would also bring in a substantial number of cars which this area cannot handle. So please, let's keep this land the treasure that it is now.  
Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinion.  
Sincerely,  
Liane Brookhart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5982    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:04:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,

there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Donna Dobryn

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5983	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San carlos,, CA 94070 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	none Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:05:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog owner and animal over, I think it reasonable that designated open space and leash free zones be established as a balance between all park users. A common sense approach to a very charged issue. Let common sense dictate over feel good politically correct behavior. I urge the recreation areas management to strike a balance that can be utilized by all those concerned. Please ...				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5984	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to every one of the places you intent to ban or minimize use. Dogs need to run and reducing the places to go will only serve to over crowd the areas where they are allowed.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

In addition, you will likely find that people will ignore the new rules. It will be very expensive to hire the number of rangers required to patrol all of these areas. People are watching how our Government, including the President and the US District Attorney, either ignore or recraft laws that are not compatible

with their agenda. If they do not follow the law or Constitution then why should the people? Please reconsider the current plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5985    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Organization Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:08:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not ban Fetch my dog loves that game

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5986    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Vallejo, CA 94590  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:10:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Recreationareas in all counties should have areas for dog Walking on and off leash. The plan as it is set now is unfair to dog owners and is likely to have a negative effect on their parts of communities such as dog and neighborhood parks. As it is already it is difficult to find Dog friendly and family friendly areas of recreation. Please don't make it even harder.

Thank you,  
Celeste Neumann

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5987    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:11:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I am opposed to the GGNRA plan to substantially reduce off leash dog play areas. I live in a city where more people have dogs than children and having dog is the reason i get out to parks, beaches and off leash hiking areas.

GGNRA seems to have lost its way, I believe the last two letters of your name include Recreation Area, not preservation area. Please consider the wishes of your constituents before making any further unnecessary changes.

thanks  
Jim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5988    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Qi Chen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5989    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:12:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi,

I am writing to opose any changes to the laws surrounding off leash rules at the park. Dog and owners activate and use the parks to their fullest. I have never heard anyone complain that they don't use a park because it has dogs. Actually I heard the opposite where like children people enjoy the activity of seeing dogs and children. These laws are dumb and an infringement on the rights of the users of the parks. I strongly discourage any changes to the law. People, children and animals have happy coexisted in the parks for years. Don't mess up a good thing.

Collin Burry

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5990    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:12:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Linda S Lockyer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5991	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san carlos, CA 94070 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:13:49
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly object to decreasing the off leash areas at any of these parks. There are very few areas for our dogs to run off leash, and even fewer in a natural setting, not a fenced in dog park. We have been going to Fort Funston almost weekly ever since we got our dog, and it is the happiest we ever see him. It is great for all the dogs to run free, and play and swim, and we have never had a bad experience with other dogs, or witnessed a bad person/dog interaction. There are plenty of beaches and trails for people who do not like dogs, please do not take away the few that exist for dogs and dog lovers.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5992	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:17:38
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,
------------------------	---------------------------

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Laurie Macomber

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5993	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I walk my dog regularly in Fort Funston and Ocean Beach and I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive!

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas.

Sincerely,  
Susan Barba

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5994	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:18:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet

policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Liz Schenk

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5995	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:19:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We need our off leash areas left in place. There are many dog owners in the city that use them daily. Many of the dog owners are elderly and/or disabled and it is difficult for them to get to parks that aren't part of the National Park Service. Most people enjoy watching the dogs play together. I believe the areas that are already in place, should be left as is.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5996	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog owner who has walked 7 mornings per week for the past eight years, I am disappointed that this subject keeps coming up and seems to be so unreasonable to me. These areas comprise such a tiny amount of GGNRA public lands, and are beautifully kept by the "dog" people. I walk several times each week on the beach at Fort Funston, and there are regulars who pick up bags of trash from the beach daily. I have heard many stories about how Funston was in huge disrepair when the dog people began using this park, and we have helped to maintain it- -frankly, we do more than it seems the Park Service does.				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. We are responsible, tax-paying citizens and we need places to exercise our dogs and ourselves. Take a look at how many seniors are in these parks with their dogs.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please listen to your constituents. It sort of feels like these decisions get made in a vacuum and the GGNRA is just going through the motions this restrictive, unfair and unreasonable plan happen. Thank you. Nina Steinman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5997    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

The dogs in the Bay Area are awesome.

Why?

Because they have great off-leash places to play.

Those places are limited as it is, and the new draft will take away some of the best spots.

Please please reconsider the new draft dog management plan.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 5998    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:20:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm writing to protest the proropsed off leash changed in the GGNRA.

I've lived in the city for 35 years, and have had many wonderful dogs in that time.

Daily walks (rain or shine, or at midnight for that matter) have been some of the high points of my time spent here. I realize the pressure the park service has been put under with the recent rapid population growth of San Francisco, the limited space and resources, and ever present 'progress' that has ultimately paved, re-utilized, or just plain encroached on all the parks, shorelines, and vacant lots.

I fully support reasonable off leash policy, but I fear that much of the fear and misunderstanding that many people have about off leash dogs is caused by ignorance of the animals themselves, and how (and when) to deal with them. It's not complicated. Learn about dogs, just like leaning to swim, or cross a street safely. I feel that individuals should take responsibility for themselves in a world with a variety of creatures, not just enact, may I add, virtually unenforcable laws that restrict an already tightly restricted community.

On a personal note, I have had experience with park police enforcement. For DMV Tags. Lets just say that it took me 9 hours at the Federal Bldg, with a number of other hardened criminals; off leash included...to have the ticket dismissed.

Yours,

Shady's Dad

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	5999	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:22:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Margaret Baumert

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6000	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:22:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** I very strongly disagree with Alternative F. I am only in support of Alternative A, the "No Action" Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood valley trail, and there is no reason for restricting the access to dogs. If they are friendly and not causing harm, then why do you wish to harm them, and there owners! I am told that there has been no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents. Marin residents and there pets rely upon this open space, It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. Alternative F is unacceptable, and it will not be tolerated.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6001	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:22:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Mark Miller

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6002	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:24:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I urge the National Park Service to adopt strong, effective dog management in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Dog owners should be provided with well fenced off leash areas, and then off leash laws must be enforced. Enforcement will require persistence, since a culture of dog 'freedom to roam' has been fostered for many years. I have seen policies like this work in other jurisdictions. A well fenced off leash area along the Bay Trail in the Berkeley/Albany area allow all users				

---

to enjoy trail the trail and the wintering birds to feed and rest in peace.

Commercial dog walkers have no place in the National Park areas. They typically have 6 or more dogs, which they cannot pick up after effectively. I have seen several instances where they don't even control their charges effectively. Their favored areas have become a tread at your own risk area.

Some trails should be totally off limits to dogs, so humans who do not wish to

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6003    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:24:52  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog parents. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my dog and I will be losing one of the many great reasons as to why we live here in the San Francisco Bay Area.

There is an estimated 120,000 dogs in the Bay Area. It's been stated since 2007, that dogs outnumber the amount of children in our community. This fact alone is reason enough to not deplete our use of the dog-friendly areas of the GGNRA.

Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on my dog and I, but our entire community. Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

The "facts" stated in the SEIS are not fair and are completely biased. Public comments from 2011 were not taken into consideration when drafting the new plan. Why is this just? Why is this happening? There is not enough scientific substantial evidence to merit these changes.

We've been coexisting fine all these years. Let's keep the 1979 Pet Policy. The policy's backbone is recreational and nature based. Nature and recreation are two things the Bay Area is made up of and should continue to be made up of.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6004    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** DOES Architecture Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, Im writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dogs health the way I have on GGNRA properties for seven years.



I am particularly concerned that the new plan is far too restrictive at Fort Funston and in the Marin Headlands. At Fort Funston, especially in the winter, the tide level can make the beach effectively unusable. Removing the upper areas - which are in no way "natural" - from use by off-leash dogs means that I will have no large open play area within 5 miles of my house that is usable in the winter. I do, however, strongly support repairing the fences and enforcing the boundaries of the current protected wildlife areas between the cliffs and the main service road at Fort Funston. In the Marin Headlands, the current trails open to dogs are the only trails within reasonable reach of the city that I can enjoy with my dogs.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches, which make up less than 10% of the total area of the RECREATION AREA, have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Eric Staten  
San Francisco, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6005	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	san rafael, CA 94901 United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:26:17
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I'm strongly opposed to the dog management plan proposed by the GGNRA. 99% of GGNRA land is already off limits to dogs. When I spend time outside in nature, I want to share that experience with my dogs. My dogs are part of my family. I end up not going to areas that don't allow dogs, because I feel my experience is not the same if I have to leave family members behind. This plan makes no sense for the community where the land is. Dogs need to run off leash. To be free and to release pent up energy. Without that ability to release, they can suffer, just as humans do when they are kept restrained. I rarely visit dog parks and city parks with my dogs because I find that many of the owners who take their dogs there, are just there as a quick way to let their dog off leash. There can often be unbalanced dogs at parks like this. These parks will be overrun with people and dogs if GGNRA restricts access to existing lands. Dogs need to run off leash, period. If the area where they are allowed to do that is minimized, that doesn't change that I will find places to allow my dogs to run. So will thousands of others who love their dogs and know what it takes to keep them balanced and happy.

If we are restricting dog access, we should also restrict access to children who can run rampant trampling plants and screaming and squealing. We should restrict smokers and horses and mountain bikes, and the list goes on. This land was set aside for recreation. Spending time in nature with beloved family members is recreation.

GGNRA's vision is very short sighted and caters to small interest groups with a loud voice.

Thanks for reading  
Sarah Jensen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6006    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:27:21  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive for the dogs that enjoy the freedom to run and socialize freely. I support formalization of the Pet policy as well as off leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences in the off leash area because they remind dogs of cages and physical restrictions, and they make visitors feel unwelcome.

As someone who walks frequently with both family dogs , I feel that turning the off leash area into a restrictive area will prevent me from recreating with our dogs. It will also be detrimental for my dogs' health as I rely on that open space for them to run and exercise.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a recreation area for densely populated urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. This policy needs to be formalized and supported with off leash areas in San Mateo county and on new lands the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

A Concerned and Devoted Dog Walker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6007    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:28:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I usually support the National Park Service wholeheartedly, but eliminating the leash laws at GGNRA is ridiculous. Dogs, people, native wildlife and their habitat can all live together harmoniously. They've been doing it for years. Please don't take away one of our SF treasures.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6008    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:29:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Michael Lopez

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6009	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:30:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dogs shouldn't always be on leashes, they deserve to run free just like humans. If anything we need more off leash parks instead of banning them!!!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6010	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94019 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:30:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please reconsider your plan to make more area available for off leash dogs. We have walked our dogs off leash on Montara Mtn for 25 years and never ever had a problem. Of all the groups to consider, off leash dogs got the short end of the stick. Thanks you				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6011	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:32:33**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Hello,

I am a proud and responsible dog owner currently living in the Mission District in San Francisco. I am very concerned with the the possible ordinance prohibiting off-leash walking in public parks which have traditionally been friendly to dogs and their owners. Here are only a few of my concerns:

-The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

-The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

-The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

I urge you to reconsider this plan and keep our open spaces friendly for all inhabitants, even four-legged ones. Thank you for your time

Sincerely,  
Lynette Rosenblum

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6012    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416**Address:** san francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** San Francisco Tomorrow Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:** OfficialRep**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:33:05**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** February 18, 2914

Frank Dean, Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Fort Mason Building 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

Re: Dog Management Plan (SEIS)

Dear Superintendent Dean:

San Francisco Tomorrow believes that the Dog Management policy put forward by the National Park Service after many years of outreach, research and discussion is a worthy one. We agree that regulating dogs in the GGNRA is a necessary action to ensure visitor safety, protect natural and cultural resources, preserve national park values, and provide for a quality national park experience for all park visitors. We urge speedy approval of the Dog Management Plan. We support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

SFT Board has voted to support a limit on the number of dogs that are brought to the park by recreational

dog walkers. Our Board believes that three dogs per dog-walker should be the maximum number to strive for in the future but we recognize the difficulty of bringing any changes to the Plan at this time; we would therefore support the limitation of six dogs per person for the time being. But the question of whether the Park should allow commercial dog walking in any form will remain.

SFT Board also voted that all dogs should be on leash in the Park, as with the longstanding NPS national policy. The idea that there could be "designated areas" for off-leash dog walking would need thoughtful landscaping, implicit boundaries and signage, if it were to be proposed for adoption in the future.

In the worst possible case, it is important to avoid "another Fort Funston" where dog walking, dog running, ball fetching and dog trampling have virtually destroyed the tough natural terrain on the northern segment of the bluff there.

The NPS has been exceedingly generous to propose a Special Rule to accommodate recreational dog walking, while ensuring visitor safety and resource protection, instead of merely implementing the standard national park policy.

But caveats remain and it is still not clear that NPS should accept commercial dog walking at all, since it is in fact allowing the Park to be exploited for private financial gain.

Sincerely,

Mary Anne Miller for  
Jennifer Clary  
President, San Francisco Tomorrow

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6013	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** SHCP Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:34:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please allow responsible dog owners and walkers to continue to use these parks with their dogs. If the problems are bad owners, please deal with them and do not take away these beautiful parks from the rest of us who have good, friendly dogs, and clean up after them and have raised obedient dogs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6014	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:35:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Having room to run without being on leash is important for the health of our dogs. It's also good for the health of humans because it usually involves much more walking on the part of people than going to the small areas designated as off leash. Being able to play off leash is not only important for the physical health of dogs, but also their mental health as well. The same for the people who walk them, live with them. Cecil Myers

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6015	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94401				

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:35:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the dog owning parents with children. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that one of my family's favorite activities will be swiped off our "Fun to-do List".

We are an active family with an active lifestyle and much of our lifestyle includes our dog. Our household is happy hugely in part to our dog and limiting access to our dog's favorite playgrounds (I.E. Fort Funston, Muir Beach and Ocean Beach) will be devastating to us all. Especially to our (breed of dog) (name).

The points brought up in the SEIS are completely unjust for such a radical change to be made. My family and our dog won't be able to have the bonding time and exercise like we do on the GGNRA lands at our local, fenced-in dog park. Nothing is quite as fulfilling as having my family together, (your dog's name here) included, out for a day of hiking, observing and learning about the great environment around us.

Please consider keeping the 1979 Pet Policy - it keeps all points of nature and recreation in harmony. It ensures my dog and any other future dogs my family has; will have their space now and for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6016    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:37:04

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We have a huge goldendoodle puppy. The only way for him to get enough exercise is to run around off leash and play with other dogs. I can power walk our puppy for 6 miles (trust me, I've tried) and it's just not enough exercise. He needs to run and wrestle with other dogs or else he's a little hellion at home. Plus, the ability to run around and play with other dogs is what gives dogs a great quality of life. Dogs can't have or do any of this if they have to remain on a leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6017    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:37:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from

recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ashley Erickson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6018	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Chico, CA 95928 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	"taxpayer and voter" Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:41:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

Even though my legal residence is in Butte County, I work in Redwood City, rent a room there, and spend more of my days off in San Francisco and the North Bay than I do in Chico. My wife packs up the dogs for a day trip or a weekend and we enjoy our time together walking at Crissy Field or on one of the beaches where dogs are allowed off-leash. This is essential for our physical and spiritual well-being, and I know the same is true for many people, dog owners or otherwise. We live in a densely-populated area, we work hard, and we need places we can go to get fresh air, exercise, and reconnect with nature. Places that are close by so that we can reach them in the limited time available to us, and places that allow dogs off-leash so we can give our canine companions the free activity they need while at the same time being drawn by them to live in the moment, enjoy the freedom and the natural beauty around us, and forget about the stress that seems to be the fuel that powers the Bay Area economy. Eliminating recreational options for the majority of people who live and work in the Bay Area is not the correct approach to achieving any environmental goals. Some people are content just knowing that natural places exist, but most people protect what they have a stake in. Keep the GGNRA areas that are currently off-leash and open to the public, and add more. Educate people to protect the sensitive habitat areas within the GGNRA. Build a supportive community through cooperation and mutual respect, not through added restrictions.

Thank you,

Chuck Humpal

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6019	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:43:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the new altered restrictions for off leash restrictions at Fort Funston and Crissy Field. I walk my Golden retriever daily at Fort Funston for the sake of his need to exercise and socialize- -as well as mine! I meet people of all walks of life and socio-economic levels and I see the extremely important benefit of the social interaction that a place like Fort Funston provides. I have 3 grown children whom I raised going to the numerous outdoor playgrounds and parks that are available for children where dogs are not allowed. We need open space for unleashed dogs to explore. Please remember that the GGNRA was developed as a recreation area for a densely populated area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6020 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the 2011 DEIS. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) included that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with access for people with their dogs, on and off-leash in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. The GGNRA should use the dollars to be spent on the new proposed regulations to enforce the existing ones!

Sincerely,

Laura

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6021 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:43:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---



**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6022	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Crescent City, CA 95531 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:44:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I used to live in the San Francisco Bay Area, visit there frequently and will probably move back there at some point. Open space for responsible dog owners and their pets is critical to health and well-being. While I am only 67, the fresh air and socializing (with others and with my Boston Terrier, Georgie) is critical to my mental health (as in keeping me from isolation).				

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6023	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:45:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Open parks for dogs are important for not just the dogs but their owners as well. They are important for happy healthy socialized dogs				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6024	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:45:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe that the GGNRA should continue to allow dog on the beaches and trails that they have used for years. Both dogs on leashes and off where permitted should continue.				

---

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6025    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:47:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I walk my two dogs almost every morning at Chrissey Field. In twelve years, I have never had a problem with any resident or their dog.

Chrissey Field has more dog walkers now. Most have a minimum of six dogs. They arrive around nine thirty. I believe very few people can control six to ten dogs off leash. Many of the dog walkers visit in the East Beach area and are not watching their dogs closely.. I believe that there should be a two dog limit at the East Beach so that residents can bring their children and dog. Dog walkers should have to park by the warming hut since there are fewer people and children in that area.

I hope you are getting money from the dog walkers since the average one makes \$100,000,00 in San Francisco. They are running a business on federal land.

Sincerely,

Nancy Zacher

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6026    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94602  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:47:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I really don't understand why the push to change this. It's been a joy for me and my dogs, as well as so, so many over the years. As a native San Franciscan i am astonished that this would even be an issue. Please reverse this plan. Please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6027    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Considering the city of San Francisco has more dogs than children it worries me that more dog friendly off leash areas get restricted resulting in more dogs being at the designated fenced in dog parks. This does not give any dog the freedom to run and burn energy. Having off leash area's will also not cost more money than creating and maintaining fenced in dog play area's.

Sincerely,

Best,

Andreas Wieder

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6028	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:50:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I walk my dogs in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) almost every day.

I strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement.

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

The objective of having designated recreation areas is to provide open space for recreation for all residents. I am careful not to take my dogs into areas currently off limits in the GGNRA, and keep them on lead in areas that require it. But off-leash areas are essential for the health of dogs. The tiny back yards in San Francisco don't begin to provide enough space. And the transit first, dense urban planning (of which I wholeheartedly approve) depends on access to public space for recreation - including for dog owners.

The new plan clearly has not been significantly modified in response the substantive concerns and objections of thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with continued off-leash areas on current GGNRA lands, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

We need more (not less) areas for safe, healthy, off-leash recreation.

Sincerely,  
Rhodes Klement

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6029	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:51:05				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog Ramone for my own health and my dog's health the way I have daily at Crissy Field's Middle Beach, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Mason, or Fort Funston for the past eight years without any incidents.				

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. Like many current dog parks they will give owners who lack control of their dogs the ability to take them off leash causing much more problems for other dogs under voice command, and for visitors.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan lacks any acknowledgement of it's impact on other areas. The GGNRA plan has not adequately studied how dispersion will affect local communities, neighborhood parks, and their preferred dog recreation areas due to overcrowding. I myself do not frequent my city parks with my dog under voice command because they are too crowded, there's not enough room to exercise, and they're not at all relaxing.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a Recreation Area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in

1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with current off-leash areas, and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Emily Sheppard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6030    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:51:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I hope you will reconsider the drastic reduction in off leash recreation. The walk I have in the early morning with my two small dogs is one of my greatest pleasures. I remember that when this area was established it was intended as off leash for dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6031    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Orinda, CA 94563  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:52:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to support the proposed GGNRA plan to limit dog accessible areas for the protection of wildlife and enjoyment of people who would rather not be forced to interact with dogs.

I have owned dogs and very much appreciate the valuable companionship they provide, but have always felt that ownership brings a responsibility to prevent imposition on others in society, including not giving concern to those who may not be comfortable around a dog and ensuring that there be no adverse impact on public places, including no disturbance of any kind of other creatures. I understand this means critical areas must be totally off limits to dogs, had no problem with that when with my dog and expect other owners to respect that as well. The suggestion that dogs can be adequately controlled is a fiction, both in theory- -very few dogs actually obey- -and practice- -very few owners bother to even try. This past weekend I was on public beaches in San Mateo county where most dogs were running free in front of signs clearly requiring leashes on all.

I hope you will realize that the rabid opposition from some dog owners does not represent the interests of the vast majority of park users or the long term health of the parks and values they are intended to preserve for all to enjoy. Limit dog access areas clearly, protect the birds and other wildlife and enforce the restrictions when violated.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6032    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:52:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Please do not penalize those of us who control our dogs. Keep Funsron leach free.

Use currently existing regulation to police the bad behavior.

David Campbell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6033    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:53:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Annalisa Joecks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6034    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Auburn, CA 95604  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:53:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for accepting comments on this important issue.

The primary issue is not and should not be whether someone has a right to bring a dog to an ecologically sensitive area or not, and/or whether someone's dog can be in a park/recreation area and be on or off leash. Instead, the primary issue must be whether a National Park or National Recreation Area has the right to protect the natural resources and the ecological balances from negative impacts, no matter how large or small they may be, or may be perceived.

GGNRA governing officials and scientist must take ever precautionary step to protect the GGNRA's

---

resources. If this means either having no dogs in area(s) at all, or having dogs only in specifically designated areas, then the GGNRA should have full authority to issue such a regulations and be given the power to fully enforce them.

The secondary issue comes about IF, and only if, GGNRA governing officials determine that the presence of dogs in a specific area will not have a negative impact. Then it behooves the GGNRA to insist that as a concession to allowing dogs, that every dog must be totally under control via being on leash. A four-year old 70 lb child holding the leash of a 125 lb dog is NOT an indicator of being fully under control. Voice control should never be allowed any more than allowing someone to drive 100 mph in a 45 mph speed zone because he/she has the vehicle "under control."

We urge regulations to (1) support GGNRA in any decisions as to protecting the natural resources that may be negatively impacted by various types of activities; and (2) stop all off-leash activities of any kind in our National Recreation Areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6035	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:54:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lisa Braun

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6036	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Representative Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 17:54:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** As a business owner in this city and a dog owner, I strongly protest the possibility of ending dogs off leash in our parks. It is hard enough to find homes for all the unwanted dogs in the city and to limit the ability to take them out to play and run just sounds plain crazy to me. I love taking my dogs to Fort Funston on the Beach and always take them to off leash areas. Thank you, Carole Lennon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6037    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:54:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

I would like to voice my concern for the loss of off-leash areas for dogs in the GGNRA. In particular, I routinely use Fort Funston for recreation with my dog Baxter (always in a responsible way, respectful of plants, wildlife, and other people).

One of the things that makes San Francisco a unique and great place to live is that there are many beautiful places that can be fully enjoyed with our dogs because of the wide off-leash access. In most metropolitan areas, dog lovers who want to live in the city have to sacrifice the joy of sharing nature with their pets in a pure and free way. I love that I can enjoy the benefits of urban living, including the lower per-capita carbon footprint of cities over rural and suburban areas, and still have the opportunity to escape to nature with my dog, unencumbered by strict leash laws.

If San Francisco became like all the other cities with highly restrictive dog policies, the life that I chose when I moved here would no longer exist. And I know the same is true for many of my friends and colleagues.

Please don't restrict the freedoms of responsible dog owners in a misguided effort to address the behavior of irresponsible ones. Let's find a way to enforce the restrictions that matter, so everyone can enjoy what makes this place great.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6038    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:55:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



Sincerely,  
John Burton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6039    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 17:58:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the

GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6040    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco , CA 94141  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:00:20

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I've been a Dog Walker for over a year & feel VERY strongly that you consider a 'more' dog friendly agenda to the GGNRA Dog Management Plan. I often use the Crissy Field BECAUSE it was created to be an off-leash park & it's purpose perfectly meets my needs & that of the company I work for. In my time as a Dog Walker I've NEVER had a problem with another dog or their walker, in fact just the opposite - I feel overall we police the area ourselves very well & in no way do I feel \$2,000,000 should be used in support of more rangers. There are certainly many other areas that would benefit from those funds like MORE parking! There's not enough off leash areas as it is & if people without dogs want an area to go - there are MANY places already for them & if people are afraid of dogs - they should go to those areas NOT designed & set aside for Dogs. Sure, there have been a few complaints & problems but there's no perfect place. I think it's important to remember that the number of complaints about people (visitors) out weigh those about dogs. When I have a dog that poops, when I pick it up (& I always do) I go out of my way to pickup nearby trash left by visitors - most Dog Walkers do that - because they are already picking something up. The area's are safe for people using common sense. You can spend all kinds of money putting up fences, etc but if someone is going to be foolish enough to walk near the edge of a cliff, those are the same people that would consider the fence inviting & want to jump it!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6041    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** King City, CA 93930  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Please do not restrict off leash areas! This is one of the few areas left where people and dogs can enjoy the beach together. I know I will visit less often if I am forced to leave my pets at home. Please don't take money out of the hands of your city by limiting visitors.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome. These packed in areas cause more issues than they solve. They are usually gross and unpleasant places to visit. I avoid them at all costs.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Making more restrictions will only raise the number of non-compliant pet owners.

Sincerely,  
Cristin McKee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6042	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,Elizabeth Ramirez

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6043	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SF, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:04:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6044    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:07:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6045    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:07:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Of course, I want to protect any species not just the Snowy Plover. feel the dogs should be able to run around but I don't feel they should terrorize the Plovers or any other species.

Not all dogs are out of control, in fact, the majority of the dogs are very well behaved. It is not the dogs fault but their human owners faults for not controlling their pet. These are also the same people who do not pick up the dogs feces or if they do they leave the little bag on the beach instead of walking it to the garbage can.

Here, is my problem with passing the no dog zone, having the leash law etc., the laws are only as good as their enforcement. This means that the public shouldn't have to tell others they are breaking the law or public shouldn't have to call the GGNRA to have a patrol officer come out to ticket them.

What it means is if you're going to add the NO DOG ZONE ALONG WITH THE LEASH LAW then you NEED to hire more officers or have the officers make their presence known on the beach and other areas the law will impact so they can warn, ticket or arrest.

Thank you,  
a Native San Franciscan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6046    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** SF Resident Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:07:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** We fully support the dog management plan as proposed. We have lived across the street from Sutro Forest for over 50 years and had a dog for at least 40 of those years but are appalled by and are not in sympathy with the strident arguments of the SF dog lobby. Allowing dogs to run freely is inconsistent with protection of park resources. You must not be intimidated by their clamorous behavior.

Robert and Beatrice Laws

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6047    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Chico, CA 95928  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:08:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have used GGNRA for many years to give my dogs much needed off-leash activity. Canine access to these lands is a huge part of what makes the San Francisco Bay Area such a wonderful place to visit, to live, and to play, and, quite frankly, implementing the drastic changes proposed in the GGNRA's new Draft Dog Management Plan would completely change my life and the lives of my beloved pups. While I don't reside in the Bay Area, I spend a great deal of time there largely because of the fabulous off-leash areas. I clean up after my dogs, I never allow them in areas designated off-limits, nor do I ever allow them to bother anyone. And judging by the many lit up faces I encounter in response to my happy canines, it appears the general public thoroughly enjoys sharing the natural beauty of the GGNRA with dogs. I have a deep concern for protecting the environment and I use GGNRA lands with the utmost respect and responsibility. So why am I, my dogs, and many others like me, being punished? It is my strong belief that making nature off-limits is not the answer to environmental issues. Rather, educating the public about the importance of preserving the environment and teaching them methods to achieve this should be the goal. Irresponsible people without dogs cause damage, not responsible people with dogs. I believe the GGNRA is completely missing its purpose, which is to provide a place for public recreation in an urban area that happens to be home to many dogs and the people who love them and value their companionship. Forcing dogs to live their lives at the end of a leash is inhumane. And the very real concern that dogs need to be able to socialize and play in off-leash areas in order to be well-adjusted canine citizens should be given serious thought, as it is of particular significance in a densely populated setting such as San Francisco. The clear thinking people behind the original 1979 Pet Policy, which allows for off-leash activity on beaches and trails throughout the area, got it right. I adamantly oppose the new Draft Dog Management Plan and adamantly support formalizing the 1979 Pet Policy, as well as adding off-leash

areas in San Mateo County and providing off-leash areas on new lands the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Respectfully,  
Patricia Inman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6048    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:10:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a long time resident of San Francisco and a dog owner, I strongly urge the NPS and GGNRA to adhere to the 1979 dog policy. All other offered alternatives are unacceptable and fail to fulfill the recreational goals for which the GGNRA was created in the first place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6049    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94705  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:12:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 35 years ago I joined with other citizen volunteers to create responsible off-leash dog parks at Point Isabel in Richmond and at Cesar Chavez Dog Park at the former Berkeley city dump. These parks are models of success today. Well-exercised dogs and their people are healthy and better adjusted. Responsible dog people recognize that safe, off-leash freedom in our crowded parks and beaches comes with requirements: dog training and socialization, cleaning up all waste, respecting others' rights and well-being. Point Isabel and Cesar Chavez improve these behaviors and promote community consciousness.

We agree that the GGNRA is unique: a natural gem in an urban region- -the heart and lungs of our connected cities. We must not only preserve this rare natural resource, but we must also balance the needs of all constituents. If 50% o Bay Area households include dogs, we must preserve accessible open space in our counties, especially at urban beaches. The current plan is far too restrictive, especially for Marin and San Mateo counties. Dog people with cars will have to drive farther for off-leash exercise, making regional traffic worse and greatly impacting the remaining off-leash areas. Please do not vote for the plan as it is currently configured. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6050    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:13:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is

way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sidney Tarlow

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6051	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:15:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a dog-owner and resident of San Francisco, I hope you reconsider the plan to eliminate off-leash dog-walking areas! There are few enough places now; please don't shut down those too. I think it would be great if there were MORE areas (especially fenced-in areas) where people could let their dogs run.				

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6052	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:15:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Peter Wan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6053    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Thanks for the work you do!

As you know, pets are now seen in a more broader sense as companions for healing for many in our communities. As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6054    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Private Citizen/CrissyFieldDogGroup Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:18:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To All Persons involved in proposing and implementing unreasonable reductions of dog off leash areas.

My personal history is as a worker and user of the GGNRA. Dogs are not a worthy subject of review. The percentage of what problems they cause through out the years are fractional compared to other important topics such as: money saving, safety issues, environmental impacts, inner city youth exclusion, corrupt contractors and NPS officials not hold accountable for the duties they are responsible to perform for the



GGNRA.

As a dog owner for the last 14 years I have been to all of the areas that are available. In all of these years very little has changed. That is said in the best possible way. The only thing that has changed is the Management and where the money/funds come from. I feel with each new onset of players that there is a hidden agenda to rid the GGNRA OF THE REGULARS WITH DOGS WHO MAINTAIN A CARING CONSTANT PRESENTS DAILY.

Please consider scraping all of these proposals. Start a more people/dog friendly conversation. Open up your sources of findings, information, research and science from more well versed avenues for future actions.

The joy of a dog swimming, running and enjoying the same places I do is why I live here, pay taxes here, and support any dog off leash areas.

Thank you, DAB

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6055    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:19:49

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** For about fifteen years, I have observed the impact on our parks, and specifically GGNRA, by off-leash dogs. I have also witnessed many dog-owners behave with careless disregard for whatever dog use rules might apply in a given situation. I have concluded that enclosed off-leash dog areas are the best way to keep pets, people, and plovors (as well as other wildlife) safe from harm. The other solutions tried, which allow, for example, for owner discretion, or for off-leash dogs in designated open spaces, or for timed use, simply do not work to protect people, pets, wildlife and the environment. It seems that very specific, enclosed areas will clarify the situation. Enforcement becomes pretty obvious. If outside an enclosed area, the off-leash dog must be considered in violation, a ticket issued.

I have watched countless moments when handicapped people, children, other pets, as well as birds, are frightened by roving off-leash dogs. I also watch the degradation of the ground and ground cover by uncontrolled dogs.

It is time for the final plans to roll out, time for enclosed areas only for off-leash dog recreation. The GGNRA belongs to all of us, it is a natural gem that must be safe-guarded.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6056    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:24:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Sienna Rogers, I live just a few blocks from the Presidio in San Francisco and have been a resident of San Francisco for over 10 years. Two years ago I adopted a dog from the SPCA. Both before then and now even more, I have been a frequent walker, runner, hiker, and biker at many of the locations throughout the GGNRA. It is a wonderful resource for all bay area residents and I am grateful for all the work and investment the community and the park service invest in this resource. It is one of the principle reasons I love living in the Bay Area.

As a user of the GGNRA prior to having a dog, I never felt a conflict or observed any conflict with

---

different stakeholders. I personally hope you will find that off leash dog areas are sustainable and acceptable in most of the areas that currently permit off leash activities.

Since adopting my dog, I have found myself out in substantially all of the GGNRA parks even more. Being a dog owner has enhanced my sense of community and I've met and engaged with countless other dog owners as well as hikers and runners in the GGNRA and in my neighborhood.

I believe protecting our environment should be a high priority for our community, however, I encourage you to ensure that the policies implemented in the plan for the GGNRA don't overly rely on perceptions or assumptions about impacts of dogs on the GGNRA. Any decisions that would have a significant impact on the availability of this immense resource should be based on sound scientific evidence and process. I also encourage you to think creatively, and potentially institute pilot programs that try to maximize the benefits of all users while reducing risk to the environment and the visitors and bay area residents as well as our canine companions.

Thank you for taking my comments.

Sienna

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6057	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Union City, CA 94587 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:25:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Randy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6058	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:25:54**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I live in San Francisco and take my dog to the Presidio and Chrissy Field regularly.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative and feel it is too restrictive, and in fact will likely create more dangerous situations in our parks for people and their pets. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I am specifically opposed to fencing surrounding or delineating any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Penning in animals and their owners will make visitors unwelcome, and I feel will also make off leash areas less safe.

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

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

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6059 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Edmonton, UN T5A 3R1  
Canada**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:26:53**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** A close friend of mine lives with her dog in San Fransisco. I'm not sure if you're aware, but humans are not meant to live in cities - we were built to walk on dirt not pavement, to breathe pure air, to see the stars in the sky. The human body is designed to walk at least 10, 000 steps per day. For some people, the only walking they get to do is when they take their pet outside. If you reduce the places available for people to take their pets for fresh air and exercise then you are depriving people of an essential experience that enhances their lives and makes modern city living bearable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6060 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:27:19**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6061    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:28:57  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Story Rafter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6062    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:31:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The preferred alternative would unfairly discriminate against disabled and senior recreational access by unreasonably enforcing a six foot limit on leash length. For seniors and disabled persons there needs to be greater flexibility in the tether, such as either voice control or the popular retractable leashes. Having recently suffered a neck injury I have found that even with my well-trained dog I can not comfortably walk with a fixed length shorter leash without experiencing occasional painful and damaging pulls on the leash. Consequently I think that the Park Service should accommodate disabled and senior access by allowing use of retractable leashes greater than six feet in length in some portions of the Recreation Area..

I think plan unreasonably tries to fit a one size fits all approach to the park Obviously, in some parts the

key factor is congestion and human interaction with dogs. In such areas longer length retractable leashes may be less of a favorable alternative than in less congested beach areas where the Park Service presumably identifies the key factor to be wildlife interaction with dogs.

The Park Service preferred alternative fails to consider less restrictive alternatives that would achieve the goals that the Park service articulates for certain beach areas. For example as to Ocean Beach the Park Service asserts that it needs to separate dogs from birds. However, a short six foot leash is not the least restrictive alternative. A longer leash or retractable leash would still allow some individuals to walk on the beach, as would voice control. Similarly the Park Service could largely achieve the same presumed wildlife protection goals by simply enforcing a ban on any dogs being allowed within 50 or 75 feet of a bird. Alternatively the Park service could in the interim test a program of certifying people with well trained voice control proven dogs for off leash recreation in some areas.

A total ban on walking dogs on Ocean Beach, even if it were enforceable, would likely have marginal impact on wildlife and fails the balancing test when analyzing any potential benefit in comparison much greater downside impact on recreational access. The Park Service purports to want to ban off leash beach walking to encourage the snowy plover population but fails to apply a proportionately different approach to areas with the least chance of plover presence. Particularly, the beach area south Sloat Ave is not known to have many plovers and is largely free of tourists. It is a traditional area for off leash dog walking and adjoins Ford Funston which is also a traditional off leash area. There is an advantage in park planning to allow for contiguous areas so that enthusiasts can enjoy longer recreational access experiences. This would be a perfect area to allow continued off leash access, even if the Park service insists on making the mistake of overly restricting off leash access in other areas.

If the Park Service wishes to engage in a more balanced public policy evaluation, and fairly consider the best locations for public access, the Park Service should evaluate all possibilities and paint on a full canvass evaluating all potential sites for dog walking recreational access rather than arbitrarily limiting the areas under consideration and only considering alternatives restricting access further. Such an arbitrary approach limiting the potential for the best public input is all the more a problem when it is clear that the overwhelming public opinion is that the Park Service should consider expanding access.

The Park Service needs to have an unbiased review of the costs vs. benefit consideration of the proposals. 34 years ago the Citizens Advisory Committee made a reasoned evaluation and determination of the best areas to locate off leash access with the least impairment of resources. Making a change off the prior sound analysis will be exceedingly costly and have little environmental or social policy benefit, if any. I, like many, believe it will actually have adverse impact on the people, and also will be adverse to the Park Service. Such expensive and likely contentious changes should not be made absent a clear showing of benefit. Here, there is a great debate over whether there is any benefit at all. Hence the proposal does not meet the most basic test of cost-benefit-risk analysis.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6063	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Staten Island , NY 10301 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

---

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Christine Ferragano

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6064	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I am a native Marin resident who, for most of my life, has had a dog.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach to run and play and we also hike the Miwok and Coastal trails. This is a long established part of my recreational activity. One of the truly great aspect of living in this area is the access to this urban recreation area. i do not look to the GGNRA to provide me a Yosemite, Yellowstone, ZION, Grande Canyon,.....etc wilderness experience. We live nested among 6-7 million residents with in a virtual stones throw. i look to the GGNRA to fulfill it's promise as a place where we the people of this area can benefit from the varied, urban recreational access we have to these open natural spaces. Bringing my dog along is a part of it.

Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions on the publics use of our public lands.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,  
Charles Kingsbury

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6065	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections for which I previously wrote and of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Statements like "dogs impact the habitat of California's Humpback Whales" is a case in point.

The GGNRA has lost sight of the fact that the Bay Area Parks are set in a densely populated, urban area while most of the parks like Yosemite and Yellowstone do not have the close population that the Bay Area has. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I currently am part of a task force for Burlingame/Hillsborough looking to revamp the dog parks, but if the dogs are unable to be off lease such as you are planning, the dog parks will be over run with too many dogs and puts all the animals at risk for disease.

There are many avenues to generate additional income to assist with some of the concerns that citizens against dogs and your department have raised. I implore you to be open to other options.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6066 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Jose, CA 95112  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. IN FACT, I TRAVEL TO YOUR RECREATION REGULARILY SPECIFICALLY TO LET MY DOG RUN OFF LEASH. I WILL NOT VISIT IF I CANNOT DO THIS. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet

policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6067    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:37:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is exceedingly restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for the past 15 years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in Marin County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Mill Valley Resident

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6068    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:37:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi there,

My name is Kiley Nichols and my husband and I live in SF and are weekly visitors of Crissy Field. As the owners of a high energy Italian Greyhound mix, the off leash areas at Crissy Field have been very important to us, not just for an exercise standpoint, but also for Penny's ongoing training. She is trained to stay near us, avoid other dogs and people unless we give her permission to "say hi." This isn't something we could have accomplished without access to off-leash dog walking areas.

For this reason, I am writing to express my significant opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It restricts the area to off leash dog walking way too strictly and will have detrimental effects on both my health and that of my dog.



Further, the language used in the plan - what "might," "can," or "could" happen - is too vague and does not provide specific instances of these events/impacts happening. There has been no research published or conducted by the GGNRA to support the restrictions mentioned in the plan. It is simply not based in fact.

Finally, the fences proposed over off-leash recreational areas can and will do more harm than lack of fences. If areas of fenced off, owners who do not properly train their dogs will feel entitled to let them roam free and dogs that are trained by voice commands will suffer as will their owners. This will be seen as an excuse to let their dogs run without supervision, which is not a solution, but the creation of another problem.

The GGNRA was given jurisdiction over this areas under the promise/agreement that the area was to be used for public recreation in a highly dense urban environment and the measures mentioned in the new draft dog management plan do not align with those wishes. I strongly oppose this new plan and do not want to see it put into action.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6069	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:37:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please don't cut down the areas where dogs are allowed to be off leash. The few beach areas that currently allow off leash dogs are wonderful!! Please don't reduce the areas where dogs can run free or play fetch! Thanks!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6070	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

---

My dog is too old now to walk regularly in the GGNRA, but in his youth we went almost daily. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

The needs of wildlife and residents must be balanced, and I don't believe that the "preferred alternative" does so.

Its severe restrictions will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The R in GGNRA is for RECREATION. San Francisco was never a verdant wonderland: it was a city of sand dunes and swampland that have been already changed forever by human use. I believe strongly in preserving natural areas that are still wild, but it seems short-sighted to try to return urban parks such as Ocean Beach to a "wild" state where people and their pets are not welcome to exercise or relax.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am disgusted with the pattern you've adopted so far, which seems to avoid real engagement and ignore the will of the people.

Sincerely and apprehensively,

Kelly Ryer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6071	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:39:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ray Kuhn

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6072	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Caroline Kwan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6073	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** My name is Andras Petery and I live at 2232 Divisadero Street in San Francisco where my service dog, Cu Chulainn, and I responsibly enjoy off-leash walks in our local neighborhood park, Alta Park, and Chrissy Field multiple times per week. I am writing to express my deep concern and opposition to the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. Specifically, my concerns are based on the following:

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Optional Points to Make (choose as many or as few as you want):

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits

the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A /supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Sincerely,  
Andras Petery

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6074	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Jose , CA 95116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:41:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
  
Simran Klair

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6075    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:43:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Katherine Yarbrough

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6076    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:43:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of Pacifica, and a dog owner as well as an equestrian. I enjoy recreating on Rancho Corral de Tierra land on an almost daily basis - and have done so for the past nine years. Because I spend most of my time on the part of Rancho land that lies between Montara and McNee Ranch State Park, my comments are specific to that area.

I support Alternative A for this area. No rationale has been presented for banning leashed dogs from so many trails, as proposed by the preferred Alternative F. Hikers, cyclists, and equestrians are allowed on those trails. Why would a dog on a six foot leash be more harmful to the environment than any other user group?

On the other hand, I am very much opposed to any Alternative that would officially allow "ROLA" dog walking in this specific area. The Old Pedro Mountain Road trail is the only non-motorized route between Montara and McNee Ranch State Park. As a broad, paved, and relatively flat trail, it is heavily used by hikers, joggers, cyclists, and equestrians. It is frequently used by school groups, as well as families with children in strollers or riding their first bikes.

In the past, the area has primarily been used for recreation by local residents. Those who chose to exercise their dogs off leash practiced courtesy to other users, and problems were rare. Times have changed since opening of the Devil's Slide Tunnel, as well as greater awareness of the area due to becoming part of GGNRA. The result has been a large influx of users who cannot control their dogs, and (apparently) see no reason why they should.

Every outing now involves being run at by unrestrained dogs. While these animals may have friendly intentions, that is not enough to ensure the safety of other users. I won't walk my own dog on leash there anymore - having been charged, attacked, and bitten by a loose dog (in another area), he doesn't like unrestrained dogs running up to him. While on horseback, I have been confronted by multiple loose, unfriendly dogs, with no owner in sight or earshot of my calls for help. I have also been verbally abused for asking people to stop their dog running around my horse's feet - despite my expressed concern for the safety of their dog!

All of the current issues are occurring despite the threat of expensive federal tickets for leash violations. GGNRA has not demonstrated any capacity for sensible enforcement of existing laws; rangers either rigidly enforce leash laws or (for the most part) are completely absent from the scene. Why would anyone expect ROLA enforcement to be any better? At least under the current regulations all park users can understand that those who choose to take their chances and violate leash laws risk facing legal sanctions as well as liability for any injuries or property damage caused by the actions of their uncontrolled pets.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6077	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:45:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Kelly M. Gordon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6078    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:46:03

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please, do not take away these beautiful areas away from us and our dogs! Some of the best times when I was a teenager was walking around Fort Funston, wishing I had a dog and then taking my own beloved German Shepherd mix around there when we finally adopted him. Crissy Field is so vast and such a wonderful area for all people, families, seniors, teenagers, school groups and especially dog owners to come and enjoy the splendor of San Francisco.

Do not take these areas away from us dog owners. Next, will you ban children from the parks as well?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6079    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly both with and without my dog on the beaches and trails within GGNRA borders, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's newest version of the Draft Dog Management Plan. The newest proposals remain way too restrictive and violate the purpose and intent with which these lands were deeded to the GGNRA by our local governments.

The GGNRA's preferred alternate will prevent me from recreating for my own health in the way I have on GGNRA properties for over 20 years - for which I have caused, I might add, no more adverse affect on these properties or the local environment than have my fellow hikers, joggers, bicyclists, hang gliders or windsurfers who use the same beaches and trails. My use needs no more legislation than theirs, and all are within the parameters of the recreational use for which these properties were set aside.

The DEIS received thousands of comments with the majority opposed to the preferred plans, yet there is little change between the DEIS and the newer SEIS, and in many cases the changes are even worse than the original proposal:

â€ The SEIS continually quotes from comments received that uphold its own viewpoint that dog walking is a negative use, yet fails to quote the much higher percentage of comments that refute the plan's proposals and uphold the validity of existing uses and the lack of need for any change.

â€ The proposal to install fencing to designate dog accessible areas is unacceptable for a multi-use nature-based recreational area. What is next, fenced children's areas, fenced windsurfing zones, fenced bicycle paths? No one wants to see a singular use "dog park" within Crissy Field or other parklands.

While I can understand and would even accept a timed-use plan for the East Beach at Crissy Field, I can see no scientific, social or necessary purpose provided by any well-researched documents that would require any changes to dog walking access anywhere else on Crissy Field. And the SEIS provided nothing to prove otherwise.

â€ There is no verified study within your documents showing what the environmental consequences will be from forcing tens of thousands of current users into less than 1/4 of the area currently accessible to dog walking. With NO beaches available in San Mateo County properties, and only one off-leash beach remaining in Marin County, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach and Fort Funston would see even higher dog walking use within a much smaller footprint.

â€ The issue of how having less access will affect local municipal parks has been swept away as negligible within the report, however no additional study was done as was requested by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. The only parks mentioned as taking up the overflow from the GGNRA are designated dog parks, but the affects will be on closer proximity parks such as the Marina Green, the Palace of Fine Arts, Moscone Park, and Mountain Lake Park. The impact on these properties will be significant with less access to traditional dog walking areas in the GGNRA, yet has not been addressed.

â€ Claims by Mr. Dean himself that dog-related incidents are the largest percentage of complaints received by the GGNRA are not supported by either the data provided in the DEIS or SEIS, or by the the most recent data (2013-2013) released by the GGNRA. Out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs last year alone, there have only been 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing, and 1 horse bite incident documented. However, the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the reported necessity for any change in policy.

â€ The request for \$2,000,000 for more rangers to implement the dog management plan would be much better spent on simply enforcing the existing 1979 Pet Policy and on new educational and dog-friendly park programs, as well as supporting the existing infrastructure used by all park visitors.

Quite simply, the GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was legislated as a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area, NOT as a national park. These trails and beaches have allowed for dog walking since before the original Pet Policy of 1979. A Federal Panel concluded in its November 2002 recommendation that it would be appropriate to create a Section Seven Special Regulation to allow off-leash recreation in the GGNRA. At that time, the GGNRA could have instituted the 1979 Pet Policy as the Section Seven Special Regulation for the GGNRA. Instead, they decided to institute Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) to create a new pet management policy for the GGNRA based on will, not science or necessity.

No change in existing policy is the only alternative that I support. The 1979 Pet Policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on any new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. Recreation is the purpose of the GGNRA. Let's keep it that way.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6080	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94703 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:46:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** The off-leash areas to be affected make the Bay Area one of the last great bastions for dog-lovers.

Do not take these precious resources away.

Respectfully,

Jason George  
Berkeley, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6081	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:46:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Marcia N

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6082	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Dog owner Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:47:29				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This plan isn't reasonable. Our dogs need space to run. This plan will only cause angry conflicts in parks where people should be doing healthy things. The people working in these areas will take the brunt of the public's anger if this is enforced. Everybody loses under this plan.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6083	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:49:04**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Victor L. Sepulveda

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6084 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Santa Cruz, CA 95062  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:49:35**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dogs do not belong in public parks. Perhaps in some urban settings where there are paths, dogs could be allowed on leash. However, for most areas where there are trails through nature areas, dogs are non-native species that upset the natural wildlife. From an environmental standpoint, dogs belong in their own yards, not on public lands. Dogs by their nature harass other wildlife, especially when off-leash, so this is in direct contradiction to the premise of a park where people can enjoy a natural setting.

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

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6085 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My wife wrote the following eloquent expression of the short sighted decisions that GGNRA managers have engaged in during the comment period. I wholeheartedly support her sentiment and statement of facts.

- - -

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My dog is too old now to walk regularly in the GGNRA, but in his youth we went almost daily. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

The needs of wildlife and residents must be balanced, and I don't believe that the "preferred alternative" does so.

Its severe restrictions will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The R in GGNRA is for RECREATION. San Francisco was never a verdant wonderland: it was a city of sand dunes and swampland that have been already changed forever by human use. I believe strongly in preserving natural areas that are still wild, but it seems short-sighted to try to return urban parks such as Ocean Beach to a "wild" state where people and their pets are not welcome to exercise or relax.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am disgusted with the pattern you've adopted so far, which seems to avoid real engagement and ignore the will of the people.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6086	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:51:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I oppose the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. As someone who regularly walks, runs, and picnic's with my partner and her dog in these areas, the plan would severely impact our use and enjoyment of these areas. It is already hard enough finding a place where we can go to run with the dog, and this new plan will make it even more difficult.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6087	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:52:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** In the draft report, a section on Park Operations states that " Park staff, time, and money would be needed to manage any existing or future dog policies." While this statement is obviously true, it says nothing about the need for a change from the present dog management policy to a new dog management policy. The statement applies equally to both the present and the proposed policy. I expected the report to provide a comparative analysis of the staff time use under the present and the proposed policy. So, I kept reading...

In chapter 2, the report describes the expected costs of implementation of the various options. Option A, which is the "no action" option currently costs approximately \$430K. I assume that these are the annual costs for the staff and materials associated with the operations for the present policy. For each of the other alternatives, the report estimates implementation costs of between \$2M and \$3M, with the added costs associated with "hiring of additional personnel for implementing the dog management plan". These added staff are presumably permanent. Based on this set of statements, it seems true that the proposed changes to the operations are all at least 5X more expensive than the supervision of the current policy because of the significant increase in staff needed to impose and manage the new policy.

So, if I understand this correctly, the Park Service is interested in imposing new rules and regulations that will severely limit the use of the GGNRA by the local population, and will need a 5x increase in staff in order to implement and enforce these new restrictive policies. A consequence of this proposal will be 5X more park service staff wandering about in the GGNRA writing tickets and otherwise interfering with the use of the park by a smaller and smaller number of citizens.

As a taxpayer, and a user of the GGNRA under the present policies, I am strongly opposed to any plan which costs the taxpayer significantly more money and provides significantly less benefit.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6088	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 18:52:40				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6089    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:54:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

Please don't take any action to change the current environment that exists in our beloved GGNRA. As citizens of these counties and as dog lovers - these are our beaches and trails and open spaces, and we respect them, and steward them with the utmost respect for the land and all forms of life there. It's vital that these recreation areas remain unmolested by more rules and fences, and less access for the citizens of the counties that ceded these areas to the NPS.

I think House Minority leader Nancy Pelosi stated it eloquently and succinctly in her letter to you, as stated in the San Francisco Chronicle (12/03/2013):

"Our city is named for Saint Francis of Assisi, patron saint of animals and the environment," wrote the congresswoman. "There is a long history of off-leash dog recreation in San Francisco which began before the transfer of land from the city and county of San Francisco to the National Park Service. Responsible dog guardians must continue to enjoy recreational activities with their pets in our spectacular setting."

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Edward O'Connell  
Tiburon, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6090    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Veronique Lauriault

---

332 Hill Street  
San Francisco, CA 94114

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6091    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:55:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing to comment on the GGNRA Dog Management plan. I have reviewed the document and would like to add my support for less restriction on dog accessible areas within the park system. My family, which includes our dog love to visit and contribute to the GGNRA park system. We feel that families with dogs deserve places to let dogs run free and enjoy nature as much as any other animal. Certainly they should be given equal access as those places as horses. Please do whatever is possible to retain the access that dogs currently enjoy. If there are problem dogs, the owners should be responsible for them and laws should be enforced enforced as appropriate. Don't discriminate against dogs and their owners who abide by established rules and policies.

Thank you,

Michael Lee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6092    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Carlos, CA 94070  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I very strongly oppose the plan put forth by the GGNRA to ban dogs from Muir Beach as well as from the hiking trails. Not only will this harm local businesses that I currently frequent when I take my dog to these locations, but it will also concentrate more dog owners to fewer places, increasing congestion and causing over-use.

I also strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and the Coastal trail.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,

Harald Loeffler

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6093    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:56:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a San Francisco resident whose dog regularly frequents Crissy Field, Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. More importantly, I am vehemently against a proposal that would limit off-leash dog areas. Particularly given the lack of supporting evidence to justify such a change, and the dramatic affect it would have on dog owners who utilize the space to permit their dogs to get exercise, it appears prudent to permit the off-leash areas to remain as is.  
Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6094    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:56:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely  
Sarah Schumm

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6095    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Chelsea Curry

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6096    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930-1520  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:57:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I'd like to see the GGNRA keep Plan A.  
Our dogs need open areas to run.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6097    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Patricia

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6098    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---



**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 18:57:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kristi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6099    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94608  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Kevin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6100    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94110  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

As a dog owner we need designated locations to take our dogs for them to run off leash to properly exercise and experience the outdoors. It is in these moments as a dog owner when my dog and I are able to run free in open space that I most enjoy GGNRA properties. For years I have chosen to donate to GGNRA parks to support these beautiful properties that allow dogs off leash. If GGNRA applies this new management plan, I will no longer visit these properties or donate to them. I strongly urge you to reconsider removing the privilege of these dog friendly areas.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Krista McDonald

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6101    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:00:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA Superintendent:

I live in San Francisco and regularly walk with my dog at Fort Funston and Ocean Beach, and occasionally at Muir Beach and along the Miwok trail. I also run at Crissy Field and mountain bike in the Marin Headlands. The comments I am submitting today are from my personal experience as a frequent user of these recreational areas and my response after carefully reviewing the draft supplemental plan.

On a related note, I had submitted comments to the draft plan in 2011 and I am disappointed that the current plan did not address my significant concerns. If there is any question that people who use these recreational areas and their political representatives want to be heard and taken seriously, please see the letter from U.S. Representative Nancy Pelosi to GGNRA Superintendent Frank Dean on December 2, 2013 asking that Comments from the community not only be reviewed, but carefully considered and incorporated into the final dog management rules.

My overall comment is that the Preferred Alternative is too restrictive and I oppose it at all recreational units in the GGNRA. There is no justification in the EIS for such major changes. I urge you to formalize the 1979 Pet Policy and add reasonable and adequate off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am opposed to the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the previous Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The strategy is still based largely on compliance with leash restrictions and there are no thresholds for violations or other conditions that would trigger any change in status even if on a temporary basis. The plan allows the GGNRA to unilaterally make additional closures without providing meaningful descriptions of the conditions and metrics that would warrant such actions; these changes in use would not be subject to a requirement that public review and input be obtained. Any compliance based plan needs to be adequately developed with sufficient detail to enable meaningful public comment.

After almost three years and two draft plans comprising a combined 4,300 pages, where is the scientific study conducted at Fort Funston or any other recreational unit in the GGNRA? There are few, if any, scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so the plan cites anecdotal observations of impacts made by National Park Service Staff. However these anecdotal claims have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc. - and cannot be used to set policy. An EIS is expected to be based on science, not anecdote.

Fort Funston is arguably the most popular place for dog walking and the plan to eliminate the vast majority of space for off-leash access and condense dogs into small areas is dangerous. There is no rationale and it could set up confrontations between dogs as well as people in small places. Furthermore, there is no justification for cutting off beach access between Fort Funston and Ocean Beach. Why would you want to do that? The plan cites two protected species at Fort Funston, the state threatened Bank Swallow (State) and the federally and state threatened San Francisco lessingia. However, there is no evidence that dogs or humans for that matter affect the swallow and the lessingia does not exist at Funston.

Your data still does not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. Even the total number of dog-related incidents (nearly all of which were for having dogs off-leash where they weren't supposed to be) from 2001 to 2011 - 4,932 - represent a tiny fraction of the million dog visits each year (p. 252). The vast majority of incidents (at least 89%) the GGNRA involve people without dogs, including murder, rape, robbery, drugs, and larceny. People are the safety problem in the GGNRA, not dogs.

Why does the GGNRA refuse to acknowledge these lands are national recreation areas and they are to be managed differently than a back country remote wilderness of a National Park? You misrepresent the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA: the purpose is to offer a national park experience to a large and diverse urban population (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space (Enabling legislation, first paragraph).

I fully support the letter from Ken Weiner to GGNRA Superintendent Frank Dean on February 14, 2014 that says the GGNRA dog management draft plan and supplemental EIS contains serious bias and lack of objective analysis. His letter clearly demonstrates the significant problems with the plan and I believe it letter raises critical questions about the motives of the GGNRA and National Park Service, as well as your competency, in drafting the plan.

You have an opportunity to craft a plan that is balanced and fair, one that offers reasonable and adequate access for people with dogs for areas that are on- and off-leash like they have been since before the creation of the GGNRA.

Sincerely,

Dave Emanuel

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6102	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Cotati, CA 94931 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:00:30				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	GGNRA is a wonderful place to recreate and to experience nature and even seek solitude.				

I am writing to say that the National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs.

â€ Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes.

â€ Park officials need to enforce the dog rules more vigorously.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I urge you to implement the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6103	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Letter #1				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Kim

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6104	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:02:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Letter #2				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Kim

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6105	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I walk our terrier mix in stern grove and ocean beach on a bi-weekly basis.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Katharine Irving

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6106	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Paul Shepard

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6107	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:04:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I want my tax dollars to support EVERYONE in the city of San Francisco, not restrict some people.				

I have recently learned that it could cost 2.5 million dollars per year to enforce the proposed ban on off leash dog walking in some of San Francisco's most favorite areas for dog lovers (and this represents more than 40% o the population of SF Bay area).

That money should be used to enhance this recreational activity (if spent at all), not to ban it. I cannot understand why dogs cannot play on the beach under the supervision of their owners. This has always been a popular activity and is not detrimental as far as I can see.

The areas where dogs can be now is already quite restricted and I cannot see why it should be further diminished. Let the tax paying citizens of the city and their canine companions continue to enjoy the less than 1% o GGNRA lands - as they can now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6108    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94061  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:05:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6109    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94939  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Soulmates Animal Care Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:05:51  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I work for Soulmates Animal Care and regularly walk dogs on behalf of Soulmate's clients.

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative particularly at Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% othe Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There is no good reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

Most importantly, as a Marin County resident I am aware that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite.

Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National

---

Park. Dogs on leash and off leash are a major component of a family recreational area. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Furthermore, the SEIS preferred alternatives, as suggested by the GGNRA, force people into their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

Thank you for considering these comments!

Sincerely,

Kathleen Denison



---

**Correspondence ID:** 6110    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6111    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I have lived in the UK for the past 20 years. During this entire time my husband and I have had Labrador Retrievers in London, where fortunately we have been able to walk our dogs off leash in beautiful open spaces, but much smaller than the GGNRA. We are moving back to Marin County and we have been looking forward to enjoying the open space with our dog Riley. We were shocked to find out this might not be possible, even though he is always under voice control and he has attained Gold Medal Status with the UK Kennel Club's "Good Citizen Dog Scheme".

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed

---

in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I urge you to reconsider this ill-conceived plan. We are counting on you to be able to exercise both ourselves and our dog responsibly.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6112	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sunnyvale, CA 94087 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendet Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Chris Hackler

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6113	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in the bay area and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I am lucky to have friends with dogs, even though I don't own one myself. When we are out walking, I see that most other non dog owners react favorably to having dogs off leash. The vast majority of dogs stay close to their owners and behave themselves. Most dog owners are very attached to their animals, care for them & clean up after them. Dogs are an asset. From my perspective, there are far more humans that leave garbage and trample on sensitive areas.

Sincerely,

Susan L. Schoen

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6114	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:13:52
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

**Correspondence:** I am writing to you concerning the dogs in the Golden Gate Recreation Area. I have resided in San Francisco since 1980. I would love to visit the GG recreation area, to go for walks on Crissy Field or other places of natural beauty. I find it impossible to have a pleasant walk because of the many many many dogs running loose. Their owners stand around with their cell phones, talk with each other, throw things for the dogs to chase, but the owners DO NOT mind their pets. I love dogs. I grew up with beloved pets. However, I feel that I should have as much right to go for a walk on the beach or in a park as someone's dog. I do not. There are too many dogs and they are running loose. Even on park areas where there is supposed to be a leash rule, no one keeps a dog on a leash. Seriously, in the past at least ten years I think I have seen two dogs on leash, and they may have been about to be set loose or may have been just recalled and leashed. The running loose of the dogs is not good for the beach. It is harmful to the carefully restored natural areas. It is a death sentence for the birds. It makes no sense at all. Allowing it is just giving in to the self-indulgent, selfishness of the dog owners. I feel this situation is very like the days when smokers were allowed to smoke in restaurants and other places. A person who did not want to have to breathe their smoke was considered anti-social. Rather than criticize the smokers for their anti-social behavior, it was anyone who dared to say, "yes, I do mind," when asked the formula "Do you mind if I smoke?" That question was considered all that was required of the fashionable smoker. A park is not just a public toilet for dogs. Dogs are not part of the natural environment. I have also had the extremely unpleasant experience of having to stop, start, stop, wheel my car around in order to avoid dogs which were not on leashes. After endangering my life in order to save the life of a little dog running loose in a parking lot or in the middle of a street adjacent to a park, the owners appear and tell me that the dog is under "voice control." This is simply insane. Each time this happened, the owner would be calling and calling while the dog, either confused and lost or over excited by the traffic and running, just kept running away from the owner. In both cases, if I had not had great reflexes the dogs and possibly the owners would have been smashed. I know that the dog lobby is powerful because it is so well organized and vocal. I also know that the beaches, the tide pools, the shore birds, and yes, individuals such as myself do not have a voice. I appreciate the opportunity to beg you not to give in to this lobby. This is a group which wants its own way and will cry and pout until you give them what they want- -even if that is just so that they will be quiet and go away. I beg you not to capitulate. These parklands are a tiny per centage of our natural heritage. It is little enough that is left to allow us to imagine nature in a natural setting and

allow us a chance to relax while breathing in fresh air and enjoying a quiet atmosphere. That quiet atmosphere cannot exist with packs of dogs chasing birds, balls and each other. I am so tired of having to tip toe around the edges of the beach or park so that I am not in the way of the dogs. I do not enjoy seeing them urinate on the beach and the delicate plants. I do not enjoy seeing them defecate and then wondering if the owner will stop talking long enough to clean up. Nine times out of ten, they do not. I have friends who are guilty of this: they look around and away from the dog. "Oh, that's not my dog," and walk away a little.

Even if they do clean up, does that really belong in the parkland? Dogs are not natural, wild animals who are part of this natural environment. We worked so hard to win the protection of this magnificent place which can never be duplicated or replaced. Please act as champions of the park lands and limit areas in which the dogs can run and limit to the greatest degree possible off leash dogs. Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6115	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:15:58				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Whom It May Concern,				

Thank you for allowing us to make comments. I am a NON dog owner. Here are the reasons why there should be strong restrictions on dog walking / owners:

- NON dog owners have not organized, or raised funds like the SF PAC: <http://www.dogpacsf.org/>
- please take note of the SF Dog PAC - bc there will be many more comments generated by this group, that will disproportionately outway NON dog owners.
- just this Saturday, I was hiking on a "leashed" trail, the Cataract Trail, and there were 4 dogs off leash.
- It's not the dogs but the owners that are the problem:
- I'm tired of seeing the green, black, or blue dog poops bags that owners have left on the ground.
- I've found those bags on my street in SF, in the Marin headlands, on Ocean Beach, at the trails by Ocean beach.
- The dog owners have purchased dogs that they cannot exercise in their city apartment - but that doesn't mean the the responsibility falls on our shared public property or NPS land.
- The dogs remind them every day that they need to get out.
- When I go to our shared public / NPS land, I don't want to be interrupted by someone else's dog.
- Dog owners often think.... oh, it's not that big of a deal. The problem is.... the dog owners think this!!
- I like to see the bobcats, coyotes, rabbits, squirrels on the public property / NPS land.
- Research clearly shows that there are less critters around when dogs are present - bc they scare them off!

- please be our voice for the non dog owners and make strong protections.

- Don't let dogs take over our space!

Thank you!

Matt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6116    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** EL CERRITO, CA 94530

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:16:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am an Asian pharmacist who works and resides in the East Bay. I belong to the Nature ConservancyI and have a dog. I have visited almost all of the SEIS sites of the GGNRA in San Francisco and Marin County, and hope to expand my travels to San Mateo County. I visit a GGNRA site about once every 3 weeks for an off-leash ( and under voice control) dog walking experience in nature. 30% o the time I am accompanied by other adults and/or children ages 2-17.

There is a great feeling of discovery, spontaneity , freedom and relaxation that happens when out on an off-leash outing to the GGNRA that does not occur with the "chore" (the tugging, the pulling, the untangling, the forced stops on both ends of the leash - I feel like I'm out and about with a canister-style vacuum cleaner ) of on-leash walking.

I read the SEIS alternative plans A-F for all sites. I find Plan F, the NPS Preferred Plan, unacceptable as it is too restrictive for off-leash dog walking. Yes, unacceptable.

I am disappointed that " SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. The SEIS lists many, many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking. The SEIS copies, without change, entire sentences and text from the DEIS about studies of dog impacts, especially on wildlife and birds, even though DEIS comment showed that this text was inaccurate, misleading, and misrepresented what the studies actually said. Yet the SEIS copied it word for word. Comments supporting dog walking were not used to argue that there should be more off-leash restrictions, while comments opposing dog walking were used to argue for more restrictions," to quote SFDog.

Recreation - The GGNRA has a recreation mandate and the DEIS treats recreation as an adverse impact, rather than a value to be preserved. DEIS should add section evaluating benefits of recreation.

Urban Environment - The GGNRA is in a dense urban area, yet the DEIS is written as if the Bay Area and its residents dont exist just outside its boundaries. This is an urban area, not a pristine wilderness. The DEIS ignores impact on residents or area resources, especially city parks if restrictions take effect. Note that the SF Board of Supervisors passed a resolution opposing the Preferred Alternative because of the lack of study of impacts on city parks.

Undocumented Assumptions - The DEIS is full of assumptions about impacts - things that might or could happen - but there is no evidence of actual observed impacts. Cannot base management plan on hypotheticals. The GGNRA has had years to observe and document actual observed impacts. The fact the GGNRA did not include them in the DEIS indicates they dont exist.

Safety - DEIS claims a major safety problem with dogs in the GGNRA. But their own data indicates dogs accounted for only 2% o serious safety incidents involved dogs. The vast majority of serious incidents involved people only. Even if you include non-serious incidents, dogs accounted for a mere 7% o incidents in the GGNRA. Dogs are not a major safety problem.

Diversity - Dog walkers constitute the most diverse group of people who use the GGNRA - people of all

---

ages, people with disabilities, gay and straight, all ethnic groups, all religions, all social and economic classes - all interacting in positive ways, bound by their common love of dogs. There is no mention of this diversity in the DEIS. Minorities are mentioned only in the context of being afraid of dogs. The DEIS incorrectly quotes from a focus group of people who had largely never been to the GGNRA as proof that minorities don't come to the GGNRA because of the dogs. " to quote SFDog.

Areas in San Mateo County that the GGNRA administers or will in the future should have full recreational off-leash dog areas.

Thirteen years ago, on Jan.23, 2001, 7:30 pm, I was one of the many who stood outside the packed meeting room at the Presidio in SF to protest restrictions in the GGNRA to off-leash dog walking. On Oct.21,2013, I went on record at an SF City Council meeting to support SF Supervisor Scott Wiener's resolution opposing the GGNRA's restriction on dog access.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns as a tax-paying, voting citizen! Have a great day!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6117	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901-2730
-----------------	---------------------------

	United States of America
--	--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:16:41
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please reconsider your incredibly restrictive pet policy and revert back to the 1979 policy. Do not try to "fix" what it is not broken. The GGNRA is not your average National Park and should not be treated as such. Our urban area needs to preserve the BALANCE of humans/pet recreation with wildlife, not eliminate it completely. Education of the public and enforcement are the best tools we have available. Please employ them instead of taking away our valuable open space.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6118	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Bruno, CA 94066
-----------------	---------------------

	United States of America
--	--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:18:11
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,
------------------------	---------------------------

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
John Humphrey

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6119    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:21:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Victoria Smith  
sfgirlbybay.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6120    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:21:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6121    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94124  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:21:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Given that the name of the area is the Golden Gate National RECREATION AREA, I am surprised to see that the preferred plans do not emphasize what is obviously a recreational priority for a great number of Bay Area residents - walking dogs in natural areas. I understand the appeal and importance of re-establishing native plants and providing opportunities for contemplative appreciation of nature and solitude. However, I believe it is also important to offer diverse recreational opportunities, and, to the extent possible, to accommodate the interests of people who live in a particular area. With such a huge space available within GGNRA, and many, many other natural areas that people can enjoy without dogs (or with dogs on leashes), I would hope that GGNRA could re-brand itself, at least partially, as "Off-Leash Heaven."

I wish that the GGNRA planners would work WITH dog owners, as county officials did in Redmond, WA, where they allotted 150 acres as an off-leash dog park, maintained completely by volunteers, and eventually funded with a small parking fee. Instead, it feels as though the comment periods are a perfunctory step in a process that has a foregone conclusion, namely that of drastically reducing off-leash dog exercise/recreation areas.

If nothing else, give us more of Fort Funston for off-leash use. Reducing the available off-leash areas as much as you propose will mean more dogs in a smaller space, putting greater stress on the existing vegetation and soil, and likely producing an increase in dog feces per square foot. Most of us clean up, but not everyone does or will - with more dogs in less space, it won't be pretty.

Ever since the last report was released, I've treated every Fort Funston trip with my dog as though it might be my last. If I have to switch back and forth between on-leash and off, or stay restricted to a small, unattractive area near the parking lot, I am much less likely to go there at all.

Finally, I hope you will consider doing an "impact study" a year or two after you impose whatever new plan you choose - to see whether more or less people are using the area, how satisfied they are, and so on.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6122	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94705 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:23:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I used to live in San Francisco, and though I am now in the East Bay, I come to the city to enjoy the Presidio, the Crissy Field area, and other open spaces that are part of the national park- - just as I would travel east to spend time in Yosemite. Over the years, I have been surprised, even shocked, by the number of off-leash dogs. If I were a dog owner, I would certainly want to have places where I can walk and exercise my dog. But the park is for many users, some of whom want to enjoy a dog-free area as much as they want to be free to roam in open space free of buildings and cars. I am very much in favor of the new GGNRA dog rules. I think that they require everyone to compromise. After all, the GGNRA is one of the only, if not the only, parks in the system that permits dogs, especially dogs on leash. I hope that the new rules are approved and put into effect.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6123	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				

---



**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
Thank you for your time..

Sincerely,  
Celene Matthews

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6124	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:23:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	In the section on page 91-92, which describes how the proposals meet the alternatives, I have several concerns.				

1) The report says that objective for "Minimize conflicts related to dog use by providing a variety of safe, high-quality visitor use experiences, including areas where dogs are allowed" is met. There is an inherent conflict between "minimizing conflicts" and "including areas where dogs are allowed", and the report says nothing about how these conflicting goals are weighted or balanced. At present, the number of conflicts is exceedingly low (only 95 reports in 4 years, compared against 4.5 million incidents nationwide), and the present arrangement provides for a tremendous quantity of high-value experiences, as any visitor to the GGNRA can plainly see. The proposed plans will dramatically curtail experiences related to dog walking while providing no obvious reduction in the number of dog-attacks. Therefore, I do not believe that this objective is met by any of the new proposals, and is in fact, worsened by each of them.

2) The report says "Maximize dog walker compliance with clear, enforceable parameters in order to improve park operations and use of staff resources in managing dog walking.". In fact, each of the proposed alternatives will cost between \$2M and \$3M to implement, as compared to the \$400K for present operations. Therefore, the proposed preferred alternatives will degrade park operations, requiring hiring of significantly more staff, and increase the costs of the entire operation. How can it be that the proposals are "improvements" if a clear consequence is that 5X MORE staff are required to operate under those proposals? Isn't the outcome expected by the NPS in its own reporting the EXACT OPPOSITE of this objective?

3) The report says that a goal is "Provide adaptability and flexibility so that information gathered from monitoring can be used in future decision making based on estimated outcomes, including in new park

areas." In fact, the proposed policies are substantially less flexible than the present policy. Further, the proposals are being offered without any clear data indicating that the changes will deliver any of the supposed benefits, because of the absence of any of the data required to offer any such analyses - So, how are we to believe that implementation of a policy that is broadly applied elsewhere in the NPS will lead to "information gathering"? If information is not being gathered in any of the other 60 parks operated by the NPS, how will the addition of the GGNRA to this structure suddenly lead to "information gathering"? Therefore, I do not believe that the proposed changes will meet this objective at all - in fact, the proposed changes will reduce flexibility and produce no new data - exactly the OPPOSITE of this objective.

4) the Natural resources objective is to reduce the detrimental effects of dogs on wildlife and natural vegetation. However, throughout the report, I find no evidence that shows that the present policies have produced any particular detrimental effects. There are many hypothetical statements, and plausible observations, but the plain truth is that the overwhelming majority of off-leash dog use in the GGNRA is on beaches or on planted lawn areas, where none of the detrimental effects are even possible. For example, it simply makes no sense to assert that removal of off-leash dog walking from the east and west beach areas of Crissy field will have any effect at all on wildlife or vegetation.

5) The report cites as an objective "Protect cultural resources from the detrimental effects of dog use." I have read this entire report carefully, and found no reference to any "cultural resources" of any substantial value that are being degraded by dog use. This objective is not altered under any of the proposed plans, and is of no use in justifying any of the plans.

6) Under "Education", the report has an objective of "Build community support for the plan to maximize management of dog walking use." Exactly - The goal is to "maximize management". Who decided that the Goal of the NPS should be to MAXIMIZE MANAGEMENT of anything? As a taxpayer and a user, I prefer a lean model for the management of activities - and especially the management of harmless and beneficial activities. I am strongly opposed to any notion that the NPS should have a goal of maximizing management.

7) Further, under Education, I see the goal of "Increase public understanding of NPS policies." So, regardless of the value or benefit of the policies, the NPS is offering to "increase public understanding" by imposing policies crafted for parks situated in remote wildernesses upon our urban GGNRA. Sure, by imposing inappropriate policies at the GGNRA, the NPS will be able to increase public awareness of these policies. Each and every time a citizen is given a ticket for behavior that has been allowed and shown to be harmless for decades, there will certainly be an increase in public awareness. I find it absurd that this objective is being satisfied in the proposed manner - by imposing wilderness park policies in an urban setting simply to generate "awareness" by heavy-handed imposition of policies from DC.

I apologize for some of the tone of my comment, but I honestly find it exasperating that these "objectives" are imposed without concern for the present successful public use of the GGNRA, and that, in several cases, it is obvious that the proposed changes will have effects that are the OPPOSITE of these objectives.

I hope the NPS recognizes that it is trying a One-Size-Fits-All solution that is probably appropriate for remote wilderness parks to a unique urban recreation area where the objectives of the NPS make no sense, and where the most likely effects are unrelated to or even opposed to the objectives,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6125	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:24:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ashley Lyon

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6126	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Christina Pappas

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6127	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Blackwolf Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:26:38				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Once again, the vast majority of law abiding citizens, in this case dog walkers, are being forced to put up with an aggressive minority of people, who would force yet another issue in the name of ... what? Public safety? Because of the three wild dogs owned by owners who are rude? Really?

Must we always solve the problem caused by the few with restrictions on the many? It is called the tyranny of the minority. Can we just stop all of this regulation, and let civility creep back onto the public square, and let us work things out ourselves? Please, please, do not punish nearly all dogs and dog owners because of the few bad ones....thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6128 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Redwood City, CA 94062

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:26:53

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep Fort Funston a dog beach. I love taking my dog to the beach and I'll be so sad if off leash dog beaches are no longer options. I know you are worried about birds that nest on beaches, and other environmental impacts, but there are so many beaches preserved for birds but so few that allow dogs. Thanks,

Justin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6129 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94103

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:26:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** please allow dogs that are well mannered and listen to play off leash in the water near the beach. We are responsible dog owners. Our dog loves to run in the water and fetch the ball as he is part Lab. He never bothers any other people or wild life.

His day on the beach is as important to him as it is to the kids. In fact, I think the dog behaves and listens better than the kids do! Thank you for listening to our comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6130 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:27:23

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I would like a place to walk and hike with my dogs. They are well behaved. on leash and I always clean up after them. They are better cared for and trained than many other park visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6131 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:27:59

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I recognize the difficulty in trying to please so many diverse user groups. However, as a dog owner, I do not support the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. It will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. The SEIS did not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

Overall, I support allowing dogs on-leash in the study areas rather than prohibiting dogs altogether, particularly in areas where dogs have been historically allowed. It's no critically important to a visitor's wellbeing to take a hike in the beautiful and re-energizing of the park, and it equally as important to have the option of bringing along our best friends. The plan should include more on-leash trail access.

There is not enough justification in the dog management plan for major changes. Consistency seems to be lacking in the decisions of where dogs are permitted, and in cases the decisions seem arbitrary. For example, dogs are permitted on leash at Ocean Beach in the Snowy Plover Protection area, yet the preferred alternative prohibits them all together from the Wildlife Protection Area and Easy Beach at Crissy Field (where there have never been any snowy plover sightings). The plan states that dogs are also restricted South of Sloat, yet the map shows that area with season closures only; it is unclear if dogs are prohibited from this area entirely. Instead of prohibiting dogs entirely in wildlife areas, they should be allowed on leash.

Limiting the central beach at Crissy for off leash use is unacceptable. This is an established and well used off leash area. To provide for a consistent use of the area, some of Crissy could be off-leash, but no areas should be prohibited. Limiting only a portion of the airfield for a ROLA is also unacceptable. The entire airfield is entirely underutilized to begin with. Delineation of the ROLA and leash required areas would be difficult, and I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens, create visual impacts, and add to the cost of park operations. Dogs should be permitted on more areas in Fort Funston. Dog walkers transformed this once dangerous area of the park into a safe and welcoming site. Opportunities are too limited. Please consider adding the Funston Horse Trail for on-leash dog access, so that we could have a loop trail to enjoy with our dogs, and as stated above, leashed access north of the Funston Beach Trail.

Congress created the GGNRA in 1972 to "... expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972). We need more places to recreate with our dogs, not less.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6132	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:29:14

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I often walk on Chrissy field beach from the Chrissy field parking lot to Fort Point. Most days when I walk there, there are at least one if not more dog owners walking their dog or dogs inside the protected area for the Snowy Plovers. They do not read the sign asking them to stay close to the water line. They trample the plants, and the area where the snowy plovers like to rest and hide, with their

---

dogs. They usually don't listen when I ask them to observe the guidelines on the signs, by putting their dogs on leash and avoiding the areas away from the water line. This is very upsetting to me knowing how vulnerable the snowy plovers are.

I am so sick of having to deal with dogs on the beach. It is a public beach that is overrun by so many dogs it makes it difficult to enjoy it. My husband will not walk with me there because he dislikes contending with all the dogs. I really support the restrictions on dogs on this beach so that the birds can have their habitat, and the beach will be a peaceful place for humans to enjoy again. Thank you for protecting the beach.

So many parks are overrun by dogs and their rude insensitive dog owners, that it is difficult to enjoy the parks. For that reason I only go to the Stribling arboretum where dogs are not allowed. You cannot sit in the grass at a park without smelling dog excrement or urine. Even in parks like Duboce park, the areas that are supposed to be dog-free are not observed by selfish dog owners. I really look forward to being able to enjoy the outdoors more in the areas where dogs will be restricted. Thank you!!!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6133	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:29:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Amanda Rowlee, and Jack (the dog who loves being off leash!)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6134	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:30:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** The reason my husband and I moved to the Bay Area is because of how dog friendly it is. Please don't take away!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6135	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Tamarind Street Resident Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:30:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To the Dog Management Planners for the National Park Service - PEPC				

Regarding: The Draft Dog Management Plan for the Mid-Coast of California

I strongly oppose the placement of a fenced dog walking area in the middle of our Montara residential area near the elementary school. I am not sure we "need" a dog park at all, but if anyone needs it, I do not want one that is a neighborhood disturbance.

Text in the GGNRA Dog Management Plan references the potential of fenced dog walking area between Le Conte and Tamarind Streets in Montara near the Farallone elementary school. If you have any input to this situation, I hope that you will recommend a different dog park location. I do not believe this proposal has been duly approved by the community.

Each evening for many years, my husband has sat out on our deck to enjoy the peace and quiet, watch the sunset, contemplate, and relax. And he often stays out there hours until it is completely dark. Doesn't he as a homeowner, have a right to do this in peace? Isn't there another place to put a dog park that is away from residents seeking peace and quiet?

I am hoping that the National Park Service will take care of people like my husband and people who do not have a dog and will respect our rights as well.

We pay our property taxes, and dog owners pay no additional taxes. So, there is no reason that the needs of dog owners, should be put ahead of the rights of residents to sit on their front decks in peaceful contemplation.

It would be more appropriate to have a dog park, away from private homes, closer to Highway 1 (where the paved parking is planned for the Golden Gate Recreation area) where the noise and activity would be a large open space area. After all, the purpose of this new National Recreation area, was for people to get out of urban, residential areas, and to enjoy the wide open spaces.

For a large concentration of dogs to collect in the middle of a residential area would lead to a dramatically noisy situations in which barking dogs would disturb all nearby residents. If unacquainted dogs of different breeds, size and sexes mix in this small area, there will be many dog conflicts and much barking. If dogs are under "voice command" and not a leash, that means owners will have to be shouting commands. This will be a major disturbance to the quiet of the street.

Aside from the noise and the lack of community approval, there are other reasons that this area near the school is inappropriate.

1. The proximity of the school. It is never a good idea to mix small elementary school children and a local

playground with a large concentration of dogs of different breeds. Children are more vulnerable to dog bites than adults.

2. The narrowness of Tamarind Street. The undeveloped street of Tamarind is very narrow and lacks sidewalks. Currently, cars often have to take turns passing through the narrowest part, because in places there is not room enough for two cars to pass. The street is not equipped to support more traffic and more parking.

3. The lack of integration with the GGNRA area. Residents of the coast who own dogs surely would want to see the scenic rural beauty of the GGNRA, as opposed to local residential streets and rows of houses. Put these dogs and dog owners out where they can enjoy open spaces.

4. Urine/manure buildup and dead vegetation in a residential area. A fenced area for dogs on Tamarind Street would cause the current vegetation of sensitive coastal grasses to be trampled and die, turning the area into a highly visible blight in summer and a mud pit in winter. Although there would be distribution of plastic bags for poop-pickup and a place to dispose of those poop bags, poop collection is often not totally complete. Urine and manure would collect in a residential area.

5. Lower Property Values & Harm to Residents. The collection of urine and manure, the trampling of natural grasses, a new unattractive fence, barking dogs, noise, increased traffic, all are destined to transform a peaceful area for quiet walks into a disturbance that lowers property values.

The Alternative:

Instead we recommend a larger fenced area within the GGNRA closer to Highway 1 near to where parking is planned to be developed. In this other area, the dogs can bark as much as they want and still not disturb residents trying to sleep or read or smell their dinner.

Linda Rutherford  
(650) 728 1151  
PO Box 371063  
Montara, CA 94037

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6136	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:30:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern:				

I hike in various parks in San Francisco everyday. This activity is very important to my health and well being. My 14 pound Berger des Pyrenees / Griffon mix accompanies me, is my walking partner, and is the reason I use the Parks regularly and consistently.

My dog is well trained, has perfect recall, is well socialized BECAUSE we get out daily. I pick up and dispose of 100% of my dog's feces and carry the bag until I find a proper waste can. We are the responsible regular visitors of the parks, respecters of the wildlife, and the park's eyes and ears - discouraging illegal activity by simply being present. During the week there is NOBODY at the park except dog walkers, tourists, retired people, and vagrants. I have had zero conflicts with others over park usage.



The parks in our city are important to we who pay the bills (taxes), it is how we have our downtime, and if you tell me certain members of my family are no longer welcome, ie my dog, we will stop going and our parks will go unappreciated and could fall into the hands of droves of vagrant's encampments, trash,human feces, illegal activity, and even more used needles.

If there are a few people not following existing laws, and there are, please punish the troublemakers. Fine \$1000 for not cleaning feces, I welcome that. (Make sure to include ALL depositors of feces, human included) punish those who have untrained dogs off leash.

Do not punish me - who leaves the park in the same condition if not better when I leave.

Sincerely,  
Ginny

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6137    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** pittsburg, CA 94565  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:31:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Fort Funston a leash free area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6138    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:31:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for restricting dogs in Chrissy field. I am an elderly lady who enjoys walking on the beach, but I am afraid of being knocked down by the large dogs running around on the beach. They are unpredictable and often out of control. Their owners are not able to control them. Thank you for preserving the beaches for people!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6139    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:36:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Leo Fagundes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6140    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:37:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** On page 93-94, the report discusses the various ROLAs that have been eliminated from consideration in any of the recommended alternatives. In each case, the decision is stated, with one or two accompanying reasons, but without any discussion of the reasons for preserving these ROLAs, or analysis of the benefits -vs- detriments of these decisions. I think it is obvious that elimination of off-leash dogs from all of these areas may have one or more minor beneficial effects, but I also believe that there will be significant impact to the opportunities for public enjoyment of these spaces. The report does not even pretend to offer a balanced analysis of the benefits and impacts of these decisions.

I disagree that the goal of the NPS should be to absolutely minimize impacts without concern for public use. In the case of the GGNRA which is a public park situated in the middle of a dense urban population, the value of public use is MUCH HIGHER than in a remote park. The NPS wants to use exactly the same analysis on Crissy Field as it would use on a beach in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. However, it should be obvious that the potential benefits associated with public use at Crissy Field are immensely different than they would be on a remote beach in a wilderness. Therefore, a different analysis, based on the obviously different value opportunity, should be used.

In this section, the authors of the report demonstrate that they do not appreciate the unique value of public enjoyment for a park in a unique urban setting within easy access of millions of visitors, as weighed against the incremental benefit of preserving one more beach out of thousands in the entire NPS. The goal of this report should be to consider a balance of objectives. The NPS pretends that public use is equally unimportant for a remote wilderness beach as it is for a beach in San Francisco. If nothing else, this demonstrates that the NPS are fundamentally incapable of appreciating the value of an urban park, and I think they should not be granted responsibility for management of the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6141    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94129

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:38:58

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not take away dog accessible land. It benefits the entire community to take care and bond with animals, even dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6142    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118-1211

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Robert Dewey. I am 69 years old, a native Californian and a resident of San Francisco since 1972. I am a writer and editor who lives on Eighth Avenue, just south of the Presidio. I have walked in the Presidio and Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) with three successive dogs since 1978. I also walk with my dog in Mountain Lake Park where I have been active in efforts to restore the lake.

During walks in the Presidio my dogs and I have come to the aid of an owl caught in barbed wire fencing. We alerted to Presidio post veterinarian who freed the bird and saved its life. We have chased off vandals, reported broken water lines and participated in various activities to benefit the park.

GGNRA is an important resource for us for exercise, quiet contemplation, picnics and pleasure. We have submitted comments during the past several years that GGNRA management has been muddling about what to do about dogs in the park.

I'm appalled that after all of these many years, draft plans and redrafted plans and delays, GGNRA's proposed Dog Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement pays so little attention to the public's input. In fact, with each iteration, GGNRA's gets more restrictive and less responsive.

What's missing is recognition that GGNRA is an urban recreation area. Taking that stance is contrary to the GGNRA's founding principal. Why does GGNRA refuse to create a balanced plan for a recreation area that recognizes that people with dogs use and enjoy the park?

â€ Specifically I oppose the plan's "Preferred Alternative" because it is too restrictive.

â€ I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences may make for good neighbor relations out on the range - - not within the city. We don't need animal pens here.

â€ The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) does not adequately consider comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

â€ The SEIS still lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA.

â€ The SEIS says that, during the last six years, National Park Service (NPS) staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. Why didn't they bother to study GGNRA and the Presidio? After all that's the subject at hand.

â€ The SEIS relies on anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. These comments have no context - how frequent were they, how serious, etc.. How can these be used to set policy? NPS staff is recognized for its long-stand bias against dogs and the people who walk them. That's all the more reason to discard any anecdotal observations.

â€ SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS. It reports more than 4,700 comments were

---

received, but says nothing about how many comments were in support or opposition. Shouldn't public sentiment be reported and considered?

â€ The SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. What little attention is paid to this is just an estimate. Why wasn't the issue studied thoroughly as the San Francisco board of supervisors has requested?

â€ The SEIS data still do not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. Between 2008 to 2011 it reports 95 dog bites. That's a minuscule number considering the tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of dog walks that must have taken place within the GGNRA during those four years. I'm just guessing but I imaging there were thousands of more instances of vandalism in the park during those four years. That's a "serious" problem. It's caused by people, not dogs. I've seen no effort to close off substantial portions of the GGNRA to people as you are proposing to do with dogs.

Overall, I see little in the way of a response to the public interest in this latest Draft Dog Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Based on the response from dog-owner groups, local governments and various elected officials, I'm not alone in my view.

Why can't you either create a plan that responds to the public interest or quit wasting time and taxpayers' money and just maintain the status quo?

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6143	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis

---

was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

Pamela Wyman, CTC @ 415-867-1333

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6144	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Monterey, CA 93940 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:43:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is

way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

David Scherr

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6145	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:44:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I could go on about the finer points about what I disagree with your plan. But first I have to tell you about how walking my dogs at Fort Funston has saved my sanity. My building burned on January 23, 2014. The Wag Hotel has been taking care of my dogs. Every morning I pick them up and go for an hour or more walk at Fort Funston. I then go to clean up my house. Fort Funston has saved my sanity once again. I have been walking my dogs there since 1983.

Thank you,  
Patricia LaCava

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6146	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Lodi, CA 95240 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:45:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am in favor of the NPS Preferred Alternative 'F,' it seems to allow access to the many types of users while also improving safety to visitors. This will allow the vegetation in the parks to not be overrun by packs of dogs. Maybe we can all share this recreation area!

Fort Funston has been inundated with professional dog walkers coming day after day, mornings and afternoons. To have them limited to 6 dogs per person would be great. Keeping track of 10 or 12 unleashed dogs, especially while simultaneously talking on a cell phone is just not possible. If this goes through, please require them to throw away their bagged dog feces in trash cans and not leave them at the top of stairway/sand ladders (because who wants to carry bags of poop down and back up again?) for later (maybe) pick up.

When I have mentioned Fort Funston, there have been mainly 2 reactions - 1) "Oh the dog park! I have

friends who are planning/have just started a dog walking business and they love it" or 2) "Ugh, we took the kids there once but all those dogs running around scared them and us. We're never going there again." Please let us all share the park and not give it to the dogs, it is a beautiful area. And please find some money for proper fencing for the GGNRA, these plans are only as good as the signage and fencing. People need to be able to see what is out of bounds or not. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6147    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Eureka, CA 95501  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:46:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose implementation of the latest GGNRA dog management plan. I support formalization of the 1979 pet policy AND expansion of off leash areas for dogs in Marin And San Mateo portions of the GGNRA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6148    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Brisbane, CA 94005  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Rosanna Lyons

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6149    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:49:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** On page 96-97 of the report, the concept of ROLA certification is discussed, but dismissed, on the basis of marginal success at implementation for a similar program in Boulder.

Compared to the rest of the report, this may be the one and only instance of the NPS providing specific

evidence of the effect of a policy change on an issue. In this case, only ~40% of the public participated in the certification program, and the costs were deemed to be excessive - this being offered as a definitive reason for dismissal of this option.

For comparison, the NPS intends to impose other policy changes on the GGNRA, such as elimination of off-leash walking in many areas without any particular evidence that the policy change will have beneficial impacts, and ignoring the substantial reduction in opportunities for public enjoyment and, all the while, admitting that the proposed changes will come with a significant increase in the costs of management.

It would be nice if the same quality of analysis used to dismiss certain proposals (such as ROLA Certification) was also applied to the proposals preferred by the NPS. If this were the case, I believe that the NPS would recognize that its proposed policy changes will have very few beneficial effects, substantial negative effects, and come with increased costs - All of which seem like clear and obvious reasons NOT TO CHANGE THE POLICIES FOR THE GGNRA.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6150	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 19:49:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

We regularly walk our dog in the GGNRA. The beach at Ft. Funston is an enjoyable experience for people of all ages with and without dogs. I am writing to express my opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is too restrictive and prevents me from enjoying the beach with my dog.

The new plan was not significantly modified to reflect concerns and objections of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

The GGNRA is a recreation area for a densely populated urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. For the most part, dog owners have been quite respectful of the needs of non-dog owners and off-leash areas should be formalized and supported in San Mateo County. Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Phil Battat

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6151	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Anthony Ochoa

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6152    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:52:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do NOT reduce the dog area in fort Funston!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6153    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 19:56:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hi,  
Please allow dogs on leash above Seton Hospital in Moss Beach all the way up above Park st.  
These are lands w many dog owning neighbors who use these acres daily(currently).  
There are long lines of sight, ample wide fire roads that are conducive to dog walking.  
Striking a fair balance by allowing dog walking from the surrounding neighborhood on Vicente Ridge is a fair expectation.  
Not 1 horse rider I have ever spoken with(dozens over the years) have voiced opposition to allowing leashed dogs on these trails.  
In fact, I'd venture a guess that at least 75% o equestrians have their dogs with them when riding from the stables area.

Thank You,  
Jim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6154    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** SEATTLE, WA 98112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sample Letter

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

In the past, I regularly took my dog to Muir Beach. It was one of the most treasured and rewarding parts of living in the area. I'd like to think that this important right remain in place so that I can visit and contribute to the support of this area.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% o the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. ou havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Jennifer Morris

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6155	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification for the dog management plan to make major changes to the existing policy.

I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy, plus providing for off-leash access in San Mateo County and on any new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Per the latest data released by the GGNRA, the claim that dog-related incidents are the largest percentage of complaints received is false. Out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs last year alone, there have only been 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing, and 1 horse bite incident documented (2012-2013 report). However, the incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the reported necessity for any change in policy for improved public safety or visitor experience.

I especially oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. These lands are meant to act as a foil to our compartmentalized urban experience. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens, visitors using them will feel unwelcome, and it will disrupt the view and experience for ALL

park users.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Enforcement of the existing policy will be far more economical (instead of the \$2 million dollars requested to implement the proposed Dog Management Plan) as well as solving any problems currently perceived or existing.

Quite simply, the GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was legislated as a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area, NOT as a national park. These trails and beaches have allowed for dog walking since before the original Pet Policy of 1979, and the 1% of current GGNRA lands allocated for dog walking should remain accessible as is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6156    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Adam Horowitz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6157    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:04:13  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** On page 100 of the report, the authors state that "NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment..." and proceeds to list all of the negative things that can go wrong when people interact with dogs in open spaces. However, there is no quantitative analysis of these incidents or comparisons to the likelihood of such incidents under different policies.

It is also true that people riding horses complain about the presence of humans on trails, that bird-watchers complain about the presence of humans or any sources of non-natural noise, and that some environmentalists would prefer to close the parks to all humans. The fact that there are some complaints is not compelling - there will be complaints under any of the proposed alternatives. Since the report makes no effort to provide a quantitative analysis of the complaints, it is unreasonable to use some complaints as

justification for a policy change, and ignore complaints that will still arise under that proposal. Further, if the NPS is allowed to implement its preferred alternative, there will be an avalanche of complaints from residents near these parks, and I think it is fair to say that the NPS will ignore most of those complaints as well.

Therefore, some complaints cannot be used as a basis for a policy change, if other complaints are ignored.

We must face the reality that the GGNRA is an urban park with unique capacity to provide immense human enjoyment to an enormous number of visitors and local residents. The balance between enjoyment and preservation must be different for a park in an urban setting as compared to a park in a remote setting. If the NPS is unwilling to recognize this difference of values and opportunities, it is the wrong agency to have authority over an urban park, such as the GGNRA.

Further, the NPS must face the fact that the present policy does provide immense opportunities for public use, in a manner that generally has only very minor negative impacts, and that all of the preferred alternatives will only marginally reduce the negative impacts while substantially reducing the opportunity for enjoyment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6158	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:04:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello! We are now on our 2nd dog and walk on the Escalon Trail. I have friends who walk on the other open space trails. In walking off leash, as 99% d on this trail, I have never, ever felt there was a problem, especially with other species. Perhaps the water fowl are an issue in other open space areas, however, it is not at all an issue on the Escalon trail. Dogs need to stretch their legs, as humans do. It is important to maintain as many options as possible for our canine friends and their owners to have quality time together and enjoy the beautiful open spaces together. Please do not restrict this wonderful activity and benefit of living in Marin. Thank you. Sincerely, Lynne Smith				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6159	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:04:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Page

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6160	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:04:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	as a member of the community that would be directly impacted, I submit that the idea of a dog park between Tamarind and LeConte is a terrible idea.				

infrastructure  
parking  
traffic  
noise  
close to a school  
close to homes

please be thoughtful and considerate in making decisions that would so negatively affect so many of the very constituents you have been working to build trust.

Ashley  
Montara

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6161	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94402 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:05:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean, As a family, we regularly walk our dog in the GGNRA and we need to let you know that we strongly oppose the preferred alternative described in the dog management plan set forth by the GGNRA. As members of the greater San Francisco community, it is important that all of us have the opportunity to freely utilize - without human roadblocks -this beautiful scenic recreation area that so many of us enjoy. Knowing that this dog management plan is in the offing, I took the extra time a couple of weekends ago to observe my fellow dog-walkers around me - specifically at Fort Funston. I was struck by what a cohesive, environmentally aware group, and of course dog-loving group that is naturally attracted to this beautiful scenic area. Surely San Francisco can come up with a more creative solution to their concerns about human environmental impact in the GGNRA than to set up artificial boundaries in this scenic gem				

---

that is our own. Public awareness campaigns through newspaper and radio, community service groups, environmental coalitions - the list goes on.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6162    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:08:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I understand the need for shared use and I am very VERY sympathetic to environmental concerns (plovers, etc.) but I know we can come up with a better solution than an outright ban. I'm sure others have made the case for dogs, doglovers, freedom to run, etc. I want to add my name to the list of people who expect more from Park Planning. You/we can do it!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6163    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:08:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Chrissy Beach is one of the few off leash areas for dogs in San Francisco proper. In a city which has more dogs than children, it's a shame that removing this area is even being considered. There is very little negative impact by this use of the area. The dog owners are responsible visitors, cleaning up after their pets, and others. It is often non-residents and tourists who litter, and the residents and dog owners who are cleaning up, in order to protect their dogs, and the ocean.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6164    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:12:54  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

James Norton and my dogs Glovey and Lia

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6165	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:12:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean				

After the meeting with congresswoman Jackie Speier recently at Stern Grove I asked you why you didn't have the sand dunes fenced in the Snowy Plover area on Ocean Beach. I have read about beaches managed by the state of California where this fencing is installed to protect Snowy Plover habitat. YOU HAD NO ANSWER FOR ME! When I walk on Ocean Beach and I see 50 people at a time trampling these dunes, and the dry sand transitional area to the wet beach, which you yourself admitted to me that this is an important area for the Snowy Plover; I ask you again Frank Dean: Why isn't this area fenced to protect the Snowy Plover? It seems if you really were concerned with wildlife you would have this area fenced to protect the Snowy Plover and stop several hundred people from trampling the dunes and the transitional area from the dunes to the beach every week.

You claim to be protecting wildlife by trying to deny dog owners and their dogs long standing off leash privileges in the lands known as the GGNRA, but it seems if you were actually really concerned with the protection of wildlife you would have these dunes fenced.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6166	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valey, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:14:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a daily user of the trails, very often with my small dog. I live near the Miwok trailhead. I have used the trails since 1980 with my dog/dogs. I have seen over the years hundreds of dogs on the trail, and 99% o them had responsible owners- -thereby the dogs have been very well behaved users of the land. So many people depend on their dogs as companions (especially the elderly), as a reason for getting exercise, and for protection. For those not wanting to be around dogs- -there are many, many trails and beaches on which they are already banned.				

People enjoy their dogs off-leash, and dogs are better behaved around other dogs when off-leash. The proposed provisions are totally unnecessary for the protection of the wildlife and the flora. The provisions are not based on legitimate scientific studies.

This issue is a waste of a lot of people's time and the government's money.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6167	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I regularly run with our dogs on many of the Marin Headlands Trails and Muir Beach.

I strongly oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative F for Muir Beach and The Marin Headlands (Coastal Trail/fire road to Hill 88). I support Alternative A, the no-action alternative, or a revision to provide more access to GGNRA for people with dogs in Marin County. The current plan alternatives are too restrictive on dog walking in the areas that affect our small community and it does not protect and preserve the fundamental values for which the GGNRA was established in terms of recreational values.

It is key note that the both the Marin County Board of Supervisors as well as our the Muir Beach Community Services District have passed resolutions opposing and recommending modifications to the GGNRA's SEIS, as they recognize that these lands are intertwined with vibrant communities such as Muir Beach.

The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force our community into their cars to drive a minimum of 20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to/from Muir Beach is already choked and congested on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA.

The SEIS calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as there have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the 'off-limits' creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic' (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ from other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day.

Provide a loop trail as opposed to dead end trails to allow for a recreational experience for the user. We desperately need a loop from Muir Beach and a suggested loop is:

Muir Beach - Coastal - Coyote Ridge - Middle Green Gulch or  
Green Gulch Fire Road - Muir Beach

This loop is about 3 miles and would provide excellent exercise for both owner and dogs. Green Gulch fire road or middle Green Gulch trail would be the link required to make the loop.

The GGNRA fire roads are on average 12 feet wide allowing for a variety of users, including those with dogs, to safely share the road and are accessible from many neighborhoods and locations outside the GGNRA, encouraging people to walk directly into the recreation area instead of driving to the GGNRA or to other park spaces.



Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6168    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:17:04  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As my dog's guardian, I am standing up for his rights to walk off leash on GGNRA property.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Best,  
Jade

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6169    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative F for Muir Beach and The Marin Headlands (Coastal Trail/fire road to Hill 88). I support Alternative A, the no-action alternative, or a revision to provide more access to GGNRA for people with dogs in Marin County. The current plan alternatives are too restrictive on dog walking in the areas that affect our small community and it does not protect and preserve the fundamental values for which the GGNRA was established in terms of recreational values.

The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force our community into their cars to drive a minimum of 20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to/from Muir Beach is already choked and congested

on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA.

The SEIS calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as there have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the 'off-limits' creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic' (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ from other areas of high traffic; and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6170	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:18:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern,				

The proposed changes to dog policies at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Rodeo Beach, and many many other great locations will be a terrible blow to our family. Our two dogs join a responsible dog walking group of 4-6 dogs for 60-90 minute exercises in Fort Funston 4 days a week. My wife and I also love walking them at Crissy Field and going for hikes at Rodeo Beach. You can see evidence of their perfectly wonderful uses of the space here: [http://instagram.com/sitstayplay\\_sf](http://instagram.com/sitstayplay_sf) We hope you reconsider preventing our four-legged friends from enjoying our shared spaces.

Sincerely,  
Eric and Aryiro Toan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6171	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:19:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	What in the world is the point in banning off-leash dog areas? Simply ludicrous. I am sure others can be far more eloquent on the topic. For me, it's absolute bullcrap. Designated space for humans and their dogs in no way-shape-or-form hinders those who, for whatever ridiculous reason other than allergies, do not have a dog from anything. How!? How is it a problem?				

---

That's it. Just do not be stupid. Think about this logically and come up with three legitimate reason off-leash parks are a problem in the least.

-Chris Flick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6172    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:20:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendant Dean,

It is with great sadness I see you are preparing to ban my access with my dog to large areas of Ocean Beach, Ft. Funston, Baker Beach, Rodeo Beach and many other areas. My dog and I go for long walks in these and other areas that will be curtailed under most the plans that have been published, especially the 'preferred alternatives'. In fact the long walks we take will be impossible in all of these areas. We obey the current laws and don't chase wildlife. We are healthy and happy due the access we have enjoyed.

I consider myself a conservationist. I support organizations like the Nature Conservancy that promote working with the stakeholders of an area to reach the desired outcome of protecting habitat and wildlife. Wouldn't it be wonderful if the GGNRA would work with people who recreate with their dogs in these areas and the organizations that support them to educate them and also hold them as esteemed allies in protecting the land at the same time as they are having good exercise and fun.

What about giving something back? These plans are about restricting access to small areas where long walks are impossible. GGNRA is taking over new lands and it seems you are restricting the access in those locations as well.

In short, our walks will be curtailed or eliminated at almost every site. We don't just go sit on a spot on the beach. I hope the GGNRA will take no action on any of the plans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6173    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:20:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I run with my dog on many of the Marin Headlands Trails and Muir Beach and I oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative F for Muir Beach and The Marin Headlands (Coastal Trail/fire road to Hill 88). I support Alternative A, the no-action alternative, or a revision to provide more access to GGNRA for people with dogs in Marin County. The current plan alternatives are too restrictive on dog walking in the areas that affect our small community and it does not protect and preserve the fundamental values for which the GGNRA was established in terms of recreational values.

The plan reduces Marin Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. The SEIS calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as there have been no studies as to how this

would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the 'off-limits' creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

Make more trails and access!!!! Provide a loop trail as opposed to dead end trails to allow for a recreational experience for the user. We desperately need a loop from Muir Beach and a suggested loop is:

Muir Beach - Coastal - Coyote Ridge - Middle Green Gulch or Green Gulch Fire Road - Muir Beach  
This loop is about 3 miles and would provide excellent exercise for both owner and dogs. Green Gulch fire road or middle Green Gulch trail would be the link required to make the loop.

The GGNRA fire roads are on average 12 feet wide allowing for a variety of users, including those with dogs, to safely share the road and are accessible from many neighborhoods and locations outside the GGNRA, encouraging people to walk directly into the recreation area instead of driving to the GGNRA or to other park spaces.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6174	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:20:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Carmen Lopez

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6175	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jason Feinberg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6176    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Dean

I am a Pacifica resident who has been using GGNRAs Sweeney Ridge trail system for over 5 years. My dog and I typically walk to Sweeney Ridge from our house to the Baquiano trailhead at the dead end of Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. I typically hike with my dog on-leash the Baquiano trail to the Portola Discovery Site down to Sneath Lane in San Bruno or the San Francisco Public Utilities watershed boundary at the Portola Gate. This gives us a good two hour round trip hike on GGNRA lands.

I support the use of the city of Pacificas GGNRA lands for all including on-leash dog walking, hiking, trail running, mountain biking, horseback riding, wildlife watching, etc. I understand the need to protect fragile areas and balance public recreation needs but it feels dog owners are being excluded from the use of this public recreation resource when there has been years of use and very little environmental impact. I would hope better signage and enforcement could accomplish your goal without restricting the areas we are currently able to bring our dog. 51% of the city of Pacifica is owned by GGNRA. It would be unfortunate to lose our recreation and the associated tax base that dog walkers bring with them.

Sweeney Ridge/Cattle Hill

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A with the addition of the Baquiano Trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. The adoption of Alternative A with the mentioned additions would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge trail system.

I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Many users of Sweeney Ridge live

locally and access the trail system from three very different geographical trail access points.

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Most trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if a dog is leashed it will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Currently a gas, water and electrical right of way. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Sweeney Ridge. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

No attempt to protect sensitive areas with signage or fencing.

Visitor use of Sweeny Ridge is relatively low compared to other GGNRA areas, making visitor and on-leash dog contacts very minimal.

Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep, only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

#### Mori Point

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A)

I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

Consideration for ADA accessibility.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

## San Pedro Highlands

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E)

I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the new Devils Slide Trail.

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation.

Consideration for ADA accessibility.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

As you know the GGNRA is a unique special place that was created to accommodate the recreational needs of an urban area, essentially creating an urban park. Any attempt to mirror dog restrictions used in national parks with a wilderness experience would be misguided and would go against the intended mission of the GGNRA -TO RECREATE- when it was created. Please continue to allow us to enjoy our public lands with our dog and consider my concerns.

Sincerely,

Emily Read  
Pacifica, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6177    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:22:33

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** This would be very short sighted to close down Funston as a leash free area for dogs. My wife and I take our dogs there at least 5 days a week. We drive 20 minutes each way and it is worth it for the dogs and for us as we will walk at least 3 miles each time. I know there are some environmental issues but let's not forget that dogs are animals also and should have the right to the environment also. In the grand scheme of things, Funston is a small part of that coast line. Please don't deprive the dogs and their human owners of the outdoors. Walking a dog on a leash around the neighborhood just does not cut it compared to the Funston experience.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Thanos

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6178    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:23:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I carefully read the section of the report from pages 252-258, which describes many of the reported dog-related incidents. Over a 10-year period, there are reports of about 4000 events, which averages to 400/year or about 30 each month - roughly one each day.

This sounds terrible, but there is no data offered for comparison. What is the incidence of dog-related incidents in a comparably-sized park with comparable volume of visitors, and dogs either not allowed or only allowed on leash? Is it much lower, the same, or much higher? Without any comparative analysis, this data is absolutely meaningless, and is not useful as a basis for a massive change in policy. If the NPS wants to impose a policy change on the GGNRA, and wants to offer data to support this change, the NPS should offer enough data to show that the policy change will have the intended effect. This data does not indicate anything useful about the proposed policy change.

Further, the written descriptions of particular events include some peculiar features. For instance, quite a few of them appear to be written by the same individual, in response to their own experiences on a particular day or two. If these are representative, I think it may be true that there are really only a very few individuals offering the majority of these complaints.

Further, to the extent that many of these complaints are related to incidents where "birds took flight" (as seems to be the case for most of the incident reports selected for inclusion in the report), I think we're over-reacting a bit. I see birds take flight all the time, and generally don't regard these incidents as crimes against nature. If one incident each day of birds taking flight is caused by a dog, out of thousands of such incidents every day in the GGNRA, I think we should all find something else to worry about, even is there is one bird lover out there that finds these events unacceptable.



**Correspondence ID:** 6179    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Dean

I am a Pacifica resident who has been using GGNRA's Sweeney Ridge trail system for over 20 years. I support the use of the city of Pacifica's GGNRA lands for all including on-leash dog walking, hiking, trail running, mountain biking, horseback riding, wildlife watching, etc. I understand the need to protect fragile areas and balance public recreation needs but it feels dog owners are being excluded from the use of this public recreation resource when there has been years of use and very little environmental impact. I would hope better signage and enforcement could accomplish your goal without restricting the areas we are currently able to bring our dog. 51% of the city of Pacifica is owned by GGNRA. It would be unfortunate to lose our recreation and the associated tax base that dog walkers bring with them.

#### Sweeney Ridge/Cattle Hill

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 19-A) with the addition of the Baquiano Trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. The adoption of Alternative A with the mentioned additions would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge trail system.

I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Many users of Sweeney Ridge live locally and access the trail system from three very different geographical trail access points.

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Most trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Currently a gas, water and electrical right of way. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Sweeney Ridge. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habitat areas and species.

No attempt to protect sensitive areas with signage or fencing.

Visitor use of Sweeney Ridge is relatively low compared to other GGNRA areas, making visitor and on-leash dog contacts very minimal.

Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep, only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

#### Mori Point

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A)  
I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

Consideration for ADA accessibility.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

#### San Pedro Highlands

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E)  
I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the Devils Slide Trail.

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation.

Consideration for ADA accessibility.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

As you know the GGNRA is a unique special place that was created to accommodate the recreational needs of an urban area, essentially creating an urban park. Any attempt to mirror dog restrictions used in national parks with a wilderness experience would be misguided and would go against the intended mission of the GGNRA when it was created. Please continue to allow us to recreate with our dog in the GGNRA and consider my concerns.

Sincerely,  
Ron Jetke  
Pacifica, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6180	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:24:24				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have read a couple hundred pages of the proposal and have found the language to seem to describe every inch of the GGNRA as covered in rare flora and fauna species and soils.				

One section here from Pages 268-9: The park has installed fencing to restrict access by dogs and people to Crissy Field Tidal Marsh, and signage has been installed to educate visitors on the access restrictions; however, dogs gain access to the marsh through the tidal channel under the pedestrian bridge, and have been observed by park staff in the tidal marsh (NPS 2010a, 1).

seems to point out that the NPS does not think a rare occasion of human/dog error is acceptable. That is unacceptable. If every time a car accident occurred, the powers that be threatened "Ok, humans, you only get a few more accidents then we will remove cars from the road", one would say that is preposterous. To be human and to live among others, sometimes accidents happen. The goal should be to minimize the accidents with more non-threatening actions that don't punish the "good drivers" for the actions of the "bad ones".

And having read hundreds of pages, one can infer that the NPS seems to think NO area of these thousands of acres should be touched or visited by humans or non-native animals of any kind. I am sure coyotes and dogs have been native for thousands of years. The well respected show Nature on PBS, based on DNA analysis, has stated that domesticated dogs have probably been around for 100,000 years, not only the 15,000 years previously determined. Domestication only occurs if humans think an animal has use for them. Therefore, dogs and people come together, and have been existing together before we even had agriculture. Especially in this city where there are more dogs residing than children, one should show some RESPECT for the local culture which is essentially historical proven.

To save me time in writing this comment, I will just cut and paste from Wikipedia which has all the references for this data on their website. But here it is clear that by banning dogs, you are banning a long standing tradition of the coexistence, (( A TRADITION WHICH IS MUCH LONGER THAN THE DEFINITION OF THE DATE OF WHAT THE NPS (Native Plant Society which is now synonymous with the National Park Service) CONSIDERS IS A NATIVE PLANT)).

ALL BELOW IS COPIED FROM WIKIPEDIA:

Due to the difficulty in assessing the structural differences in bones, the identification of a domestic dog based on cultural evidence is of special value. Perhaps the earliest clear evidence for this domestication is the first dog found buried together with human from 12,000 years ago in Israel and a burial site in Germany called Bonn-Oberkassel with joint human and dog interments dating to 14,000 years ago.[26][27][28][29][30]

In 2008, re-examination of material excavated from Goyet Cave in Belgium in the late 19th century resulted in the identification of a 31,700 year old dog, a large and powerful animal who ate reindeer, musk oxen and horses. This dog was part of the Aurignacian culture that had produced the art in Chauvet Cave.[31][32]

33,000-year-old skull of a domesticated canid from Siberia

In 2010, the remains of a 33,000 year old dog were found in the Altai Mountains of southern Siberia.[33][34] DNA analysis published in 2013 affirmed that it was more closely related to modern dogs than to wolves.[35] In 2011, the skeleton of a 26,000 to 27,000 year old dog was found in the Czech Republic. It had been interred with a mammoth bone in its mouth-perhaps to assist its journey in the afterlife.[31][36]

TO SUMMARIZE, the NPS wants to classify the whole of the GGNRA, especially the areas used by humans and their dogs as areas to remove from human use. Every area is given a name to protect from us horrible humans such as DUNE... From page 258:

In the study area at GGNRA, coastal dune habitat is found at Muir Beach, Rodeo Beach, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston. There is also beach and coastal dune habitat at Stinson Beach,...

To continue with such excessiveness as is written into this dog management plan, by wanting to ban humans and their dogs from the lands adjacent to the city, we should perhaps start to look at what the dunes under the area of Golden Gate Park would look like and relocate the homes and humans and their dogs of the Richmond district from there so that natural Sand Dune vegetation can reclaim the area.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6181	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Dean

I am a Pacifica resident who has been using GGNRA's Sweeney Ridge trail system for over 5 years. My dog and I typically walk to Sweeney Ridge from our house to the Baquiano trailhead at the dead end of Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. I typically hike with my dog on-leash the Baquiano trail to the Portola Discovery Site down to Sneath Lane in San Bruno or the San Francisco Public Utilities watershed boundary at the Portola Gate. This gives us a good two hour round trip hike on GGNRA lands.

I support the use of the city of Pacifica's GGNRA lands for all including on-leash dog walking, hiking, trail running, mountain biking, horseback riding, wildlife watching, etc. I understand the need to protect fragile areas and balance public recreation needs but it feels dog owners are being excluded from the use of this public recreation resource when there has been years of use and very little environmental impact. I would hope better signage and enforcement could accomplish your goal without restricting the areas we are currently able to bring our dog. 51% of the city of Pacifica is owned by GGNRA. It would be unfortunate to lose our recreation and the associated tax base that dog walkers bring with them.

Sweeney Ridge/Cattle Hill

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 19-A) with the addition of the Baquiano Trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. The adoption of Alternative A with the mentioned additions would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge trail system.

I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Many users of Sweeney Ridge live locally and access the trail system from three very different geographical trail access points.

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Most trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Currently a gas, water and electrical right of way. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Sweeney Ridge. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habitat areas and species.

No attempt to protect sensitive areas with signage or fencing.

Visitor use of Sweeney Ridge is relatively low compared to other GGNRA areas, making visitor and on-leash dog contacts very minimal.

Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep, only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-

leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

#### Mori Point

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A)  
I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

Consideration for ADA accessibility.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

#### San Pedro Highlands

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E)  
I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the Devils Slide Trail.

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation.

Consideration for ADA accessibility.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness National Park experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

As you know the GGNRA is a unique special place that was created to accommodate the recreational needs of an urban area, essentially creating an urban park. Any attempt to mirror dog restrictions used in national parks with a wilderness experience would be misguided and would go against the intended mission of the GGNRA when it was created. Please continue to allow us to recreate with our dog in the GGNRA and consider my concerns.

Sincerely,  
Lynn Jetke  
Pacifica, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6182	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I regularly hike with my dog in the GGNRA - specifically in Muir Beach and the headlands. The proposed plan is way too restrictive on dogs and I'm writing to express my opposition to the preferred alternative described in the draft dog management plan. It will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. What is this about!!??

I made comments on the 2011 SEIS and they were largely ignored!!!! The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. What was it 3:1 opposing the plan!!!! In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas included in the study. Besides in your own report it talks about the effects on Muir Beach as negligible.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. YES THIS IS AN URBAN AREA!!! It isn't Yosemite dude. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

Wake up and bark!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6183    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94707  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Citizen Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:27:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent,

I am writing to express my opposition to the possible new restrictions of off-leash and leashed dog walking areas in the GGNRA. I have lived in Berkeley for almost 60 years and have owned two dogs as an adult. My dogs and I have been well trained in the etiquette of considerate and responsible dog ownership.

Taking my dogs to our beautiful local parklands is one of the joys of living in the Bay Area. Over the years I have frequented Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Rodeo Beach, Muir Beach and various Marin trails. The carefully crafted 1979 Pet Policy achieved a good balance in preserving areas historically used for people to recreate with their dogs and protecting open space in places that are not wilderness. This agreement is part of what makes the GGNRA such a special place, somewhere to enjoy the out-of-doors with our animal companions in the midst of a large urban setting. Some of these locations have already instituted additional restrictions, but trying to further limit dog use to conform to National Park rules is not appropriate.

Even though I am a long time member of the California Native Plant Society and The Sierra Club these organizations do not represent my views in regards to dog off-leash restrictions. I appreciate and value the natural environment, but believe preservation does not preclude reasonable use.

Having accessible and safe places for people and dogs to exercise and socialize together is a very important component of building a healthy community. Please preserve these off-leash areas and keep in place the agreement that was part of the original concept of the GGRNA.

Respectfully,  
Eve Lednicky  
2/18/14

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6184    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I Find offensive the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes.

I firmly support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



I strictly oppose adding restrictive Unsightly fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

This GGNRA is a National Recreation Area- Not a National Park. It is located in a very Dog Dense URBAN area. The dogs are part of many of the Bay Area Families who have enjoyed access to the public lands since 1979.

Reconsider the HARSH restrictions you have "Considered".

Sincerely,

Bennie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6185	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent Building 201, Ft. Mason San Francisco, CA 94123				

February 18, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Martha Stabler and I am a native San Franciscan, home-owner, tax payer and community volunteer. I am married and have two children and two dogs that I walk on a daily basis in areas such as Crissy Field, Golden Gate Park, Fort Funston and Stern Grove. The parks have been a consistent source of recreation, pleasure and pride for my family.

I am writing to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dogs and family in the near future. Additionally, the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years for come. I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is using in its latest supplemental

environmental impact statement are outdated - having sourced enforcement data from a previous draft. Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process has been a mockery. Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

Like so many arbitrary and narrowly focused land-use and urban planning decisions made in the City in recent years, this is yet another example of family-unfriendly policies that will lesson the quality of life for families and drive ever more of us out. I hope you will arrive at a more reasonable, inclusive and practical

Sincerely,

Martha Stabler  
601 Moraga Street, S.F.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6186	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:30:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Mr. Dean and NPS Leadership Team,				

Briefly, I would like to outline an alternative to the current proposal for a GGNRA dog management plan that speaks to the purpose of the GGNRA and that could be implemented without the drastic effects of the current proposal.

1. Implement an education plan that could include improved signage about the effects of such things as dogs chasing birds or flushing bushes and why certain limited areas may be restricted for safety or justifiable conservation purposes. (Very little is provided at most GGNRA locations as opposed to what is expected in most national parks.)
2. Solicit input on the most likely to reach consensus issues such as limits on dog-per-caretaker ratio or restricting certain sensitive areas as well as on where greater accommodation could be offered to responsible dog walkers for off-leash access.
3. Investigate a credentialing program that recognizes those guardian/dog relationships that meet reasonable standards for responsible off-leash guardian control.
4. Differentiate the various GGNRA land parcels by appropriate criteria for each parcel and suggest the most important and urgent steps towards achieving the stated goals on a case by case basis while acknowledging (quantifying current use, problematic issues, and expected benefits of any imposed restrictions vs. any displacement expected) and use this as the basis for your recommendations.
5. Start developing a focus on making the major "dog parks" excel at being what they really are, which is a special and unique recreational experience for the dogs and their owners and stop constantly trying to shut out thousands from an intense personal and spiritual experience that they have traditionally enjoyed without quantifiably justified research.

I know you all have a tough time pleasing everyone but why pursue such a no-win confrontational path instead of a path of accommodation and compromise that could make everyone a little happier?

Thank you for your consideration.

Doug Morgan,

A concerned resident, taxpayer, voter, responsible dog owner, and frequent visitor to GGNRA lands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6187	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:30:32				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6188	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Son Nguyen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6189    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Jose Lopez

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6190    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mountain View, CA 94041  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:34:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent park user I support the updated regulations on off-leash areas, which will help protect wildlife as well as dogs.  
Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6191    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Berkeley, CA 94702  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Golden Gate Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean:

The Golden Gate Audubon Society (GGAS) has reviewed the Draft Dog Management Plan/SEIS (SEIS)

---

and, while supportive of many aspects of the Preferred Alternative (Alt. F), we submit the following comments in the hope of improving the Plan. While we continue to have concerns about the adequacy of the Plan and believe that the Preferred Alternative fails in many ways to adequately protect park visitors and resources, GGAS sees this as a good first step toward a balanced approach to managing dog-related recreation in the GGNRA.

GGAS' mission is to conserve wildlife and their habitats and help Bay Area residents connect with nature. The Bay Area's densely urban environment presents significant challenges to both goals. Human activities have significantly reduced available native habitat, resulted in persistent-and often fatal-disturbance to wildlife, and consistently prioritize human-based recreation over a balanced accommodation of wildlife or other natural values. Sadly, for all the talk about the humane treatment of dogs in this process-we have never heard expressions of concern for wildlife from those advocating for more dog recreation in the GGNRA.

Following our mission, our concern with dog management in the GGNRA is two-fold. First, dog-related recreation clearly has significant impacts on wildlife. The overwhelming body of scientific literature-much of it cited in the SEIS-demonstrates that dog-related recreation has a strong negative impact on wildlife and habitat. Empirically, GGAS members have observed these impacts as local, native species such as the California Quail and brush rabbits have been extirpated by dog-related recreation at Ft. Funston; elsewhere, our members have recorded and observed dogs actively harassing and sometimes killing birds within the GGNRA. By failing to act for so long, the National Park Service has failed to protect the resources that it stewards in trust for all Americans.

Second, dog-related recreation has clear and negative impacts for park visitors. As discussed further below, the presence of dogs-especially off-leash dogs-acts as a barrier for many visitors to using and enjoying the parks. As an organization concerned about getting as many Bay Area residents outside and enjoying the natural beauty of our environment, GGAS must concern itself with these issues of access.

This concern with getting people outdoors extends to ensuring that dog owners have adequate space to enjoy time outside with their dogs. GGAS supports the creation of off-leash areas in San Francisco-indeed, the city already has more off-leash play areas than any other in the US. Moreover, it is widely accepted that San Francisco's city parks are de facto off-leash parks; leash laws are rarely followed and almost never enforced, again with significant impacts to local wildlife and non-dog owners in city parks. We also do not oppose the creation of off-leash areas within the GGNRA, provided they are (1) in appropriate areas, (2) fully enclosed by natural or symbolic barriers, and (3) patrolled to ensure compliance.

Given the broad accommodation of dogs in San Francisco and the GGNRA, GGAS must ask where the accommodation for wildlife is to be found. We are forced to fight for every bit of remaining habitat because so much has already been taken away and what is left is subject to so much disturbance. At least, the proposed Preferred Alternatives represent a first step toward a more balanced, respectful, and sustainable approach.

Golden Gate Audubon represents Audubon members in San Francisco and western Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. These comments are submitted on their behalf. We join in and support the comments provided by Audubon Society members in Marin and San Mateo, represented by the Marin Audubon Society and Sequoia Audubon Society, respectively.

## I. COMMENTS ON POLICIES AND FINDINGS

### A. The GGNRA Should Provide More Opportunities for Visitors to Recreate in the GGNRA in San

San Francisco without Interacting with Dogs.

Currently, the Preferred Alternatives only provide a few areas where visitors, including those with small children, may go without having to interact with dogs. This is not fair to community members that have a right to enjoy the park without fear or discomfort due to the presence of dogs.

While dog walking provides many benefits for dog owners, including socialization and exercise, it can act as a barrier to physical activities and park enjoyment for non-dog owners. For many, the presence of dogs and dog waste negatively affects their park experience and acts as a barrier to using and enjoying the park.

The Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute (CFLRI) published a summary of the Toohey (2011) and McCormack (2010) studies and summarized impacts to non-dog owners due to dog activity in urban parks to include:

- Dogs are often perceived as a nuisance, due to dog waste, litter and disturbance;
  - Uncontrolled dogs create perceptions of risks to public safety; and
  - Older adults, women, and ethnic minorities are more likely to perceive dogs as barriers to physical activity than other groups.
- o Women who perceived off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods had 50 minutes less of physical activity than women in neighborhoods who did not observe off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods; and
  - o Latino women perceived off-leash dogs in their neighborhoods or parks as barriers to letting their children play outside.

These perceptions create barriers to outdoor physical activity for many. The SEIS fails to adequately emphasize the disenfranchisement or loss of activity to many in the community due to the status quo of dog-related recreation in the GGNRA.

The CFLRI summary, like the Toohey and McCormack surveys, both also identify the substantial benefits that come with dog ownership and exercising dogs outside. GGAS acknowledges that and encourages the City of San Francisco and the National Park Service to ensure there are adequate opportunities for such activity. However, we also note that San Francisco already has more off-leash play areas than any metropolitan area in North America, and that its city parks are de facto off-leash parks. We also note that the GGNRA will be the first and only National Park to accommodate on- and off-leash activity to the scale provided in the Preferred Alternative. Dog owners will continue to have ample opportunity to benefit from dog-related recreation and exercise in San Francisco.

GGAS notes that the observations of the Toohey and McCormack surveys—the two most comprehensive and updated surveys of their kind—agree with findings in the SEIS and its supporting documentation, including The General Technical Report submitted to the GGNRA and the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy in 2007, which found:

Dogs as problems were mentioned by all Latino and Asian groups. For example, dogs off-leash create fear. Dog owners not picking up feces in fields, on trails and beaches, and picnic areas reduce enjoyment of the experience. Latinos, overall, expressed concern about dog owners "not caring" or lacking control (e.g., owners assume other people will like their dog as much as they do; allowing dogs to approach other people without their permission; dogs begging for food and owners not retracting them).

(Roberts, 2007, at ii). Quotes from park visitors that Roberts surveyed include:

"Every time we go to picnic the dogs come and eat our food, they wander around and the owners don't do anything. The same with their bowel movements! The owners don't clean after them." [31 year old, Latina]

Female, GED student, San Francisco]

(Id., at 34). These are not outlier sentiments and are common concerns from park visitors.

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

#### B. Regulated Off-leash Areas Should Be Well Defined by Physical Barriers and Signage.

Regulated Off-Leash Areas (ROLAs) should be configured, enclosed and marked with adequate signage to (1) provide dog owners with clear guidance as to where on- and off-leash dog recreation is appropriate, (2) provide non-dog owners with certainty that unwanted interaction with dogs will be minimized and provide non-dog owners with a choice to interact with dogs, and (3) clarify and simplify enforcement, to the benefit of the Park Service and park visitors.

The decision to enclose ROLAs really is fundamental to the protection of national park values. Natural areas, wildlife, and other park resources should not be fenced off as if in a zoo. Rather, the recreational activities which disrupt the park resources-in this case, off-leash dog recreation-should be appropriately enclosed.

Even the off-leash advocacy group SFDog has endorsed the creation of barriers to prevent potential conflicts between dogs, vehicles, organized sporting events, and other park users. Barriers must also be present to protect dogs from steep cliffs or other natural hazards. (Ewing, John. 1999. Managing Off-leash Recreation in Urban Parks. SFDog. Available at [http://www.sfdog.org/do/olrm\\_scan.pdf](http://www.sfdog.org/do/olrm_scan.pdf)). Indeed, the establishment of an enclosed ROLA was the only productive outcome of the Negotiated Rulemaking effort. GGAS cannot understand why the Park Service elected to ignore the only point of consensus to come out of the Negotiated Rulemaking process in choosing to not enclose ROLAs.

ROLAs can be enclosed by site-specific appropriate means. Natural barriers, shrubs, cliffs or other rocky barriers, may all be appropriate. Where fencing is the most appropriate solution, post-and-cable may suffice. It will not impede wildlife movement and will not unduly negatively affect the aesthetic values of the area. It will also not make dog owners or their dogs feel "caged". NPS' statement that it rejected the notion of enclosed ROLAs due to concerns to wildlife or aesthetics appear to be nothing more than pretext and are not supported by evidence in the SEIS. In any event, if an area is not appropriate for an enclosure, the area should not be designated as a ROLA.

Dog owners have rightly complained that the National Park Service has not provide consistent, clear guidance about where on- and off-leash recreation is appropriate under the 1979 Pet Policy. A failure to do so under the new plan will undermine and undo the years of work (and millions of dollars invested) in this plan.

Some dog owners prefer to walk their dogs on-leash and wish to avoid contact with off-leash dogs. Clearly marked ROLAs will allow those dog owners to continue to walk their dogs on-leash and to choose when, and if, they wish to encounter off-leash dogs. Indeed, McCormack (2010) found that "[t]he separation of dogs from other park users by fences enclosing off-leash areas as well as dog-specific signage were considered important for encouraging park use among dog owners: 'clear notices so that

people know that it is a dog-friendly park."

Notably, the American Veterinary Medical Association's Task Force on Canine Aggression and Human-Canine Interactions clearly states that dog bites represent a demonstrable threat to communities and that dog bite prevention requires (1) acknowledgement of the issue, (2) clear and deliberate action to prevent bites, and (3) a transparent and credible reporting process for interactions. The AVMA specifically concludes that "[r]easonable and enforceable laws or ordinances are required for good control of unrestrained or free-roaming animals..." in order to prevent bites.

Moreover, as discussed above, non-dog owners should be given a choice before interacting with off-leash dogs. A non-dog owner will have no legitimate grounds for complaint if he or she interacts with a dog in an appropriately enclosed ROLA. Complaints to this effect should decline considerable.

#### C. The SEIS Fails to Establish that "Voice Control" Is a Valid Method of Controlling Off-leash Dogs.

At the February 6th panel discussion held by Rep. Jackie Speier, Superintendent Frank Dean conceded that there is no evidence that demonstrates that dog owners in the GGNRA consistently have "voice control" over their off-leash dogs. He further conceded that the SEIS is bereft of evidence that "voice control" is a legitimate form of restraint for dogs or is supported as a management measures.

Indeed, the Criminal Incident Reports produced by the Park Service's rangers consistently demonstrate that off-leash dogs are not on "voice control" within the GGNRA. The Criminal Incident Reports record dogs attacking people, wildlife, and other dogs while ignoring owners' commands to heel or stop. Nothing in the SEIS or elsewhere in the record demonstrates-or even implies-that "voice control" is anything other than a myth.

Clearly, some responsible dog owners maintain very good voice control over their dogs. But given as how there is no requirement that voice control be demonstrated as a precursor to permitting a park visitor to letting his or her dog off-leash, the National Park Service cannot legitimately point to voice control as a practice that will minimize impacts to other park users or park resources.

Therefore, barring a revision of the SEIS, voice control as a component of management measures, should be stricken from the Dog Management Plan and not considered a factor that mitigates impacts to the environment.

#### D. Commercial Dog Walking Should Not Be Included as a Component of the Preferred Alternative.

The SEIS does not justify why commercial dog walking (CDW) is included as a component of the Preferred Alternative. A proper evaluation should examine whether commercial dog walking is consistent with applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies, which in this case include the Organic Act, the GGNRA enabling legislation, the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998, the National Environmental Policy Act, NPS Management Policies 2006, and Director's Order #53.

Clearly, many National Parks allow for commercial activity within their borders. For example, the Rocky Mountain National Park provides for Commercial Use Authorizations (CUA) for certain activities within the park. NPS states:

CUA activities must be appropriate to the mission of the park, compliment resource protection, visitor protection and interpretation goals, and not pose any potential derogation of values or purposes for which the park was established.



While some may argue that dog walking is part of the mission of the GGNRA and was intrinsic in the "values or purposes for which the park was established", no one can credibly argue that the commercial enterprise of dog walking-i.e., walking a dog that you do not own for financial gain-can in any way be considered part of the GGNRA's mission or core values or purposes.

Commercial dog walking does not meet the criteria to be authorized as an appropriate activity for national parklands. It constitutes a commercial exploitation of park resources (both in environmental impacts and personnel to manage the activity). To our knowledge, commercial dog walking is not allowed in any other unit of the National Park System. Rather, where commercial activities are allowed, they are permitted only to the extent that they provide for or enhance park visitor experiences. Commercial dog walking does not provide any park enhancement benefit. At a minimum, the SEIS must be revised to demonstrate how this commercial activity complies with applicable laws and regulations.

GGAS' specific concerns are addressed in greater detail below:

1. The SEIS fails to sufficiently demonstrate that commercial dog walking (CDW) is an appropriate use of national parkland. CDW is not provided for as a park purpose under the Organic Act, is not provided for under the GGNRA enabling legislation, and does not meet the criteria of Management Policy 8.1.2 as an appropriate use of the park.

A proper evaluation of CDW must include a determination of the appropriateness of this activity to be conducted on national parklands. The process for determining appropriate uses, as described in Management Policy 8.1.2 Process for Determining Appropriate Uses, must include an evaluation of the following:

- consistency with applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies;
- consistency with existing plans for public use and resource management;
- actual and potential effects on park resources and values;
- total costs to the Service; and
- whether the public interest will be served.

The SEIS fails to address each of these criteria as they apply to CDW, fails to demonstrate that CDW meets these criteria and thereby fails to demonstrate that CDW is an appropriate use of national parklands.

2. CDW will have unacceptable impacts on the park including:

- Large groups of dogs and commercial dog walking vehicles will create an aesthetic in the park similar to that of a dog park-including related visuals, sounds, and odors.
- NPS personnel will have to dedicate more time to regulating CDW, increasing the economic impact that CDW will have on park resources without recouping costs from the businesses-the dog walkers-profiting from exploiting park resources.
- CDWs will typically bring in many more dogs than private dog owners and walkers, resulting in increased displacement of dog owners and other park users. Notably, the SEIS fails to address any such impacts.

3. CDW does not qualify for Commercial Use Authorization. CDW does not provide services to visitors and CDW activity would be more than incidental use of the park. (See Management Policies 2006 Sec. 10.3)

4. CDW does not qualify for Special Use Permit. The SEIS fails to demonstrate CDW's qualification for Special Use Permit (See Directors Order #53).

A. The SEIS fails to demonstrate that CDW will in no way harm the integrity of park resources or values,

including the opportunities that otherwise would be present for the enjoyment of those resources or values (See DO#53 Sec. 3) (See Management Policies 2006 Sec. 1.4.4-1.4.5).

B. The SEIS fails to cite an existing legal right or statutory authority for CDW use of the park (See DO#53 sec. 3) (See Management Policies 2006 Sec. 1.4.4-1.4.5).

C. The SEIS fails to demonstrate that CDW will not trigger any of the following criteria: (See DO#53 Sec. 4)

â€¢ will create an unacceptable impact on park resources or values, or  
â€¢ is contrary to the purposes for which the park was established, or  
â€¢ will unreasonably disrupt the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, or  
â€¢ will unreasonably interfere with visitor activities or NPS administrative activities, or  
â€¢ create an unsafe or unhealthy environment for other visitors or employees, or  
â€¢ result in conflict with other existing uses.

In fact, as discussed above, CDW will (1) impact park resources, (2) disrupt the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, (3) interfere with visitor activities or NPS administration of those activities, (4) create unsafe or unhealthy environments for visitors or employees, and (5) conflict with other existing uses. At a minimum, the SEIS must be revised to address these points and explain why CDW is permissible.

5. CDW can be accommodated elsewhere in the local area. The SEIS does demonstrate the imperative to permit CDW on national park land. Commercial dog walkers have access to at least 28 off-leash dog play areas throughout the City of San Francisco and make frequent-and unrestrained-use of San Francisco's remaining city parks. (See, e.g., SEIS at 31).

6. NPS policy should not be determined based on regional politics. National park values should be upheld with the national interest in mind.

7. CDW is a local concern and should be managed within the jurisdictional boundaries of local municipalities. The GGNRA should not be devalued and used as a cheap solution to a local, urban problem. National parks provide immense social and economic value to adjacent local communities; however, they do not exist to be exploited for financial gain by members of the local community unless the commercial activity closely aligns with park values, resources, and administrative needs.

The proposed ban on CDW may seem overly harsh. However, irresponsible commercial dog walkers have, for years, let loose dogs that have harassed other park visitors (including dogs) and wildlife, trampled vegetation and other habitat, and left behind feces. The status quo is unsustainable because of the behavior of the community involved and the National Park Service is under no legal compulsion to accommodate a commercial use that diminishes park resources without any effort to mitigate its impacts or otherwise offset their costs.

E. Park Visitors Should Be Limited to Two Licensed Dogs per Visitor.

On trails, visitors with more than one dog have a wider space requirement and have the potential to impact other park visitors by disrupting or impeding their progress along the trail. In ROLAs, it is not practical to allow voice control of more than two dogs per person- -indeed, there is no evidence that owners can reliably establish voice control over one dog. With few exceptions, dog handlers are not capable of adequately managing more than one off-leash dog at a time.

The Park Service wishes to accommodate visitors that have more than two dogs per visitor, the Service

should explore a permitting system that ensures that the visitor is able to control more than two dogs at one time. Any such permitting system should (1) include an educational component, (2) a test of the visitor's ability to handle multiple dogs, (3) active enforcement of the permit requirement, and (4) be cost-neutral to the Service (i.e., paid for by those receiving the permit).

Moreover, the National Park Service should require that dogs allowed into the park-especially off-leash dogs-should be licensed by a local municipality. The American Veterinary Medical Association strongly supports dog licensing requirements. San Francisco's local SPCA and Animal Care and Control agency also support licensing. To our knowledge, none of the dog advocacy groups involved oppose dog licensing. All agree that responsible pet guardians comply with local ordinances and license their pets.

Licensing ensures ready identification of lost dogs or dogs involved in incidents of concern; it also provides greater certainty of vaccinations. Because the City of San Francisco's ordinances require licensing of dogs, this requirement is complete agreement with local laws and policies. The GGNRA could enforce the licensing requirement easily and without punitive remedies: owners or guardians of unlicensed dogs could simply be informed that licenses are required within the park and be asked to leave until the dog is licensed. Moreover, increased licensing would directly benefit the City by providing increased revenue to its Animal Care and Control agency and greater safety and security to community members and dogs within city limits. Permitting only dogs with licenses into the GGNRA is a win-win for all stakeholders.

#### F. A Simple and Effective Violation Reporting and Enforcement System Should Be Established and Records Made Publicly Available.

Compliance with any dog management plan is essential to the plan's success and the sustainable, balanced use of the park. An effective compliance system must include the following components:

1. Clear guidelines that are easily communicated to and understood by park visitors;
2. Signage, brochures, and enclosures (for ROLAs, where appropriate);
3. A simple system for reporting violations to NPS by members of the public;
4. Consistent and active enforcement of park rules by NPS rangers;
5. Completion of Criminal Incident Reports (or other written reports) regarding violations;
6. Easy and efficient public access to reports and statistics of compliance rates, violations, and conflicts recorded by NPS; and
7. An adaptive management approach, open to adjusting to resolve problems with compliance or unanticipated impacts to people, park resources, or park personnel.

The American Veterinary Medical Association states: "Enforcement of restraint laws is, therefore, essential if the incidence of dog bites is to be reduced." The same could be said about overall numbers of dog assaults (where no bite occurs) or other disturbances within the GGNRA. Even under the 1979 Pet Policy, NPS has been inconsistent and lacked a clear, transparent enforcement program.

Unfortunately, the current version of the Dog Management Plan and the SEIS lack specificity as to how NPS will improve upon the status quo. Notably, none of the criteria identified above are met under the 1979 Pet Policy or its current implementation. The SEIS lacks adequate information to demonstrate that the status quo will be changed.

At a minimum, the National Park Service should implement an online database for reported incidents that area searchable by members of the public. This could include digital copies of Criminal Incident Reports (with personal information redacted). The American Veterinary Medical Association Task Force concluded:

Accurate and complete reporting of dog bites is an essential element of a bite prevention program. These reports are vital not only for case management and judicial review but for planning, implementing, and evaluating the status of the problem.

A requirement that all dogs within the GGNRA be licensed will greatly help with incident reporting and tracking.

Finally, the National Park Service should produce an annual report with statistics regarding compliance with the existing rules (whether it be the 1979 Pet Policy or the new dog management rule). The report should include site-specific information on (1) statistics of compliance, (2) counts of incidents involving dogs, (3) an estimate of costs for (a) enforcement, (b) natural resource damages, and (c) other incidental costs associated with managing dog-related recreation at the site. The annual report will assist in adaptive implementation of the dog management plan and help the public and the Park Service understand the true financial cost of this recreational activity in the Park.

G. The Accepted Taxonomic Binomial for the Western Snowy Plover Is Now *Charadrius nivosus*.

The SEIS and plan continue to refer to the Western Snowy Plover as *Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*. The species is now identified as the Snowy Plover and recognized as distinct from the Kentish Plover. The binomial for the Snowy Plover should be corrected in the SEIS to be *Charadrius nivosus*.

In the GGNRA, the Snowy Plover has both biological and historical significance. Biologically, the Pacific Coast population of the Western Snowy Plover is federally listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 as threatened, and is a Bird Species of Special Concern in California. Historically, the Snowy Plover was first known to science by a specimen collected by Lt. William P. Trowbridge on May 8, 1854, from the shoreline dunes of the Presidio, making the Presidio the "type locality" for the species.

## II. SITE-SPECIFIC COMMENTS

While many of our general concerns reach to the SEIS as proposed for the entire GGNRA, we have restricted our site-specific comments to areas in San Francisco. While our members have concerns about the alternatives and their elements in Marin and San Mateo Counties, we defer to the Marin Audubon Society and the Sequoia Audubon Society, respectively, based on their local expertise and representation of local community members. We join in and support the comments submitted by both groups, as well as comments provided by the San Francisco Bay chapter of the Sierra Club, Nature in the City, the California Native Plant Society, and the Wild Equity Institute.

Ft. Mason - GGAS supports the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: (1) no commercial dog walking; (2) two licensed dogs per visitor, and (3) establishment a simple and effective reporting system.

Crissy Field WPA - The language of the plan should allow the National Park Service flexibility in determining the exact location of the fence and consideration should be given to the visual penetration effect as well as the geographical conditions of the immediate area.

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

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

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

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

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

Crissy East of the Lagoon - The Freshwater Swale should be designated as a no dog zone.

Crissy Promenade - GGAS supports the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: (1) no commercial dog walking; (2) two licensed dogs per visitor; and (3) establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

Crissy Airfield - The Crissy airfield attracts a wide variety of grassland bird species, including rare vagrants, and is a popular venue for wildlife viewing. This fact is not adequately represented in the SEIS. The eastern portion of the airfield, in its proximity to the Crissy lagoon, is the most environmentally sensitive portion of the airfield. Establishing a ROLA on the eastern portion of the airfield will create a greater potential for conflict between dog walking activities and wildlife, wildlife viewing, and visitor experience.

We prefer to have no off-leash dogs on the airfield. However, if a section is to be chosen as a ROLA, off-leash activity in the central portion of the airfield would have the least impact on wildlife and those engaged in wildlife viewing. Any ROLA should be fully enclosed with, at a minimum, post-and-cable fencing and clear signage.

Ft. Point - GGAS supports the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: (1) no commercial dog walking; (2) two licensed dogs per visitor; and (3) establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

Baker Beach - The Preferred Alternative for Baker Beach is problematic for several reasons. Splitting the beach into leash-only and no-dog areas will lead to confusion, non-compliance, visitor conflict and continued management problems. Furthermore, allowing dogs near the creek outlet, an area often used by shorebirds, will increase the potential for wildlife conflicts. As a means of eliminating these problems and of creating more opportunities for visitors to enjoy dog-free National Park experiences, the entire Baker Beach area should be designated as a dog-free zone.

Lands End - GGAS supports the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: (1) no commercial dog walking; (2) two licensed dogs per visitor; and (3) establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

Sutro Heights Park - GGAS supports the Preferred Alternative with the following changes: (1) no commercial dog walking; (2) two licensed dogs per visitor; and (3) establishment of a simple and effective reporting system.

Ocean Beach - GGAS supports the Preferred Alternative for Ocean Beach. To improve upon the Preferred Alternative, it is suggested that symbolic fencing and adequate signage is used to delineate the south border of the ROLA. A simple post and cable fence could be placed along the border from the sea wall to the plover sculpture. A well-defined border will help to reduce compliance problems and visitor conflict. Additionally, GGAS suggests changing the name Snowy Plover Protection Area to Wildlife Protection Area. A designation of Wildlife Protection Area would be inclusive of all wildlife species that use the beach habitat area.

Ft. Funston - To the extent that NPS proceeds in allowing a ROLA at Ft. Funston, it must be fenced and fully marked to provide adequate notice to dog owners and other park users about where on- and off-leash dog activities are appropriate.

GGAS strongly opposes the Preferred Alternative, which creates a ROLA along the beach south of the Funston Beach Trail access. Given the historic noncompliance by dog owners at Ft. Funston and the sensitivity of the habitat, GGAS has concluded that dog related recreation on the Ft. Funston beach is not an appropriate use of the park land.

Because dogs should not be accessing the beach at Ft. Funston, GGAS further recommends that NPS not allow dogs on the beach access trails. The presence of dogs on the beach at Ft. Funston will adversely impact shorebirds. Additionally, the presence of dogs on the beach at Ft. Funston will adversely impact park visitors, including equestrians, some of whom have suffered attacks from dogs when riding at or near Ft. Funston.

GGAS opposes permitting dog recreation south of the main parking lot. Dog-related recreation on the Ft. Funston beach is not an appropriate use of that park land, there is no need for dogs to be on the beach access trails, especially Sand Ladder Trail. GGAS recommends that this area be designated as a "no-dog" area.

GGAS does not oppose the establishment of a ROLA north of the main lot at Ft. Funston provided (1) that the ROLA is not established on sensitive habitat, (2) that the ROLA is fully contained by a natural or physical barrier with adequate signage, and (3) that the ROLA and surrounding areas are adequately patrolled and leash requirements are enforced.

### III. CONCLUSION

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. It is our hope that the FEIS will reflect a comprehensive analysis of the impacts that will occur under the selected alternatives and that active education and enforcement is part of ongoing management in the GGNRA for dogs. With a reasonable regulation and adequate enforcement, we believe the GGNRA can continue to accommodate dogs while protecting the valuable natural and cultural resources that make the GGNRA an urban national treasure.

If you would like to discuss these issues further, please do not hesitate to contact me at [mlynes@goldengateaudubon.org](mailto:mlynes@goldengateaudubon.org) or at (510) 843-9912.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Lynes  
Executive Director

#### REFERENCES

- (1) Toohey and Rock (2011). Unleashing their potential: a critical realist scoping review of the influence of dogs on physical activity for dog-owners and non-owners. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2011, 8:46, <http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/8/1/46>, at 1
- (2) G.R. McCormack et al. (2010) Characteristics of urban parks associated with park use and physical activity: A review of qualitative research. *Health & Place* 16 (2010) 712-726, at 716 (noting dog feces degraded park quality), 717
- (3) The Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute and ParticipACTION. Can dogs influence physical activity levels of dog-owners and non-owners? Issue 07-07/12. Available at <http://www.participaction.com/pdf/ResearchFile-July-EN.pdf>
- (4) Roberts, N. (2007) General Technical Report Submitted to: The Golden Gate National Recreation Area and The Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy (March 2007), at 28, 30, available at [http://online.sfsu.edu/nroberts/documents/research/SFSU\\_GGNRA-FocusGroups\\_FinalReport07.pdf](http://online.sfsu.edu/nroberts/documents/research/SFSU_GGNRA-FocusGroups_FinalReport07.pdf).
- (5) American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA). 2001. A Community Approach to Dog Bite Prevention. *JAVMA*, Vol 218, No. 11, June 1, 2001, available at <https://www.avma.org/public/Health/Documents/dogbite.pdf>.
- (6) Id. at 1736.
- (7) See [http://www.nps.gov/romo/parkmgmt/commercial\\_use\\_authorizations.htm](http://www.nps.gov/romo/parkmgmt/commercial_use_authorizations.htm)
- (8) AMVA (2001), at 1736.
- (9) Id. at 1736.
- (10) Id. at 1738.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6192	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Mr. Dean				

I am a Burlingame resident who has been using GGNRA's Sweeney Ridge trail system for over 5 years. My dog and I typically walk to Sweeney Ridge from the Sneath lane trail head to meet our son who comes over the from Fassler trail head in Pacifica. I typically hike with my dog on Sneath Lane in San Bruno or the San Francisco Public Utilities watershed boundary at the Portola Gate. This gives us a good two hour round trip.

I support the use of the city of Pacifica's GGNRA lands for all including on-leash dog walking, hiking, trail running, mountain biking, horseback riding, wildlife watching, etc. I understand the need to protect fragile areas and balance public recreation needs but it feels dog owners are being excluded from the use of this public recreation resource when there has been years of use and very little environmental impact. I would hope better signage and enforcement could accomplish your goal without restricting the areas we are currently able to bring our dog.

#### Sweeny Ridge/Cattle Hill

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 19-A) with the addition of the Baquiano Trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. The adoption of Alternative A with the mentioned additions would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the

Sweeney Ridge trail system.

I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Many users of Sweeney Ridge live locally and access the trail system from three very different geographical trail access points.

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Most trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Currently a gas, water and electrical right of way. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Sweeney Ridge. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

No attempt to protect sensitive areas with signage or fencing.

Visitor use of Sweeney Ridge is relatively low compared to other GGNRA areas, making visitor and on-leash dog contacts very minimal.

Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep, only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

#### Mori Point

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A)

I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

Consideration for ADA accessibility.



Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness "National Park" experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

### San Pedro Highlands

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E)  
I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the Devil's Slide Trail.

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation.

Consideration for ADA accessibility.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness "National Park" experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

As you know the GGNRA is a unique special place that was created to accommodate the recreational needs of an urban area, essentially creating an urban park. Any attempt to mirror dog restrictions used in national parks with a wilderness experience would be misguided and would go against the intended mission of the GGNRA when it was created. Please continue to allow us to recreate with our dog in the

GGNRA  
and consider my concerns.

Sincerely,  
Michael Read  
Burlingame, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6193    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:38:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Obedient, well behaved dogs need to be able to run free with their owners. There are already enough restrictions on where they can do that in San Francisco. I believe the proposed new rules are unreasonable and unnecessarily restrictive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6194    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:38:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean

I attended the meeting at Stern Grove recently featuring you and congresswoman Jackie Speier. When a question came up as to why there are no off leash areas in the GGNRA in San Mateo county you indicated local law, or local precedent. How is this relevant Frank Dean? Doesn't federal law supersede local and state law?

Also, I am noticing a double standard here in your policy. When pressed about there being no off leash areas in the GGNRA in San Mateo county you indicated it is because there is precedent in San Mateo county for not having off leash areas. WHAT ABOUT THE PRECEDENT IN SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY FRANK DEAN? There is precedent here for off leash in the GGNRA, which you are trying to take away these rights. How can you respect precedent in one area and give this as reason for your failure to establish off leash lands, and disrespect precedent in another area by trying to take away these rights that have been long established?

And what about the fact that the San Francisco city supervisors voted unanimously to recommend for you to keep the long standing off leash dog rights the same as they always have been? Why do you give false respect to lawmakers in San Mateo, who actual probably do not care if you establish off leash lands in that county and disrespect lawmakers in San Francisco by not complying with their wishes for the people who live in our city after this issue was much studied, contemplated and debated by them?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6195    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:39:10**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Simone Echeguren

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6196 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I don't have a dog but grew up with them and we went to Muir Beach and Rodeo all the time with the dog.

The preferred plan is way too restrictive. The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Let the dogs play and let people exercise with their dogs.

Thanks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6197 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:42:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Why is there NO MENTION OF THIS GGNRA on your FACEBOOK Page?  
Hiding the truth...  
Spineless of you.  
Shame on you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6198    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Cappelletti

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6199    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Sonja Renner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6200    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:45:47  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** On pages 310-328, there is an extensive and details presentation of data describing dog-related incidents in many locations throughout the GGNRA. I read this section with great interest.

For the years from 2008 to 2011, in most cases, there has been a steady and significant downward trend in the number of these incidents. For example, at Crissy Field, the number of incidents falls from almost 200 to much less than 100, including a dramatic reduction in the incidents of dogs in the WPA.

These reductions have come about because of increased efforts at education, as well as self-policing of these areas.

On the basis of this data, I believe the present policy is working, and that some additional investment in education would produce significant benefits. In contrast, the report gives no evidence to show that the proposed policy changes will have beneficial effects, or that the presence of the proposed policies in other comparable urban park settings has had these benefits.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6201    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Burlingame, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Dean

I have been using GGNRAs Sweeney Ridge trail system for over 5 years. I support the use of GGNRA lands for all including on-leash dog walking, hiking, trail running, mountain biking, horseback riding, wildlife watching, etc. I understand the need to protect fragile areas and balance public recreation needs but it feels dog owners are being excluded from the use of this public recreation resource when there has been years of use and very little environmental impact. I would hope better signage and enforcement could accomplish your goal without restricting the areas we are currently able to bring our dog.

Sweeny Ridge/Cattle Hill

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 19-A) with the addition of the Baquiano Trail from the trailhead at Fassler Ave. in Pacifica. The adoption of Alternative A with the mentioned additions would allow continued multi use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Sweeney Ridge trail system.

I do not support the current preferred alternative 19-F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of all of the Sweeney Ridge Trail System. Many users of Sweeney Ridge live locally and access the trail system from three very different geographical trail access points.

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Most trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Currently a gas, water and electrical right of way. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Sweeney Ridge. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

No attempt to protect sensitive areas with signage or fencing.

Visitor use of Sweeny Ridge is relatively low compared to other GGNRA areas, making visitor and on-leash dog contacts very minimal.

Consideration for ADA accessibility. 19-F would exclude the least steep, only switch backed trail into the Sweeney Ridge Trail System.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

Sweeney Ridge is surrounded by urban areas with direct access from many neighborhoods making the wilderness back country experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking. Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

#### Mori Point

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 17-A)  
I do not support the preferred alternative of 17F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of trails

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. Some trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on Mori Point. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

Degradation of area with existing non native vegetation.

Consideration for ADA accessibility.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

Mori Point is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness "National Park" experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

San Pedro Highlands

I support GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's Alternative A (Map 20-E)  
I do not support with the preferred alternative of 20F due to:

Lack of interconnect-ability of trails. Please open up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trail for on-leash dogs. These would connect to the Devil's Slide Trail.

Over stating of damage caused by on-leash dog walking given the historical use of the area which once was an active military site. All trails are existing 4x4 vehicle roads at least eight feet wide-if dog is leashed will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Mountain biking and horse riding are permitted on San Pedro Highlands. These activities are just as destructive if not more so to sensitive habit areas and species.

San Pedro Highlands was until recently a dirt bike club. There is heavy degradation of this area with existing non native vegetation.

Consideration for ADA accessibility.

Impact on other local parks. The San Mateo County Parks Department has a no pet policy making the GGNRA the only legal place to walk our dog in a rural park setting.

San Pedro headlands is surrounded by an urban area making the wilderness "National Park" experience unattainable.

Is enforcement realistic? I would rather have consistent on-leash enforcement rather than unregulated off-leash due to difficulty of enforcement.

Failure of EIS to show specific scientific damage resulting from on-leash dog walking.  
Many rare and endangered species and plants have thrived and not adversely been effected by on-leash dog walking.

As you know the GGNRA is a unique special place that was created to accommodate the recreational needs of an urban area, essentially creating an urban park. Any attempt to mirror dog restrictions used in national parks with a wilderness experience would be misguided and would go against the intended mission of the GGNRA when it was created. Please continue to allow us to recreate with our dog in the GGNRA  
and consider my concerns.

Sincerely,

Christine Read  
Burlingame, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6202    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:48:46  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Laurel Robinson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6203    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Philadelphia , PA 19118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:49:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the study. Dogs should be banned anywhere that they pose a threat to birds and other wildlife or people's enjoyment of nature! I applaud your courage in trying to protect our natural habitats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6204    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:49:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Reviewing the Dog Management Plan, I find myself shocked by all of the work and expense that has gone into managing dogs in our local National Park. And San Francisco residents know

---



that dog owners often do not follow the rules anyway, as can be seen by looking at SF city parks and green spaces, so even making rules seems like a very optimistic undertaking. That said, I support Alternative D.

I do not think that commercial dog walking belongs in a national park. It is a business, not a recreation. It may be very pleasant to get to conduct one's business in a beautiful national park, but that is not fair to the rest of us who want to enjoy being outdoors and are tired of the vast number of dogs. There are 32 dedicated off leash dog parks in San Francisco already and more on the way. Millions of dollars have been spent on SF dogs, yet they now prefer our national park.

I think that the maximum number of dogs that a private person should walk is two. I also support fenced ROLAs. Please require that every dog walker carry an ID that can be presented if there is a problem.

Dog owners are very politically organized, but their opinions do not accurately reflect the rest of the population who are too cowed by their bullying angry stances. Our parks are for people, not dogs. Many older people now avoid parks and the GGNRA because of all of the dogs, mostly off leash. Even on-leash dogs can jump on a person, especially when they are walked on the long expandable leashes. I think that you need to specify a maximum leash length of 6 feet. I get tired of having leashes wrap around my legs and that entrapment is also dangerous.

I enjoy the wild landscape and the wildlife of the GGNRA. Any day on the beach dogs can be seen chasing birds that are feeding, forcing them to fly off. And dog waste is frequently left, especially in wilder areas where the dogs go off the trail but the owners don't leave the trail to pick up the waste.

Please limit the number of dogs in the GGNRA. And please give the public a phone number for reporting dog problems of all sorts and submitting photos of wildlife harassment. There presently appears to be no way to do that.

Thanks!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6205	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:49:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet

policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Gribble

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6206	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. The management plan is too restrictive and will prevent me from enjoying the area with my dog in the way I have enjoyed GGNRA properties for many years. The GGNRA is a wonderful local resource for the dog owning community.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

My grandfather was a great outdoorsman and I learned to love and respect nature and public space through times I shared with him. While we need to protect nature, it is public caretakers' responsibility to find a balance so that nature is protected and the community may enjoy and actively use the land.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Please do not move forward with the planned changes to the GGNRA dog management plan.

Sincerely,

Michelle Murray, MSN, RN

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6207	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Seattle, WA 98105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

---

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Audryn Lovinger  
Former SF Resident

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6208	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:51:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Bringing our dogs to the park is the main way we enjoy the parks. I'm certain I wouldn't frequent them as often if dogs were not allowed.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6209	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Delmar, NY 12054 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:52:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

As a frequent visitor and future resident of Montara, I oppose the proposed 'Regulated Off Leash Area' (ROLA) in the area between Le Conte St. and Tamarind St., Montara in the Rancho Corral de Tierra area of the GGNRA. Reference Alternative 'C' and 'E' of the GGNRA draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)."

Some reasons to oppose the 'dog park' in this area:

- Preserve / conserve the open space
- The operation of the adjacent school and student safety will be adversely impacted
- The streets accessing the area are not suited to additional traffic
- The existing quiet neighborhood will be degraded by noise and traffic

A fenced off-leash area directly adjacent to a residential community will be unsightly - dog excrement will accumulate despite best efforts by owners to cleanup. This is not only unsightly, but a potential public health hazard where dog parasites can contaminate the soil. Urine and fecal matter accumulation will smell and will ruin grass and topsoil. Barking and yelping will contribute to noise pollution.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6210	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94540  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Shawna Balzer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6211    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:53:30  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

We are dog owners and are very saddened to learn of the planned severe restrictions for on-leash dog walking in the GGNRA in Pacifica. We would be very happy if you will allow leashed dogs on the Bootlegger Steps at Mori Point. We always liked to go down a different trail - the road going east should be fine for dogs since it's very wide. If these are not kept open for dogs we won't be walking there as we won't go without our dog and we need uphill walking.

We like Councilmember Sue Digre's suggestion of opening the trails around Sheldance Nursery for dog walkers. Please keep trails in Pacifica open for dog walkers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Susan & Richard Herring & Sadie the Dog

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6212    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Niki F. ... former SF resident for 10 years ... and an active volunteer for Golden Gate Labrador Retriever Rescue

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6213	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:56:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Whereas the worst possible of scenarios would be that Muir Beach be turned into a Dog Park, I believe it equally wrong that local residents be prevented from frolicking with their pooches on the sandy beach. I am not a dog owner but I believe the responsible dog owners outnumber those lacking. I hope that some compromise may be reached. Thank you				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6214	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Carlos, CA 94070 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 20:57:47				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been a regular weekend user of Ft. Funston for 20 years. I've seen many thousands of people and their dogs enjoying this unique space - especially the stretch of beach at the bottom of the bluff. I understand that the present tolerance for off-leash enjoyment of this space is different than other locations in the national parks. However, in all of the time I've been there, I can recall only a few minor incidents of inappropriate behavior - far less than I regularly see at on-leash dog parks.				

I suppose that the National Parks may achieve a very slight reduction in certain kinds of events by eliminating the use of this location for recreation, but there will be an immense reduction in my enjoyment of these lands. I am happy to let the National parks administer all of the other lands under their management in a manner that is consistent with wilderness preservation. I do not agree that the lands at Ft. Funston should be treated as if they are a remote wilderness. In the case of Ft. Funston, there needs to be a balance between public use and preservation, and in this case, preserving an opportunity for public

use should be the higher priority. there are hundreds of miles of beaches that are preserved - why not let this one small stretch be an exception?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6215    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland and West Marin, CA 94608

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:57:47

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not restricted or band dog access in our state parks. Limiting access for dogs would also limit access for so many dog owners. For so many people dogs are a huge and enriching part of our lives. Dogs do so much for people with disabilities, people who may suffer from depression, people that may otherwie not make it out of their houses and into the parks. Dogs help people feel connected and can easy anxiety. walking dogs daily can have great health benifits for dog owners. My dog has got me through some pretty rough times. Enjoying our parks is one of my favorite past times and is an enriching experience and great luxury that I do not want to loose. I'm not sure what all the driving forces are to baning dogs within certain parks, but I hope the people in charge can consider working on the specific problems that are caused by dogs in parks and try to find solutions rather than restricting.

Thanks for your time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6216    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Antioch , CA 95431

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6217    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Philadelphia, PA 19118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 20:59:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Re dog management plan

A worthy undertaking, to try to manage the already excessive population in beaches and parks. They represent, by their numbers, a large and negative impact on plants and birds and non-dog toting humans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6218    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:01:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I just moved here from the East Coast a half year ago and love walking my dog off leash as much as possible for it truly hurts my back when I constantly clench his leash. I used to farm and land scape and have a bad back and easily sore arms from working on a computer constantly and my only joy of every day is walking and running my dog off leash, giving us both a great exercise. It is nearly impossible to run with a dog for they need to consistently stop and smell for enjoyment and to catch their breath... running with him off leash allows him to take a break and go to the bathroom and for me to keep on running as well (obviously I stop and pick up his #2 if he goes)!

I always hike Tennessee Valley, Blithedale Canyon, and love taking him to the many beaches Marin has to offer and noticed the signs warning that this privilege may be taken away due to dog walkers not picking up after their animal... However, it is odd to me since all the soccer fields seem to be covered in geese feces and the trails covered in deer droppings and no one seems to care about those! If people continue to pick up after there dog and keep them under voice control, I don't understand what difference a leash law makes...

I know the geese are not native and come down from Canada seasonally and I know the deer are over populated here so it seems that having dogs off leash should not be a problem. I totally understand wild life preserves and never take my dog anywhere that doesn't allow them for I respect nature and all animals. However, dogs like humans, need to enjoy a variety of new locations to wander and roam, which is why I plead my case for allowing new comers like myself to enjoy this vast wonderful land of Redwoods with my dog off leash.

There are too many sport fields that don't allow any dogs and too few dog parks with wood chips that are so small a dog can barely run around... it is quite sad to see such little love for a state claims to be so dog friendly. What a shame it would be if dogs were to be harnessed and never allowed to roam free and get the exercise they deserve. I know that Indian just passed a law declaring dolphins as non-human citizens and they are no longer allowed to be held captive... Dogs may not be as smart as dolphins, but they sure are incredibly intelligent and need to be able to run wild and free!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6219    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:01:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong

---

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jelte Liebrand

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6220	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:03:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Cary Gibaldi

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6221	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael , CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:05:06				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---



**Correspondence:** Ours and all dogs need plenty of space to run off leash. Countless reasons that are stated to support maintaining the off leash trails and beaches. To maintain good health dogs need to run hard and the most effective way to run is off leash. Please consider the behavior that may result when our well exercised dogs are denied their right to run free.....possible bad behavior which may include aggressiveness. Thank you for your consideration of all of the thousands of dog owners.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6222    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:07:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I believe dogs should be able to roam in parks to remain strong and healthy. If dogs don't get the energy that their bodies require, it can lead to behavior issues.

The website: <http://voices.yahoo.com/the-importance-exercise-dog-exercise-can-6166548.html?cat=53> proves that if dogs do not get a sufficient amount of energy the dog could do things from chewing on a shoe, to attacking another dog, or even a human being.

If an owner is not able to take their dog anywhere local to exercise it is not so much that the humans will suffer; it is that the dogs will. If the owner does not have time to take them anywhere out of their way (you know how busy we all are) dogs will not be able to get exercise and would live a very unhappy life. Any dog owner would understand how much your dog's happiness means to you and if their dog cannot be happy (it can be very hard to see a dog be unhappy) owners might feel as if they did not do a good job caring for their pet.

In conclusion, if parks and trails no longer let dogs roam and get the exercise that their bodies need, it can result in aggressive behavior, unhealthiness, and most importantly unhappiness. If dogs can roam free, these things have a better chance of not occurring.

Sincerely,  
Laila LoRe Age: 10

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6223    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:07:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Patrick

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6224	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:07:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Betsy

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6225	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:08:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Alan Tse

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6226	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I have been enjoying Fort Funston everyday for the past 8 years with my 2 very well behaved & trained dogs and see no reason why I can not continue to. I am a very responsible and compliant dog owner who picks up after my dogs and does not allow them where they are not allowed.

Sincerely,  
Michelle Guiral

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6227	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Letter #1 Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

---

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Susan Edmonds

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6228    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sacramento, CA 95838  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:09:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't waste tax payers \$\$, and societies time with ridiculous ways to tie up the judicial system. Dogs are family and have the right to access these beautiful places as we do..with constrains. Its the idiots that don't teach and enforce good behavior that ruin it for everyone.... Please don't do this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6229    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:09:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am appalled at the extreme nature of the proposed changes in the GGNRA dog management plan/SEIS. The existing situation is not perfect, but as a 30 year (frequent NON-DOG OWNING) user of the GGNRA (mostly in SF and Marin Headlands), I am at a loss to understand the severity of the proposed changes. I have never seen (and I can't even remember hearing) of any problems caused by the presence of dogs on or off-leash. Please reconsider the radical restrictiveness of these rules. Dogs are one of the universe's greatest creations (as is the GGNRA). Dogs benefit greatly from the recreational opportunities at the GGNRA and their humans gain an immense amount from their companionship and well-being, especially in a gorgeous natural setting.

I wish that I had the time to respond to the SEIS point by point, but I did read it thoroughly and am in strong disagreement with both the spirit and the details of the proposal. I'm sure that there are hundreds of people who will make the argument against the SEIS in a detailed and succinct manner. I hope that you will take their comments/critiques and mine very seriously!

Thanks for your (re)consideration,

Jay Kammen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6230    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:10:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please don't place additional restrictions on dog walking in the GGNRA. I am a resident of San Francisco and have been going to Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and Baker Beach on a weekly basis for the last 10 years because I can walk my dog off leash there. Being able to do this improves the quality of my life and my health and gives me great joy. San Francisco is a very dense city and like many other dog owners I don't have a yard large enough that my dog can run freely. I'm sure most other owners of the 100,000 dogs in San Francisco feel the same way as I do about the benefit they get from walking their dogs off leash in the GGNRA.

The GGNRA manages all ocean front land in San Francisco and it needs to consider the recreation needs of the city residents. A one size fits all dog policy for the National Park System should not be applied to the GGNRA which is unique in that it is located within a major urban area. The 1979 Pet Policy provides access to off leash dog walking in only a minute portion of the GGNRA. Several of the proposed alternatives drastically reduce or totally eliminate the already small amount of dog walking areas. There is no justification for such a sudden and drastic change. Please consider the needs of the over hundred thousand dog owners in San Francisco and the Bay Area and do not impose any additional dog walking restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6231    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Jose, CA 95128  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Irene Wongtragool

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6232    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Mateo, CA 94402  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Phillip de Guzman

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6233	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Sharon Antonio

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6234	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
John robblee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6235	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:13:04				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern,				

I oppose the revised plans regarding re-zoning areas of Fort Funston as "on-leash" zones under the new dog management plan. This park is currently one of the most wonderful oases for dogs, unrivaled by anywhere else in the state. It seems like every person at this park comes here with their dogs - it is rare to find someone there without a dog. There are so many parks in the city where dogs are required to be on leash, which is fine, but why change this park? I bring my dog here almost every day and the dogs here all seem to get along, and I have never had an issue with "dog-violence" or any other problem due to animals not being on a leash. Please do not change this park. It's such a wonderful place to visit, but under these new rules, I and many others like me, would no longer find it as great of a place to visit. Thanks for your consideration.

Scott

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6236	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I walk my dog regularly in the GGNRA, I'm writing because I'm strongly opposed to the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is grossly restrictive and will prevent me and many people I know from enjoying time with our dogs, as we have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. As a city with far more dogs than children, a restriction like this takes away the rights of citizens to enjoy our open spaces with our pets. There are plenty of places where dogs are not allowed, and we respect that.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area, one where once again, there are far more dogs than children. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Emily Charnes

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6237	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:13:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Curt Larson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6238	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo , CA 94402 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.



I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Mary Robblee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6239	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	larkspur, CA 94977 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:14:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	dogs and dog owners are increasingly polluting the hiking/walking/running landscape. Stepping on dog poop is an every week and frequently everyday phenomenon. Exercising, yoga, circuit training, playing catch, kicking the soccer ball, playing frisbee are mightily constrained by the presence of dogs and dog poop. Dog owners and dog walkers do forget to clean up after their animal. Cryptosporidiosis proliferates...dog barking is irritating...dogs scare deer away...ex military service dogs are insulting...dog-ism is a sad substitute for human interaction...				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6240	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I regularly walk my dog in GGNRA. I have never had any issues with her, she is on great voice control and stays with me without issue. I love the opportunities I have to run or walk with her along the paths and beach in Fort Mason and the Presidio especially. If we are limited to one small area, I will be forced to simply watch my dog play, instead of getting exercise with her. I have many, many friends and neighbors who feel the same way. Unfortunately, living in a densely populated city, this is the only way for me and my dog to get great exercise and enjoy time together.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Nicole D. H.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6241    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:14:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for making comments available on this draft plan. This is my first time contacting the government about any kind of issue or proposed plan, and I hope that the tens of thousands of other area residents who share my concerns will comment as well.

I have lived in SF for about 13 years, and am the type of resident who will try to sell anyone on how wonderful it is to live here. Yes, it's expensive as hell, but it's an amazing place to live - in particular if you have a dog (or 2, like me. Both were rescued after being abandoned or mistreated). I happily pay taxes to schools and other services that I don't use directly, in support of a city I cherish - feeling that it is worth it to live and work here every day.

Having moved here from NYC, I truly appreciate access to offleash space and believe it is a critical component in keeping dogs healthy, and well socialized. The dog owners I see are responsible - we pick up after our dogs, are cautious towards people who may or may not like animals and do not allow dogs to harass or encroach on wildlife. In short, I believe people with dogs are earning this access with good behavior and that we present relative little risk to the quality of life for wildlife and nature.

What I do not believe is that there is legitimate, UNBIASED scientific evidence that offleash areas are threatening wildlife. I would be more concerned with parades, races and generally irresponsible park attendees who leave trash, fires, etc and have no incentive to keep these spaces in tact.

If this plan passes I'll be looking for a job in another city, and potentially another state, where they offer more rational governance over nature and open spaces.

Thanks again for your consideration

Christine Brumback

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6242    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:14:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I would like to see much more of GGNRA be truly dog-free, so people and wildlife can enjoy the natural setting without being harassed by dogs. The only way to achieve this is to designate areas closed to all dogs, either on- or off-leash. Fences will be needed to keep dogs in their designated areas.

San Francisco dog owners consistently demonstrate that they consider themselves entitled to allow their dogs to do whatever they like, wherever they like, whenever they like. One example of this is Lafayette

---

Park. It is clearly posted that in most of the park dogs must be leashed. Most dog owners choose to disobey this regulation. Dogs are usually released from their leashes as soon as they are at the park side of the street. Dogs run off-leash throughout most of the park in spite of the signs and regulations.

Another place dog owners disobey regulations is on trails in the Presidio. We choose to walk on trails that require dogs to be leashed, but most dogs we encounter there are off leash. We have heard dog owners there saying they knew leashes were required, but that is is really OK to not use leashes.

San Francisco dog owner behavior is that if dogs are allowed, the owners will let them off leash. There is no reason to expect this behavior to change. There are not enough park rangers in the universe to enforce compliance with leash regulations in GGNRA.

For any plan to be successfully implemented, it needs to based on two givens:

- 1) San Francisco dog owners will disobey leash requirements;
- 2) Voice control is no control.

Regarding (1), San Francisco dog owners are by far the most law-breaking, inconsiderate, irresponsible group I have seen in years of living in cities around the world.

Regarding (2), with the exception of border collies, dogs in San Francisco ignore voice commands. All you get is a bunch of owners making lots of noise hollering, while the dogs run wild.

For Fort Mason, I prefer maps 9-D or 9-F (I cannot see a difference between them), provided the ROLA is fenced to restrict off-leash dogs to that area.

For Crissy Field, I prefer map Map 10-D provided the ROLA is fenced to restrict off-leash dogs to that area.

For Fort Point, I prefer Map 11-D.

For Baker Beach, I prefer map 12-D.

For Lands End / Fort Miley, I prefer map 13-D.

For Sutro Heights Park, I really prefer map 14-D. It would be so nice to have a park in San Francisco where you could sit on the grass with reasonable expectation that a dog has not just relieved itself on it. That certainly is not the case in Lafayette Park; all of it is dog toilet.

For Ocean Beach, I prefer map 15-C, provided the ROLA is fenced to restrict off-leash dogs to that area.

No comment on Fort Funston. I am unfamiliar with it.

Thank you for your efforts, and good luck controlling dogs in GGNRA.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6243	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:14:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Laura Robblee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6244	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:14:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6245	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo , CA 94402 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Robb Robblee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6246	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:15:28				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, General Superintendent Golden Gate National Recreation Area Building 201, Fort Mason San Francisco CA 94123-0022				

Re: Draft Dog Management Plan, Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)

Dear Superintendent Dean:

Thank you for your ongoing public service to the country in your leadership position of the GGNRA.

I am a long time homeowner and resident of San Francisco with one dog, whom I have owned for several years. My primary form of daily exercise is walking and hiking with my dog. Where permitted, she walks off-leash under my voice control. We recreate on GGNRA land (primarily Fort Funston and Crissy Field) regularly, as well as in SF City parks.

I strongly oppose the GGNRA's new Draft Dog Management Plan, specifically, the Preferred Alternative. I wrote to you previously in response to the DEIS, and now write in response to the SEIS, in support of Alternative A, No Action. Your proposed plan is far too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own and my dog's health the way we have on GGNRA properties for many years. I also have other objections which I detail below.

My concerns regarding the SEIS and Draft Plan are several. I begin with the public health impact. Every owner knows "a tired dog is a happy dog," and many people like me are urban residents who rely on these GGNRA areas to give ourselves and our dogs the daily exercise they require for our physical and mental health and socialization. Your Plan would impose an undue burden on SF dog owners for whom daily commuting to some remote rural location to allow their dogs to run freely while under voice control

would be prohibitive.

Dog ownership helps promote the public health and well-being, and the GGNRA serves as an important resource for Bay Area residents with and without dogs in this context, especially in the current areas where off leash walking is permitted. I frequently walk with friends who own dogs, and others without dogs who are local friends, as well as visitors from across the country. I know that many people who cannot personally own a dog gain psychological benefit of being in a natural setting where they can observe and interact with people and dogs while walking/hiking. Of course, all dog owners bear full responsibility for observing all signs and rules, such as fenced areas protecting natural flora and fauna, maintaining voice control of their dogs, picking up dog waste (of their own pets and others), and assuring that their dogs' interaction with people and animals is positive (including avoiding those people who wish to have no interaction and avoiding all harassment of wildlife).

Next, I wish to address the legislated purpose for establishment of GGNRA and authority to alter that purpose. Our U.S. Congress created GGNRA and it is up to Congress to legislate any changes, not the NPS via incremental usage restrictions. GGNRA was not established as a National Park within the meaning of "National Park" and all that that implies with respect to priorities and policies. Contrary to the SEIS, the purpose of the GGNRA is not to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population." Congress created GGNRA as a "Recreation Area" to serve the reasonable recreational needs of Bay Area households in this densely populated, urban environment. Walking one's dog off-leash is a reasonable recreational need and has been throughout modern history. As my Representative Nancy Pelosi indicated in a letter to you recently, "While Park Service regulations may ban off-leash dog-walking in National Parks, there is a long history of off-leash dog recreation in San Francisco which began before the transfer of land from the City and County of San Francisco to the National Park Service."

The original 1979 GGNRA pet policy should be formalized and supported, expanding to include off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA may acquire in the future.

The SEIS was not modified in any significant way from the DEIS to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. Why not?

Given all the time and effort the NPS has put into the DEIS and SEIS, why has there been no peer-reviewed, site-specific study, as required by law, of dog-walking impact in the GGNRA? The DEIS & SEIS assert that such impact exists and is negative, based purely on anecdotal evidence of NPS staff and a potentially skewed limited sample of respondents to the DEIS. Rigorous scientific peer-reviewed study must be undertaken so that the resulting Dog policy comports to reality, not a pre-conceived agenda to remove off-leash dogs and more broadly, individuals recreating with their dogs, in the GGNRA.

I also oppose the Management-Based Monitoring Strategy (MBMS). It will, de facto, permit GGNRA authorities to unilaterally alter or terminate Regulated Off-Leash Areas (ROLAs). Any proposed changes to ROLAs should be made only after significant enforcement action has been taken and documented, ongoing widespread violations continue, there is a strong case for environmental protection of the area, and all of this is put to public review and input.

I oppose the SEIS recommendations to fence in ROLAs, because if the fencing is made of split-rail open design (as they are at Fort Funston) they do not truly limit or contain access, and if tightly enclosed as with chain-linked fence, they are incompatible with the area and greatly detract from the recreational experience arising from the location.

Specifically regarding Fort Funston, per the SEIS there is just one native plant species that is federally endangered, the lessingia. The locations of this plant and damage to this plant by dogs is not documented in the SEIS. Substantially restricting dog-walking access in order to potentially protect a single plant species is an imbalanced response that places one plant above the recreating needs of SF residents. The vast majority of the upper Funston dunes and trails have been covered by non-native species since the military used this area decades ago. Contrary to the SEIS, these upper Funston dunes are not "denuded" but rather the ice-plant and other plants routinely rejuvenate, and the dunes shift with the weather over the paved trails. The SEIS is written in a manner that is clearly biased against ALL dog presence, and for that matter, human presence. Large numbers of people and dogs walking across an area is considered "trampling", rather than simply walking. I find the SEIS quite biased, and strongly urge you to adopt Alternative A, the No Action Option.

Finally, the SEIS fails to adequately address the impact on SF City parks. My federal taxes support GGNRA and I expect my household to be able to undertake recreation there. The Preferred Alternative will tip the balance strongly away from GGNRA's prime founding mandate, which is to serve its surrounding urban community. I strongly urge you to adopt Alternative A, the No Action Option.

Sincerely yours,  
Rhonda Vitanye

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6247	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Ryan Kluft

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6248	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Supervisor Dean:

I am saddened by your complete and total disregard for the tens of thousands of comments you've received from the dog-walking community regarding the "dog management plan". This process has, from the very beginning, been a huge smokescreen. Despite the very active participation of our community, we have been shut out and/or ignored at almost every juncture.

Amy Meyer expressed it very well at a GGNRA Advisory Board hearing in 2001 when she said "I don't know why these people are bothering. We've already made our decision." She said this in the hallway, during a break, when 3000 people showed up to protest the GGNRA's proposed dog restrictions. I was still nominally a park service contractor, and Ms. Meyer thought she was speaking privately to an inner circle of allies.

Because the new plan was just a cut and paste job, I feel free to do the same. Therefore, let me echo what has been so eloquently stated by my comrades:

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

THE GGNRA HAS LOST SIGHT OF ITS PURPOSE: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you very much for your time.

Lisa Vittori

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6249	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.  
I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management

---



Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6250	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:17:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Angelique Loscar

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6251	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,bella

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6252	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Mateo, CA 94402 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it

deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Mike Robblee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6253    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:18:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Maria Baker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6254    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Manny Vargas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6255    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:20:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Emmy Starr

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6256    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:20:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet

---

policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Justin Cox

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6257    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:21:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The SEIS fails to make any meaningful change to the EIS even though the majority of public comment was opposed to reducing areas where on leash and off leash dogs are permitted.

The SEIS does not provide any peer reviewed site specific study on areas affected by dogs. Yet some of the proposals would cut access to people with dogs by over 90%. This is not in any way sound decision making for public policy.

The 1979 Pet Policy should be kept in place until specific and persuasive evidence is found to indicate a change is needed. And if that does happen change should be implemented gradually.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6258    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:22:10  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please don't restrict off-leash areas, this is a special city with such a good attitude about dogs, please keep it that way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6259    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:22:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner/ lover , and I vote and pay attention....keep Ggnra open as it is....no compromises for dog allowances, in already a very compromised world. But, major penalties for dog map behavior are in order....,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6260    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sf, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Tracey myers

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6261	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Dogpatch Dogs Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:25:18				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am confident that I may speak on behalf of the 900 or so families who signed a petition I circulated to validate off-leash dog play as a form of human recreation in the Dogpatch District of San Francisco,				

Dog walking and dog play are more than just healthy human recreation. Dog walking and dog play are a daily, bona fide need for families that include dogs as family members. Many responded to pleas by organizations like San Francisco's world-famous SPCA to adopt dogs. As responsible animal and nature lovers, we will fulfill our commitment to care for our recreational needs and the needs of our canine companions one way or another.

Parks in heavily-populated areas will not be able to remain as pristine as wilderness; fortunately, there are thousands of miles of unpopulated seashore along the Pacific Ocean in North America where wildlife that is too sensitive to readily cohabit dense urban areas can flourish.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area is a gateway for environmental awareness and appreciation that could serve, in turn, to protect true wilderness areas. If the GGNRA chooses to accept the reality of our urban demographic - that approximately one-third of all households in San Francisco include dogs as family members - then the GGNRA could avoid an adversarial relationship with the urban population, and could expand support to protect truly wild areas where fragile wildlife can actually survive.

Thousands of Bay Area citizens responded in prior Golden Gate National Recreation Area comment periods. To be fair, their numbers should also be counted in the tally of respondees for this current comment period. Even if there are a few duplicate respondees, the increased numbers would still not fully represent the actual statistic of all dog families in the Bay Area. Dog owners that spoke up to be able to continue to enjoy the human recreation of walking or playing with their dog at the GGNRA, as was originally promised, cannot reasonably be expected to have changed their minds.

I urge the GGNRA to recognize its urban location, and to serve the needs of true wildlife areas by

providing recreational choices suited to an urban environment. We are all in this together, as far as the broader environmental movement is concerned, and by embracing animal-loving Bay Area citizens, the National Park Service could inspire many more people to work to protect and enhance survival prospects for wildlife that live in truly wild areas, worldwide.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6262	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	sausalito, CA 94965 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:26:13				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean:				

I write to you again, as I suspect and hope many others have, to comment on the future of dogs in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA).

The last time I wrote, it was in response to the 2011 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on Dog Management in the GGNRA. This time, I write in response to the 2013 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). From my point of view, there has been some positive change from the DEIS to the SEIS, but not enough for celebration.

In 2011, Jane Woodman and I wrote you representing Marin Unleashed. The name Marin Unleashed was a bit of a misnomer, as most of what we requested was access to the Headland's peripheral fire roads on-leash.

We included the following general comment in 2011, and it still applies

"First, we have a suggestion that is applicable no matter what rules the NPS adopts: The most important aspect of dog management (as with every management issue) is clear communication, e.g. signs, brochures, websites, and maps all provide, the same information in a clear concise manner. To date, this has not been the case with dog management in the GGNRA.

Much of the conflict between humans about dogs in the GGNRA is a direct result of conflicting rules, and of the public's versus the Park Rangers' and Park Police's understanding of these rules. There are many trail signs in the Headlands that say 'no dogs' or 'dogs on-leash' in direct conflict with the Headlands map that correctly represents the current rules, the 1979 Pet Policy. It is no wonder if there have been resulting conflicts between GGNRA visitors, and with Park Staff."

There are still signs on some of the fire roads that are in conflict with the current Headland's map. I understand that signage and maps will likely need to be replaced when a new Dog Management Plan is put into place, but in the meantime, these differences can (and do) cause user conflict.

We proposed, and continue to propose:

"Allow access into the GGNRA in Marin to humans with dogs from the communities that border the GGNRA; allow access to humans with dogs on the fire roads that run around the borders of the GGNRA with the neighboring communities, e.g. Sausalito, Marin City, Tam Valley, Tennessee Valley, Homestead Valley, Mill Valley, Muir Beach."

We would prefer voice control/off-leash access on some portions of these fire roads. Neither the DEIS, nor the SEIS has convinced us that voice-control/off-leash access along at least some stretches of these fire roads is unreasonable, nor that it would cause harm to wildlife or habitat.

Alta Fire Road from Donahue to Orchard Fire Road is especially amenable to voice control/off-leash access. The first section of Alta fire road from Donahue is not on GGNRA land. Alta Fire Road from Donahue to Orchard Fire Road has been heavily used for years by dogs off-leash without adverse effect.

One of the two 'gives' from the Dog DEIS to the SEIS is added on-leash access to the Headlands from Sausalito. Alternative F would allow on-leash access on Morning Sun Trail and on the Rodeo Fire Road up to Alta Fire Road, and on Alta Fire Road from Morning Sun Trail to Oakwood Valley Trail. This added access would allow a person with a dog to walk from Sausalito across Alta Ave to Marin City, or to Oakwood Valley Trail and then down to Tennessee Valley Road. We thank you for that.

While we applaud this addition, we are concerned about the loss of access to GGNRA fire roads from other communities bordering the GGNRA. Muir Beach will be land and water locked. Residents there will be unable to walk with their dogs outside of town, except on-leash, and then only on the beach, in the parking lot, and up a short stretch of trail and back. With the SEIS Preferred Alternative, Tam Valley also loses all access to the fire roads that have been accessible with dogs on-leash under the 1979 Pet Policy.

Is it really necessary to remove the existing on-leash access to fire roads from some of the GGNRA's neighboring communities, to allow access on-leash to other neighboring communities? This is not a rhetorical question. It feels more than a little bit like 'robbing Peter to pay Paul'.

SEIS Preferred Alternative F has a second 'give' from the former DEIS Preferred Alternative F. Alternative F has gone from no dogs on Muir Beach to on-leash dogs on Muir Beach. Frankly (no pun intended), walking a dog on-leash on a beach is analogous to taking a bath with your clothes on. You get wet, but the pleasure of it is all gone, in this case for both the human and the dog. A dog on-leash on a beach is a recipe for frustration for all concerned.

The only off-leash/voice-control area in the GGNRA in Marin in the SEIS Preferred Alternative F is the northern portion of Rodeo Beach (less than 1/4 mile). If the lagoon at Muir Beach is adequately fenced, it would be protected from not only dogs, but also from humans. Residents of Muir Beach contend the human element causes much more disruption of the lagoon than the dog element. Why not adequately 'fence off' the lagoon and protect it from both elements?

If the lagoon is adequately protected, what is the argument against voice control/off-leash access for humans with dogs on Muir Beach?

Since, I can't improve upon them, I close with the same comments as in 201: We humans who live with dogs, and find our lives enriched by their company, are not by definition foes of the environment. In particular, many of us are members and volunteers of environmental organizations; we also support domestic animal rights organizations. We find no contradiction between walking in the GGNRA with our canine friends, and in being strong advocates for the preservation of the natural resources we enjoy there.

We argue that the preservation of the environment in the GGNRA is enhanced by most of us who visit with our dogs, not destroyed by it. Walking in the GGNRA is an integral part of our lives with our dogs; we are passionate in our protection of both.

Sincerely,



Sonja Hanson

cc Sears, Levine, Evans, Huffman, Feinstein, Boxer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6263    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have always considered myself an environmentalist and have consistently supported programs to promote the environment. I remain committed to preserving our natural resources but am sorry to say that your agency's recent actions (both with respect to the local oyster farm that you are putting out of business and) with respect to your unbelievably draconian proposal to largely ban off leash dog walking in the GGNRA (after, I would note, your agency's sneaky and illegal effort to implement a ban some years ago requiring a federal judge to intervene) have turned the vast majority of the public against you. You and your agency are out of control and, to be frank, a disgrace. I know of no other organization that has been more successful in turning environmentalist against those charged with hooding our (not your) lands in trust.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In fact the comments ran 3 to 1 against the proposal. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. This is not your private property, nor that of your employees, to do with what you or they see fit. It is our land and it was provided to you for the express purpose of preserving it as a recreation area, a designation that is designed to include the walking of dogs, as has been done for decades. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Libby Kiernan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6264    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:26:38  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** I don't understand why dogs have so many rights in this town. They are pets and being on leashes. People who disagree should probably not live in a busy city.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6265	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hi,				

I live in Daly City and take my two dogs to Fort Funston DAILY. We also sometimes visit Crissy Field. I love being able to go to Fort Funston. Given it's size, there is so much for the dogs to do. They can hike and go to the beach, but most importantly, because it's off leash, they can really run to get their exercise. They get 2-3 hours of off leash exercise a day, and are able to socialize properly with other dogs and people.

I understand that there are a LOT of dogs at Funston. This is because of the lack of off leash areas in the Bay Area. Sure, there are off leash dog runs, but nothing like Funston, where a dog can be close to nature and run free under voice control. It's truly something special and a rare gem to have in a urban city. It gives city dogs the opportunity to romp freely.

I am against any reductions in the voice control area. To help manage the dog population, you should look into permits for people who use the Fort for business. Charge a fee for permits and limit the number of dogs to 12. I'm sure you'll see the numbers drop radically and you can use the funds for park improvement. (a real bathroom would be great!!)

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

\* The new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

\* The plan does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. This analysis was requested by the public and by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still available in the GGNRA, even though much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption.

\* The plan lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA. The new plan admits the GGNRA has not conducted site-specific studies at GGNRA sites to document impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils.

\* The plan admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show impacts from dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), so they cite anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. A supplemental environmental impact statement needs to be based on science, not anecdote.

\* The plan misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space."

\* The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Marin County in areas where it had been practiced for decades.

\* The plan will not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there, such as recently acquired Rancho Corral di Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6266	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san Francisco, CA 94158 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	r #2				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jordan Waters

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6267	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:28:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6268    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:28:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please do not reduce the area available for off leash dog walking in the GGNRA. Our dogs need s place to play and interact with each other and the environment. On-lease walking does not provide the same quality of exercise for our pets, which is essential for their happiness, health and wellbeing.

Since the number of dogs using the open areas is fixed (or only slightly variable), if you remove the majority of the open areas impact will be focused and magnified in those areas. This will lead to more complaints from people who are afraid of dogs and the eventual removal of all off leash walking in GGNRA. Dog walking will then be concentrated on the few remaining bay area parks that allow off leash walking, and the cycle will repeat itself. Diffusion of impact is a better solution.

If you make ridiculous laws you will only turn more people into law breakers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6269    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Anne Gannon  
Sue Lesage

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6270	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:29:09				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Aimee Porter

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6271	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:29:12				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Based on the numerous bay area open space and park areas listed starting on page 29, there are many places that already restrict huge swaths of land from dogs even on leash such as huge state parks like Mt. Tamalpais State Park and most of San Mateo County. There are hundreds of thousands of adjacent acres that already provide protected areas for the plant, bird, and mammal species discussed in great length. Currently off-leash dog usage is in very few sites of the GGNRA and on very few acres. Considering how there are so many areas dogs aren't allowed in which species are able to live untouched by dogs, the GGNRA should support Plan A and not reduce the few acres that allow off leash access as it is. These areas are close to neighborhoods who have used these areas for decades.

Page 19 says this:

The comparatively relaxed regulations on GGNRA lands may attract visitors with dogs from other areas that have more restrictive policies.

The language is speculative. This argument is not strong enough to use to restrict dog walking.

Page 16:

Issue. Intensive dog use of an area could disrupt its use by wildlife or degrade the habitat, resulting in a multitude of possible negative consequences for wildlife population viability.

Once again, the language of "could" is speculative, not an argument. At a park presentation, as I am concerned about removing multiple Marin headland trails from on-leash walking, I asked a ranger if there had been any reports of dogs to bobcat or coyote or other wild life interactions and she said "NO". So added to the speculative nature of the above "issue", the GGNRA does not seem to have a valid argument. MORE DATA NEEDS TO BE COLLECTED before changing the dog walking access.

These are just two that I'll illustrate. I don't have all night to go through your document to pull out all the speculative "coulds" and "mays" that are spread all throughout these pages. There are just way too many.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6272	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
J. Canales

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6273    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:32:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly disapprove this measure. Sharing the beauty that is this area with my dog is so important. This measure is going to cause way more problems than any solution it brings. Extremely shortsighted. What happens when you reduce an area of inhabitation by 90%. Please don't make this happen. Don't ruin a great thing about living in San Francisco.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6274    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:32:32  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE save Fort Funston for the dogs - - it is our dog's favorite place in the city. It would be a terrible shame to lose it. PLEASE!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6275    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:32:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am against F and I support S.I am a responsible dog lover often taking various canines for fun in Marin and SF and resent access to these areas being denied to myself and my dog friends!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6276    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:33:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Moving from Texas, I was absolutely amazed and utterly impressed with how dog-friendly the city of San Francisco is. Taking our dog to Crissy Field, Golden Gate park, etc. etc. is the highlight of his day and also a great way for us to meet and bond with fellow dog owners. Limiting the areas in which dogs can play really takes away from a lot of the charm and camaraderie of this amazing city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6277    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:33:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have owned dogs over many years and could be considered pro-dog, but I also live in a very densely populated area where compromise and consideration for others is essential for a peaceful existence. My office overlooks a heavily used park by both dog owners and those that enjoy it for other activities. This is a dog-on-leash park and is well marked as such but is almost totally ignored. Even though most of the dogs are well behaved and are voice controlled it is common, almost daily, to observe dogs that are totally out of control; dogs chasing and fighting with other dogs, chasing after other walkers and bicyclist, nipping or biting people (this even happened to me as I walked to my office), and much more. And, it's not just the dogs but also the owners who don't pick up after their dogs, or if they do they leave the plastic bags lay on the ground for someone else to pick up. How is any of this considerate for others.

The plan by the Park Service has no choice but to take into consideration ALL the people who use these federal lands (including urban)when developing their Dog Management Plan and it's obvious they did just that. As in all compromises not everyone will be perfectly happy but with a plan that has something for everyone we should be grateful that we can live in a society that can accept compromise for consideration of others.

I fully support the Park Service's Dog Management Plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6278    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:33:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6279    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:33:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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



The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Anon.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6280	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:34:09
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please do not change the rules for off leash dogs. I know from experience working at the U.S. EPA that some so called environmentalist will do anything to prove their point, including giving false testimony, false scientific data, and conceal their true motive. I believe that the NPS should reevaluate the proposed rule changes. The GGNRA is in a major metropolitan area unlike the Yosemite, or Grand Canyon. People and dogs have lived peacefully in the GGNRA for a long time. Do not increase the tension by making the rules change, it will backfire and the NPS will be scorned. A minority of people want the changes to go into effect. This is a democracy where the majority rules just like in the U.S. Senate.
------------------------	---

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6281	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,
------------------------	---------------------------

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

This type of action should involve public, voting tax payers, not one agency.

Sincerely,  
Ayana Baltrip

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6282    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Dean:

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. This is not your land. It is our land and you are responsible for doing what we the public determine is appropriate for our property. Despite appearances and your extreme arrogance, you work for us.

I regularly take my dog to Muir and Baker Beaches, and occasionally Fort Funston.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Sincerely,

Ed Kiernan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6283    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:35:01  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Dean:

I have been walking my dogs for the past 35 years at Ft. Funston. I always picked up my dog's feces and bothered no one. I was glad that my Federal tax dollars were going to support such a wonderful off-leash area for me and my dog. I do not have the money to travel to other national parks, so Ft. Funston was my only option to enjoy Federal parkland.

It became my main recreation. I met many wonderful people and their dogs. It was a peaceful, friendly place.

Then, a number of years ago, the Federal government started to want us to leash our dogs and to restrict us to only certain areas. I and others like me wrote letters over and over and testified at numerous hearings - - all to no avail. The Federal government has come up with a plan that is exceedingly restrictive and appears to be designed to drive law-abiding, tax-paying, good citizens like me out of Ft. Funston. Why are our voices not being heard? Why does the Federal government want to deprive decent people like me of this innocent pleasure of walking with my dog in freedom.

I am now 66 years old now and have severe arthritis so I can no longer walk fast. If my current dog (a rescue from San Francisco's city animal shelter) is to get any decent exercise she needs to run off leash. I cannot possibly give her enough exercise on a leash. What are people like me to do? Why are you trying to destroy the wonderful thing that Ft. Funston has been for so many, many years.

Do the people making these decisions live in San Francisco? Do they know why having a place for people and dogs to recreate together right next to our densely populated City is so precious to so many of us? What does it take to get through to these people. I am exhausted from fighting this battle for so many years, but I will not stop.

Please finally hear us!

Sincerely,

Carolyn Lucas

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6284	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to lots of parks and beaches and always try to follow the rules. Everyone, even non-dog owners, enjoy having my very friendly dog be part of their park and beach experience. Before I was a dog owner, I always enjoyed the brief encounter with other people's dogs when I was outside.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6285	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:36:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Valerie Lau

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6286    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416    **Private:** Y  
**Address:** private, San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** GGNRA administrators,

The following comments are opposed to a change in dog management policy.

I'm a 45 year old software developer and have lived on 8th Ave near Lincoln for the past 18 years. I enjoy spending time in Golden Gate Park to get away from city noise and traffic. I walk and run in the park to relax and exercise, and have walking meetings with business associates.

I often jog through the dog play area between 7th Ave and Kezar Stadium on my way to the track, and always see off leash dogs. Sometimes dogs get excited and come up to greet me, but I have never had a problem with them. We all live in this city together, and it's the responsibility of each one of us to get along with others.

I briefly reviewed the 1,500 page GGNRA plan to revise dog management policy. As a taxpayer I was appalled to find that an administrative project of such scale, undertaken at my expense, was not based on statistics or scientific evidence of any substantial problem.

Please register my opposition to change in the current policy, and my strong dissatisfaction with the process surrounding the proposal.

Sincere regards,  
Matt Siegel

\*\*\* Please withhold my contact information from the public \*\*\*

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6287	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	san francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:37:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** I am an elderly (?) 65 year old small dog owner. My wife and I have had dogs separately growing up and together since married many years ago. We have been going to Fort Funston almost daily for nearly 2 full decades. When we hear about off leash restrictions we are greatly saddened. I am a retired physician who trained and lived in New York City and downtown Chicago for many years previously, and for what that's worth, my comment is that having dogs being able to interact naturally leads to healthier pets. Dogs (and owners) in the other highly urban, only leashed dog environments, yields more neurotic behavior including fighting, biting, social inappropriateness and other behaviors not normally seen when dogs are allowed to run around; running around naturally occurring trees, hills, up and down dunes, running into the water, etc. These are happy dogs. They support happy owners.

I am also an old (!) Eagle Boy Scout, continue to camp and hike with my wife and children. I have tremendous respect and appreciation for our sensitive environment. That is why, in part, we go to Fort Funston (and occasionally Glen Park and Stern Grove). I feel that the concerns regarding environmental damage are unproven over any long term. I've taken the time to read the 335 page commentary from a couple of years ago and find no 'evidence' to support that dogs damage the concerned areas in any way more or less than humans or the natural environment. In fact I believe - and submit the same 'proof' - that both wind and natural erosion have changed the area around Fort Funston more so than any humans and their canine companions. Also seen over 2 decades is the unacceptable, illegal and rude behavior of weekend and holiday visitors and young school age children who swarm after school over the dunes through and into the existing fenced off areas of habitat recovery and dune ridge protection. Also the weekends and holidays leave more food-related trash than any amount of unclaimed dog poop during the rest of the year. Where are the park rangers to protect our environment from obviously damaging if also illegal human behavior?

In summary, we believe that

- Closing off more areas will lead to increased degradation of these spaces,
- For those who insist on more natural protections for endangered wildlife, fence off sensitive areas during the time of year when these species come back to live with us,
- Existing regulations pertaining to commercial dog walkers and existing protections directed at other areas should be enforced
- Adhere to the spirit of the 1979 Pet Policy where the City of San Francisco gave land to the GGNRA with the express purpose that it be used as it had been historically used for recreational purposes.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6288    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Hillsborough, CA 94010  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am against the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no basis in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I fiercely against fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it believes that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Lillian Laszlo  
Resident, San Mateo County

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6289    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** oakland, CA 94607  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:37:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I enjoy hiking with my dogs in the Marin Headlands,Sweeny Ridge and Stinson Beach very much in my free time and i very much hope i will be able to do so in the future.There are already only a few trails available for dog owners so please don't restrict these any further.Thanks Tanja Baker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6290    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:38:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I love being able to walk my 8 year old Max off-lease with my two daughters. We enjoy going to Muir Beach and frequent the Oakwood Valley Fire Road. I have no problem cleaning up after my dog and am very aware of what he is doing at all times, even with two children. My dog gets so much enjoyment from being off-leash especially at the beach swimming in the waves. And from that my family gets so much enjoyment. Many times, strangers enjoy my dog also. Countless times we have had a stranger pick up the ball and throw it into the waves for my dog and the it is amazing the joy it gives them. I grew up in Marin and have had dogs all my life. I have always treasured walking with my dogs off-leash and can't imagine living here without that freedom. Please do not restrict is from exploring the

---

beautiful places in Golden Gate National Recreation Area. He is a part of our family too and we love being outdoors. Please let us have places to walk our dog off-leash and allow us to explore new trails in Marin County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6291    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:38:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** After reviewing the draft dog management plan I suggest that you not move forward with any of the very restrictive plans proposed. Specifically, I oppose the plan for San Francisco that will reduce or eliminate the dog use of the beach at Crissy Field. Map 10-A currently allows a small zone where we can take our dogs off leash. Dogs need the option to swim for exercise. Swimming is a good exercise and not hard on joints. We often take our dog to the beach at Crissy Field. It's her favorite place to go and she wears herself out swimming and running. It's also relaxing and enjoyable for us to walk along the beach with our dog. We've met some very nice dogs and dog owners when the dogs play and chase each other running down the beach.

Many people are not able to run with their dogs, especially older people, so there needs to be a place where the dogs can safely run or swim off leash. Dogs that have sufficient exercise are better behaved. In San Francisco, dogs need to be on leash the majority of the time when they are outdoors. That comes with city living, but it is unreasonable to restrict dogs from having a small area where they can enjoy the beach, swim and safely be off leash.

I oppose the draft dog management plan and suggest that you continue to allow dogs the ability to swim in our beautiful bay. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6292    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:39:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Sorry, this needs to not happen. Most dogs are more well-behaved and trained than the majority of children under 19 years old, they really need to get there energy out running about, otherwise, there will be more issues to deal with. Dogs aren't like us and just watch an episode of House and be lazy, they need to get out and get exercise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6293    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:39:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I urge you not to reduce the areas open to off leash and on leash dogs in the GGNRA. Most owners are responsible and have well behaved dogs that are under their control. It is not justifiable to deny the responsible dog owners and their dogs access to the GGNRA beacuse of the few

---

dog owners that do not follow current regulations. The solution is to better enforce the current 1979 Pet Policy and not to deny access to responsible dog owners who follow the regulations. Almost all the current dog problems are caused by dog owners not abiding by the current guidelines. The answer to this problem is not to close off areas to dogs but to provide enforcement to those that do not comply.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6294    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Valencia McCoppin Neighborhood Watch Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:40:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Limiting the off-leash dog areas as severely as your plan proposes will restrict residents' enjoyment of their city and their lives. As a resident of a neighborhood with no current off-leash dog areas, I can attest to the the emotional and physical benefits of being able to roam free with my dog at Fort Funston and wish you were creating more such areas instead of reducing them.  
Cpt. Valencia McCoppin Neighborhood Watch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6295    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Kim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6296    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

---



access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6297    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:41:17

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I feel very strongly that further restrictions should not be made to off leash use of the beaches.

I have no objection to ON LEASH access paths from parking lots or road side in fragile areas, but Muir Beach, Stinson, Fort Cronkite are heaven to my family and we do not want to go there without our canine family member.

Humans ask a lot of their animals and a small reward is the joy of running freely on the beach with their people. I think this helps pets stay healthy physically and mentally.

Of course there are always irresponsible people who could do a better job of cleaning up after themselves AND their pets and children, but the rest of us usually pick up their share of the trash and poop in order to preserve the quality of these places.

Please help keep beautiful Marin County a place for family recreation that includes the pets we love. We don't feel good spending the day at the beach when we leave the dog at home. We live here because of these activities. And we pay taxes and increased cost of living because this is the place we choose to be with our family and pets.

Thanks for acknowledging my desire to keep it easy to have our pets with us while we enjoy the beaches and trails.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6298    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

---

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. My dog and I both need the type of exercise you can only get from off-leash running!

Sincerely,

Tracey (taxpayer and longtime SF resident) and dog Little Bean  
San Francisco, CA 94105

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6299    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94115  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Mom in PAC heights Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:43:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I hope strict ON LEASH laws are passed.

For the sake of people with children. These  
Off leash areas are unsafe. Animals are unpredictable  
We became aware of this when our 4 year old  
Was bit by a pit bill this year.

Additionally, The Gardner at Lafayette park in  
PAC heights have been attacked over 30 times  
I'm under 12 months. Please protect your  
Families and pass the leash laws. It's not fair for  
The rest of us to be scared to let our kids Rome  
Around. Also please enforce the current leash laws  
With tickets. People brake them all the time and the officers  
Explained to me tickets are rarely given.

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6300    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94107  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Suhasini

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6301    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** One of my biggest weekend joys is to take my dog to Fort Funston to watch her run free along the beach and play with other dogs. It would be a shame to see either Alternative B or D (Map 16-B, Map 16D: Fort Funston) implemented as a solution. In fact, I don't even consider either a viable alternative, if I want my dog to have the freedom to run along the beach. In doing so, I don't see her playing on the beach an environmental threat. Thanks for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6302    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:45:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Iris

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6303    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:45:11

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** The dog management preferred alternative is appropriate. The comments by pro-off leash groups are one sided, and misguided. The comments I have heard from groups saying that they will put dogs on leash to cross creeks, and sensitive habitats is ridiculous. The notion of voice control is an exaggeration, I witness voice controlled dogs follow their instincts all the time, especially my mutt I rescued from the pound.

My dog is a hound, he will follow scents, regardless of how many times I will call his name. I am also part of a community group board with a off leash dog advocate, and while his dog is mostly under voice control, I have seen her not respond after 1-2 calls, and follow her instincts.

I am not against dogs off leash, I think GGNRA's proposal is actually too liberal, but fair given the emotions involved, and the urban interface of the park. The only reason SF representatives are against the preferred alternative is that they don't want more dogs in their parks, what does that tell you?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6304    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94132

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:46:01

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I think this a horrific idea. Another dog park where the community will adversely impacted. Please preserve and conserve the open spaces as a quite areas around the residential communities.

This proposed "dog park" is close to school; the safety of children should be priority.

The streets accessing the area are not suited for additional traffic and this quiet neighborhood will be disrupted by noise and traffic.

PLEASE don't let the interest of the "few" affect the life of the "many" in this beautiful area.

Frequent visitor of the Montara, CA area.

Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6305    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:46:25

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent

Building 201, Ft. Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123

February 17, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Lisa Carey and I have been a resident of San Francisco for 24 years. I walk on a daily basis in areas such as Crissy Field and Baker Beach. I walk with my dog in this area precisely because it is located in an urban environment and is used by so many for casual and formal recreation. I am a member of the

Nature Conservancy, a birder, and avid conservationist. I also have children and bring my family to the beaches (with and without our dog). To this end, I believe I represent many of the constituencies that you seek to protect with these rules.

I have read your draft SEIS and reviewed the proposed alternatives. I am deeply disappointed that the National Park Service continues to misrepresent the practical purpose of GGNRA and its founding legislation. I am also very concerned that an arm of our U.S. government is using advocating dramatic changes in usage for off leash recreating based on some "future concern that does not reflect current usage of the GGNRA areas today. Therefore, I am writing today to voice my support for alternative A (1979 Pet policy) and strong opposition to alternatives that dramatically restrict off leash use of the GGNRA by dog owners and dog walkers.

Please consider:

1. Dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972 and that this specific recreational use should continue for years for come. I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy and existing off leash area designation (option A in most of your maps). This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.
2. The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash). The NPS has already restricted access with fences and closures to large swatches of the GGNRA. Establishing a "new baseline" for further restrictions undermines the original intent of the founding of the GGNRA and vastly restricts the rights of the many citizens who own dogs and live and use GGNRA.

Further, please consider:

1. Crissy Fields, Baker Beach and most of the GGNRA in San Francisco is in the city, not in a wilderness. It should be treated differently from other parks.
2. These recreation areas are mostly used by LOCALS who live here and cherish the open space in their city, not tourists. They are used every day; not just for a single vacation (like Yosemite or Glacier National Park).
3. Dog owners are the ones who use the beaches most. In all weathers and on all days. Other beach users are only there on warm days. (Rare in San Francisco). At 9am in the morning (such as this morning), 90% of those at Crissy were dog owners and a few dog walkers. There were runners and walkers on the path but the beaches (all) were empty but for dog owners and walkers. This is what you see Monday through Friday. The only time a larger contingent of multi-users is present on the beaches is weekends and holidays, 11am or so until 4pm (and that assumes the sun is out and it's seasonably warm). Therefore, if there is competition for use of these areas, it is during a very limited time and most dog owners don't come to the key beaches or are reasonable about using leashes on high traffic areas during those times: 11am-4pm on weekends and holidays.
4. NPS fails to even acknowledge that the beaches are empty most of the time, even on the weekends when the weather is cool.
5. Dog owners report all sorts of problems to the NPS authorities, dead and injured animals, wash outs,

leaks, crimes. Dog owners are the only people I have ever seen who pick up random trash on the beach and dispose of it. Not the runners, not the sunbathers, not the mothers with kids, not the kids drinking beer, not the fishermen. I have seen many dog owners pick up trash on a regular basis because they care about these areas.

5. Regulation and restriction of off-leash usage by dog owners is not needed. All of the "problems" cited in your report can be addressed by signage (i.e. educating the dog owners) and fencing environmentally sensitive areas. The NPS has put fences up on Baker and Crissy and has blocked off a large section of Central Beach (now wildlife protection area on your map) at Crissy to protect the Snowy Plovers. You have also put fences up at Baker and Funston. You have done your work. It is inappropriate to create a new baseline claiming adverse environmental impact when you have already addressed these concerns. Your responsibility should be to monitor these areas and enforce where necessary.

6. Additional signage could be put up to ask dog owners and walkers to restrict their off leash usage on weekends during busy times. At Crissy, signage could be effectively used to recommend that off leash recreation at busy times (mid day/ afternoon on weekends) be restricted to Middle Beach or the Airfield. Most owners and walkers avoid very busy areas, bicyclists, etc. and have their dogs on leash during these times. During the week, early and late on weekends, these restrictions are not necessary as there is not a conflict.

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

8. Dogs not only get people out exercising, they are companions for families and for seniors. Many seniors walk their dogs on and off leash. Their dogs get them out and give them an opportunity to be social. Why are we regulating man's best friend when they provide so much benefit to citizens of all ages.

9. NPS has spent a lot of time enabling coyotes to return to San Francisco, yet, NPS is contriving to create regulations that restrict domestic dogs freedom and their owners ability to exercise them properly. This is counterproductive, unnecessary and a waste of taxpayer dollars.

10. Dog owners are law-abiding citizens who by their presence on the GGNRA lands discourage crime of all kinds. It is in the interest of anyone who cares about open space to work together - with the people who use that open space most often - dog owners. **DO NOT MAKE AN ENEMY OUT OF YOUR GREATEST ALLY.**

Surely **PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY** with freedom is better for our society than yet more restrictions and legislation!

Dogs provide so much love and support to humans in so many ways; they need places to run free.

I ask that the National Park Service back away from imposing and regulating additional off leash restrictions. Instead, I ask that you monitor current areas set aside for conservation protection, use signage to re-enforce sensible behavior, and work with dog owners and the extended community of dog walkers and advocates to encourage responsibility and respect of this special resource. You will find that most of us are not just dog owners, but also family members and conservations who share the same goals as the broader community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Lisa Carey (husband Bob and two children, and one Labrador)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6306    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:46:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jonathan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6307    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:46:39  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The voluminous materials generated by NPS are both commendable and lamentable. They indicate a desire to be thorough and balance complex and competing needs. They are lamentable in that the volume and complexity of the document makes it difficult to navigate and may diminish the utility of the feedback you receive.

Having reviewed the documents, I write in favor of Alternative A as the best option and alternative E as a second most favorable option.

My rationale is as follows:

Despite the hassles created by the status quo, I suspect Option A is the lowest cost option as I question whether NPS has (or should have) sufficient resources to enforce greater restriction than presently exists. I believe limited resources could be better spent attending to basic safety, education, and other purposes. I

recognize that, presently, time is devoted issues and difficulties related to dogs but enforcing more restrictive options poses on a constant battle that I think is imprudent to pursue.

Futhermore, while population growth in the area and increased usage of the GGNRA may exacerbate current difficulties, those same factors would be intensified further by restriction. Amidst competing priorities growth justifies greater consideration to social and cultural needs of visitors relative to prioritizing the environmental factors.

I want to specifically endorse the idea that dogs should have a play to recreate off leash at Muir Beach and Stinson Beach. My family has longstanding roots at Muir Beach and we are not dog owners. So, even as people who do not bring dogs to the beach ourselves, we recognize the importance and enjoyment of beaches as a place where dogs and people can circulate easily.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6308    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** daly city, CA 94014  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:46:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern,

I'm a San Francisco native and have lived here all my life. When I retired I got a dog and we go to Fort Funston daily. We also have enjoyed going to Crissy Field. These are truly beautiful urban park areas. What makes them in more special is the leash free dog access. There are few places near to San Francisco where urban dwellers and their dogs can enjoy leash free walking and playing. Please don't take this away from us. The little fenced in dog runs are not the answer. San Francisco and San Mateo dog owners have the crown jewel of urban dog parks at Ft. Funston. It is beautiful. I go there every day with my dogs. Please save this crown jewel of dog parks. It is truly special.  
Sincerely, Michael Yep

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6309    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:46:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing specifically to protest Alternative C. It proposes an off-leash fenced area between LeConte and Tamarind Streets, Montara, CA. (See text at bottom of letter from page 489. It is also mentioned on pp. 79, 489, 548, 699, and other pages throughout the SEIS.)  
My reasons for protesting a dog park in a residential area near an elementary school are:

1. Tamarind Street is very narrow street and lacks sidewalks. Currently, cars often have to take turns passing through the narrowest parts, because there is not room enough for two cars to pass. The street is not equipped to support more traffic and more parking.
2. Le Conte Street on which the Farallone Elementary School is located is not a public street, but a privately owned street. (There are some of those in Montara.) The street is in a dreadful state of disrepair.
3. There is no public street lighting on either Le Conte Street or Tamarind Street.
4. It is unwise to put a public dog park immediately adjacent to an elementary school where children



could be exposed to possible predators. This proposed park could put our children at risk.

5. For a large concentration of dogs to collect in the middle of our small residential area would lead to a dramatically noisy situation. Barking dogs and owners shouting commands would disturb nearby residents. Neighboring dogs will join in the barking. We residents will experience both a decrease in our quality of life and our property values. We would lose our quiet neighborhood.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Why not put the dog park near the large planned parking lot to be constructed off Highway 1. With the planned central parking area, there would be a place to distribute plastic bags for poop-pickup and a place to dispose of those poop bags.

2. A fenced area close to Highway 1 is more logical than in a tiny residential neighborhood by an elementary school. It would enable easy access for other neighborhoods, such as Moss Beach, and in general easy access for more people.

3. By Highway 1 parking, the barking of dogs will not disturb local residents. Children will not be put at risk from predators. A quiet peaceful neighborhood will be maintained, and our property values will not be lessened.

Brady Logan

1071 Tamarind St.

Montara Ca. 94037

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6310	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	daly city, CA 94014 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form
-----------------------------	----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have enjoyed recreating with my dog off-leash from Marin to Half Moon Bay for years. I have also donated to the parks accordingly (San Mateo, Parks Conservancy, etc), but do not plan to continue until this dog restriction matter is cleared up. The GGNRA has clearly over-stepped its bounds, & is not working in the best interest of those of us who enjoy the parks on a daily/weekly basis. Its role is legislated to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space." Period.
------------------------	---

\* I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. â€

\* I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

\* I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6311	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Bay Area Family Practice Medical Group, Inc Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	---

<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member
---------------------	--------

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:48:35
------------------	----------------------

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Off lease dog walking in Rancho Corral de Tierra should be allowed. It should be allowed in the existing area that has been used for off-lease dogs for decades. The trails are clear and there are even trash/dog poop containers and bag supplies at several convenient places. These containers and poop bag supplies have existed even before the take-over by GGNRC, and have been policed by our local dog owners group, [www.montaradogs.com](http://www.montaradogs.com) with excellent results. Dog owners in RCdT want to co-exist peacefully with other outdoor lovers and (mostly) try to limit the interaction with people who don't want to have contact with dogs.

People and dogs are healthier if they can walk/hike together in beautiful open spaces. Dogs are healthier and happier if they can romp off lease for at least some part of their day. And their owners are glad to have healthy, happier and maybe even tired-er dogs as well.

Having a fenced dog "park" in the middle of a Montara residential area that is extremely close to the elementary school is wrong. There is no convenient parking and the roads (Tamarind and Le Conte) are narrow and poorly maintained. More cars will make things worse, causing potential harm to innocent cars/people who travel these roads. The danger to young children if dogs do escape and harm them is too much to risk. This planned "park" will also be an "attractive nuisance" enticing children to come and put themselves at risk of an unpleasant dog interaction. If a dog "park" is indeed needed- -and I do not believe this is the case in Rancho Corral de Tierra- -do not put it here.

Thank you for your attention to these very important issues.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6312	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:48:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Lisa Arjes

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6313	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:48:56**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jessica Holt

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6314	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Anna Belak

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6315	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:49:44  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Golden Gate National Recreation folks:

I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict. Instead, I support Alternative for Muir Beach, Homestead, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% othe Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isnt any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. u havent conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the publics use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. that the changes made in the 2013 SEIS did not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands". We need to retain the longstanding 1979 Pet Policy and not force people in to their cars, in search of places to walk their dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

Thank you, David Lehr

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6316    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:50:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am commenting as the primary guardian for 4 dogs regarding the dog management plan for the SF Bay Area. Please keep the rules as they have been since 1979 and maintain off-leash dog walking. I bought my first house in 2008 in Montara primarily because of its proximity to the open space with off-leash dog walking. I have been walking my dogs in Rancho Corral de Tierra for nearly six years now without incident. Our morning routine starts with a run on the trails in the park and is the primary exercise that we all get every day. Walking in the streets with them on-leash is not enough exercise for me or for my dogs. I have a border collie mix, and his "job" is to chase the ball. He can't do this in the street on-leash, or in the park on-leash. His mental state will also be adversely affected if he is unable to run off-leash and do his job. And that means my mental state will also be negatively impacted with a high-strung border collie who has no outlet for his energies. I will not be able to get the exercise I need either if the leash law is enforced. I depend on that precious hour in the park every morning to get my exercise with my dogs. I don't have any other time to work out, and if I have to choose, then I will be walking my dogs on-leash in the street rather than spending that hour in a gym without them. I have also made many friends who are fellow dog guardians in the park, and they are my neighbors. We look our for one another and for our dogs. In Montara, at least, dogs are a major part of our community and off-leash walking in

---

the open space is integral to our way of life. Please don't take that away, especially without any data to support why enforcing the proposed dog management plan would be better for anyone.

Laura Hansen, Ben, Marley, Hawkeye, and Beau

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6317    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:50:08  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Allyson Davis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6318    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:50:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:**

If 71% of respondents to the last version of this proposal stated that they support off leash usage in the GGNRA, why is the GGNRA considering restricting it? The review of ethnic responses showed an equality in positive response in ethnic responses when looking at the categories that support somewhat or strongly. I would think this would be a selling point. But that format of randomly calling people for a sampling of the population might be more effective in another subject matter. One should survey park users, not people who may never go or who may never have been so their response to the experience seems irrelevant. The 71% represents people who go to and use the parks and who will be affected the most by these restrictions. Their voices should matter.

As a person who has been going to Crissy Field at least weekly if not multiple times every week since before the Haas Family donation to clean it up, I can tell you the users of this area are majority dog owners and historically have been. Before it was cleaned up when there were 6 foot chain link fences to

navigate on a bicycle to traverse the old cement areas, the beach always had dogs and their owners there chasing balls and exercising. When I moved here in 1985, I would jog down there at dusk and always felt safe because people with their dogs were ever present. I could depend that if I were to get jumped, I could scream and these people would hear me and come running at least to witness. The dog owners have always been the staple population down there.

Now that I have been a dog owner since 1995, I know about that level of dedication in attendance to that beach and can speak to who is still ever-present. We dog owners are there when it rains, when it's cold and windy as well as when its a nice day. We are the only ones there, aside from a few overly dedicated joggers, when it rains. For almost 30 years I can attest that the true users of the park are the dog people, they are the one constant and shouldn't have their lives altered so drastically by this plan.

As for complaining about dogs in the GGNRA, one highlighted comment said this:

During the public comment period for the draft plan/EIS, many park users noted disturbances associated with dogs. (AGAIN THIS IS FROM THE 29%, ot the 71%) ne commenter stated, We are very frequent visitors to the GGNRA and long- time members of the Golden Gate Parks Conservancy. We love to hike, ride our bikes and enjoy the beaches. Dogs significantly detract from our enjoyment of the park areas (NPS 2011a, Correspondence 431)

I would like to report that I do not like stepping in HORSE MANURE and actually, beyond being disgusted by the lack of hygiene, I find it very dangerous when I'm hiking up a hill as it reduces my chance for traction. There are requirements even now that dog feces is picked up and we all are very good at it around here but horse manure is always left behind for us to step in with no requirements.

Recently I was hiking in the Santa Monica Mountains on Westridge Trail and at Runyon Park in LA, both off leash trails, as I often have before. The difference in culture between that area and here is striking. There, you find uncollected dog feces many times on a hike. Here thanks to our responsible dog culture, it is a much rarer event.

Page 19 says:

Various dog groups and associations have even organized dog cleanups, provided bags, and tried to influence their members; but despite these efforts, many dog owners still do not comply with picking up dog waste.

But this is NOT true. MANY is not accurate. MANY do and SOME do not. And many who do, as I and numerous people I know do, pick up others' waste as part of our responsible culture. It seems in the LA area, it is less common to come together and try to make up for the few bad apples. Do not punish the MANY good citizens for the sins of a few.

Local culture MUST be considered in any rule making process.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6319	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	sausalito, CA 94965				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:50:46				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Being a dog lover and a resident of Marin County, I strongly oppose Alternative F, in favor of Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of their public lands. Not only that but the SEIS Alternatives will force more people to drive their cars in search of a place to walk their dogs - This is not a viable alternative in environmentally conscious Marin County.

NO ON F!!!!!!

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6320	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:50:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ashley Reese

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6321	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fairfax, CA 94930 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Daniel Noel

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6322    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Loomis, CA 95650

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Public Interest Coalitoin Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:51:34

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for accepting comments until 11 pm today.

We empathize with the task the GGNRA is directed to accomplish. We are dog aficionados, rescuers, fosters, and "lovers." But we leave those sentiments at the gate with regard to how our national public resources should be managed.

In Appendix G, a letter from a Member of Congress states, "...GGNRA has a unique mandate. The final plan must include options for public use, both with and without dogs, as well as safeguards for environmentally sensitive areas." Although we agree that GGNRA may have a unique mandate, we strongly disagree that it includes public use "with dogs." This perception may be what some constituents have fabricated to their representative, but no where can we find any such mandate. Thus, we urge the GGNRA to discount any such assumption or claim that the GGNRA must include public use with dogs. We have come to the conclusion that voluntary compliance must be abandoned as a policy when multiple facts and experience show that it does not work. There are many times and areas where we would love to take our dogs, but the bigger issues of protecting natural resources, maintaining public peace, health and safety, avoiding altercations, etc., must take priority over allowing dogs, or allowing them with unenforceable stipulations.

Dog Control: Voice v Leash Control. In areas where dogs may be allowed, only leash control should be required. Voice control is an illusion-an after-the-incident, unenforceable, and dangerous stipulation. It must not be a part of the GGNRA regulation. Award winning voice control trained dogs may excel in competition. However, when in a new environment, those same dogs can and do repeatedly ignore voice commands, as pointed out in the CA State Parks letter, "â€many dog owners believe they have voice control over dogs when, in fact, they do not." (Reference: Appendix G, page 130 of pdf file, "Letter from the State of California Parks and Recreation," from Randolph Sederquist to Mr. Brian O'Neill, GGNRA [pages 3 thru 5 of document]) That letter devotes three pages to the negative impacts of dogs. On public lands, "voice control" is an unacceptable stipulation standard. In areas where dogs may be allowed, only "on leash" (NO EXCEPTIONS) should be the standard requirement in GGNRA public lands.

The letter from Congressman Pet and Helen McCloskey [Appendix G, pg 178, pdf] claims that the significant restrictions on, and elimination of, off-leash dog walking â€[are] not fact based. The people who have been to public areas where there have been ugly altercations, injuries, and no accountability, simply never come back to those public areas for fear of more of the same. The McCloskey letter acknowledges the importance of dog companionship and healing capabilities. But it is for those exact reasons that off-leash dogs should not be allowed. When an altercation occurs, the "victim" dog that is seriously injured is then compromised for the rest of its life, and the owner loses both a quantity and quality of companionship. To keep those qualities in tact for all, requiring on-leash at all times will serve



the public much better than allowing off leash areas. We do agree that blame can be spread for negative impacts-large events, bicyclists, etc.-but that is no reason to restrict a known impact that can be easily mitigated by enforcing leash laws.

General Policy-Licensing Laws. The strongest GGNRA licensing laws should be firmly established by the GGNRA to protect wildlife and other natural resources. The general policy should NOT rely on any city, county, or out-of-town/state/country "practices" nor should it be dependent upon other jurisdiction regulations.

While we agree that the laws should be posted throughout the park, we strongly recommend that the penalties for noncompliance should also be posted, and that enforcement should be incorporated in to the dog management plan.

Policy-Marin County. No national public recreational areas should be reserved and/or restricted to a specific group, no matter what the worthwhile purpose. If a designated area of public land is set aside for "dog training," and then another for "advanced training," this is a form of discrimination. Any person should be able to use the public lands and abide by the laws established. But "designations" give one group a public-property "use" advantage over others. If dog training is needed, it should be conducted on private property. Possibly a one time event, special-use permit with associated fees to cover all contingencies and costs would be acceptable.

Last, because a National Park or Recreational Area is adjacent or close to urban areas is no excuse or reason to abandon strong regulations to protect the natural resources. In fact, if anything, the closer to an urban area that such a public areas are, the more protection is needed. We do not see parks' purpose to "serve the public" or adjacent communities, but rather we see them as places where people can visit to enjoy nature, recreate within limits so that natural resources can be enjoyed while being protected and preserved. Dogs can always be walked in urban areas, on streets and exercised in local dog parks.

We respectfully urge the GGNRA to not allow dogs in any sensitive areas and to require dogs be on leashed in any and all other areas with no exceptions where dogs may be allowed.

Thank you for considering our views.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6323	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94942				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Marin Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:52:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

FROM: MARIN AUDUBON SOCIETY  
P.O. BOX 599  
MILL VALLEY, CA 94942

February 18, 2014

Sent Via US Mail and Electronically

Frank Dean, General Manager  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

RE: Comments on Golden Gate National Recreation Area Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Dean,

The Marin Audubon Society (MAS) appreciates the opportunity to comment on GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS). As noted in our comments on the Draft EIS, Marin Audubon has a long history of working to protect wildlife and wildlife habitat. We understand that the Park Service is under intense pressure to open more areas to on- and off-leash dogs. We applaud GGNRA's focus on protecting wildlife and habitat and we urge that that approach be sustained and strengthened, most importantly to protect endangered species, wildlife and habitat. Our specific questions and recommendations discussed below. Our comments address Marin County sites only, but we support protecting wildlife, habitat and endangered species throughout GGNRA.

It is a primary responsibility of the National Park Service (NPS) to ensure that natural resources, particularly endangered species and their habitats, are fully protected. This includes ensuring that endangered species are not harassed or otherwise adversely impacted by people, dogs and other stressors.

MAS continues to support Alternative D because it would provide more comprehensive and effective protections for the natural resources within the boundaries of GGNRA. It is clear to us, after reviewing the record, that protecting wildlife and habitat is the primary reason the NPS has restricted dogs use on Marin trails. MAS supports this criterion for guiding decisions. In our view, however, adequate protection will not be achieved because the proposed restrictions are not adequate, enforcement is unclear and compliance is far from certain. The Plan is weighted in favor of dogs and dog walkers and does not go far enough to protect habitat. The DSEIS proposes to allow dogs on every Marin area and, since the DEIS, dog use has been expanded on a number of Marin sites, including Muir Beach, and Rodeo Beach.

According to our calculations from acreage figures in the DSEIS, 25.32 miles of trails and 54.32 acres of beach are open to dogs on GGNRA in Marin County. Considering this, it is hard to believe that dog walkers are not able to sufficiently exercise their pets on GGNRA trails. We also note that the Marin has many dog parks, and more that 200 miles of public trails. Dogs are allowed on most, if not all, of the trails in Marin. It is unfortunate some dog owners can't rise above their own interests to support protecting habitat for endangered butterfly, owls, fish and other at-risk species, in the limited areas where these species need to live.

We appreciate the extensive research that went into the preparation of the Draft SEIS, especially the 24 peer reviewed studies that confirm the impact of dogs on wildlife and habitats. The findings of these studies are applicable to impacts of dogs everywhere and provide ample support for recommendations to limit dog use to protect wildlife in sensitive habitats.

We also appreciate that fire roads are not considered separately from trails because use of fire roads by dogs can be just as damaging to adjacent habitats and wildlife as dogs on trails. They may even be more damaging because they are wider and could encourage more heavy use.

Inadequacies of the DSEIS:

Precedent Setting Nature Not Addressed

The DSEIS reports that GGNRA is the only facility in the entire national park system that allows off leash dogs. "Dogs that are not controlled by caging or a leash no longer than six feet are currently prohibited across the entire national park system (36 CFR 2.(a)(2))...." The DSEIS should address the nationwide implications of opening areas to off-leash dogs at GGNRA. It is a significant concern that

allowing off-leashed dogs at GGNRA could be used to justify and encourage opening other parks to off-leash dogs. This would significantly broaden the adverse impacts of off-leash dogs on wildlife and natural habitats. This is a major potential impact that should be addressed.

#### Monitoring Based Management Strategy Unclear

As explained in the Park Operations section: All sites would be regularly monitored. When the level of compliance is deemed unacceptable, based on violations and impacts to resources, primary management actions such as focused enforcement of regulations, education, time and use restrictions, establishment of buffer zones and SUP restrictions would be implemented. If non-compliance continues, secondary management actions including short-term closures would be implemented through the compendium. The schedule includes a 1-3 month period of public education followed by a 1-3 month period testing the monitoring based strategy.

With the above process, the NPS expects that impacts on wildlife and habitats would also decrease. How would those impacts be evaluated and what criteria would be used? What level of non-compliance would be tolerated? Would there be a plan for monitors to visit all sites at regular intervals over what period of time? We understand that monitors not be able to issue warrants but would have to communicate findings to enforcement staff. How would monitors communicate with enforcement personnel efficiently? How would such a communications system successfully identify violators in a timely manner and hold those violators accountable? By the time enforcement personnel appear, wouldn't it be likely the incident would be over?

#### Enforcement not Adequately Addressed

Enforcement is key to successful implementation, to compliance and to protection of wildlife and habitats. Too many people seem to feel that they will never get caught, don't care, or feel that they are somehow different and entitled to behave as they wish. The description of the enforcement program or management activities is vague and leaves many components poorly defined.

There should be a more comprehensive description of the planned enforcement program. What are the anticipated threshold levels for implementing management actions and would they differ among sites? What thresholds or triggers would be used to decide when to take enforcement actions management actions such as to close a trail? What specific enforcement actions would be initiated, besides issuing warrants to violators and or closing trails, and for what non-compliance activities would they be initiated?

GGNRA is in the process of developing a warrant process. Information should be provided about the warrants: how they would be issued; for what infractions; how many times would offenses have to be repeated before warrants would be issued?

#### Problems with Impacts Analyses

##### - Compliance Not Accurately Evaluated

The cumulative impact analyses for virtually all trails, roads and park segments consistently cite park programs such as restorations by the Golden Gate Park Conservancy and "ecologically beneficial" restoration and management activities by others, including controlled burns and invasive plant removal. Impacts at each location and cumulatively are deemed negligible when compared and considered with the restoration and management activities and agency projects. We have several problems with this approach:

The impact analyses as well as the Environmentally Preferred Alternative rely on compliance to evaluate the impacts of the Plan as negligible. This is an unrealistic approach because many people will not comply. The Plan, therefore, would be ineffective in achieving impact levels that are negligible.

The DSEIS acknowledges that even with "assuming compliance" the preferred alternative would result in localized impacts but these would be considered minor based on the assumption that dog users will comply with the regulations. Repeated observations of dog users over time, however, clearly demonstrate that this is not the case. Dog's users throughout Marin County violate dog restriction, ignore signs and sometimes destroy or steal them, and disregard policies and regulations with impunity. While many people do obey the law, particularly if they understand why, many will not. This cannot be ignored in evaluating the significance of the impacts. In addition, even localized impacts could be major when endangered species and their habitats are involved.

Conclusions that the potential impacts will be negligible are unsubstantiated and invalid until and unless the NPS presents a dependable program that will ensure dog walkers will stay on trails and not harass wildlife or damage habitat. The only way this can be assured is through an effective monitoring and enforcement program. At minimum, there needs to be a strong enforcement program that ensures dogs are restricted from sensitive habitats. It would also be helpful if dogs were restricted on more trails.

The DSEIS should acknowledge that non-compliance is a likely possibility and is highly probable. This impact should be addressed by identifying an enforcement program and actions that would mitigate this individual and cumulatively significant impact.

#### - Significance of Impacts Not Adequately Assessed

The DSEIS evaluates the significance of impacts in comparison with and consideration of beneficial activities that are being conducted in the GGNRA and even outside of GGNRA. The impacts of dogs are weighted and evaluated with activities being conducted by GGNRA, the Park Conservancy and others, including wetland and other habitat restoration and enhancement projects and management actions such as controlled burns. Offsite restoration projects and projects implemented by others than the federal government are also cited. This is a slippery slope.

These restorations/enhancements are not being implemented to mitigate for or justify dog impacts. Furthermore, most or none of the restorations would not in any way offset impacts from dog use. The argument can be made that restoring habitats would actually increase impacts because the habitat areas that dogs could disturb would be increased. Also most or all of those restoration/management activities within the park would be done anyway because it is GGNRA's responsibility to protect, enhance and restore habitat for endangered species.

Finally, the NPS must consider the consequences of claiming unrelated restoration activities as mitigation to offset or balance impacts of their project. What if shopping center or housing project developers were to claim their impacts are negligible because restoration projects of GGNRA and others created offsetting beneficial conditions? This is a real and potentially disastrous outcome, if perhaps unintended, of the approach taken in this document. MAS certainly doesn't want habitat restoration projects we have implemented to be used to offset damage to other habitats

The only effective mitigations for dog impacts are suitable protective restrictions and an education and enforcement program that works.

#### Impacts of Increased Visitor Use Not Considered

It should be recognized that, just as use of GGNRA lands has increased over the years, uses will undoubtedly continue to increase as our human population increases. Mitigation should be presented to address the increased impacts on habitat and wildlife that would accompany the anticipated increased uses of some or all of the trails.

#### Need for Environmental Review for New Trails

It appears that trails that are not presently in existence are being considered part of the Management Plan and evaluated in this DSEIS, such as new trails at Homestead Valley. It also appears that the trail locations may have not even been determined at this time.

This DSEIS should provide sufficient information about these and any other trails that are not currently in place. This is necessary to enable evaluation of the potential adverse impacts on adjacent habitats and wildlife of human and dog use and to evaluate whether there is a less environmentally damaging alternative location. If this information is not provided in this DSEIS, a separate environmental review for these non-existent trails should be conducted.

#### Comments on specific sites:

##### Stinson Beach

We continue to support Alternative D which complies with federal regulation that dogs not be allowed on swimming beaches. We question whether it is the responsibility of GGNRA, or any jurisdiction for that matter, to provide access to property owned by others. Should GGNRA continue to allow their land to be use to reach Upton Beach, an effective barrier should be constructed. The nature of this barrier should be more thoroughly discussed in this DSEIS. Whatever kind of barrier is used, it must be designed to not impede wildlife movement.

##### Homestead Valley

GGNRA preferred Alternative would allow on-leash dogs on the Homestead Fire Road and on future neighborhood connector trails that are yet to be established. We are concerned about approving additional "neighborhood connecting" trails without knowing their location, so that their impacts can be adequately evaluated. Further, MAS has a long-standing position in opposition to the development of new trails because there already are ample trails in Marin County and in GGNRA. We recommend that any new trail construction be accompanied by decommissioning of an existing trail of the same length in the same area. In particular, because Homestead Valley habitats support the endangered Spotted Owl, it is essential that any new trails, as well as all existing trails, be carefully evaluated to avoid habitat for this endangered species. In this sensitive habitat, at minimum all dogs should be required to be on-leash.

The DSEIS speaks to actions that would benefit the Spotted Owl, but these are merely suggestions in the Marin County Plan for Homestead Valley. This plan was recently out for public review and, at that time, the plan discussed the presence of Spotted Owl but did not include protective policy recommendations or policies that even recognized endangered species.

The DSEIS also mentions that the Barred Owl has more impact on the Spotted Owl than dogs. It is not a matter of "either-or". The impact analysis should consider the impacts of both dogs and Barred Owl cumulatively. Impacts from both sources increases the significance of the impacts of both.

##### Alta Trail/Orchard and Pacheco Fire Roads

The Preferred Alternative now would allow on-leash dog walking on various sections as well as walking more than three dogs with a permit. According to the DEIS, the areas that support Mission Blue Butterfly habitat are located "away" from the trails, which is beyond the 6-foot LOD corridors.

In this area, protection of endangered Mission Blue Butterfly would rely on compliance with leash restrictions. Dogs would no longer be allowed on social trails. Impacts from commercial dog walkers are expected to increase, but are considered insufficient to cause a change in the threshold level. The "threshold level" is not defined.

The preferred approach would not provide effective protection for the endangered Spotted Owl and its habitat. Monitors and enforcement personnel would have to be present frequently or daily to ensure that no social trails are used.

#### Oakwood Valley Trail

The preferred alternative for this site has been modified to allow on-leash dog walking on the fire road and on a portion of the Oakwood Valley Trail to the junction with Alta Trail. Dogs would no longer be allowed on social trails that meander through Mission Blue habitat. We support on-leash dogs on the fire road only. People without dogs also should be restricted from the social trails to protect Mission Blue Butterfly habitat. We strongly support not including a ROLA because of its impact on wildlife movement.

As with the Alta Trails above, for this Alternative to be effective frequent monitoring and effective enforcement will be required to ensure people do not go off designated trails.

#### Muir Beach

The protective provisions of the previous preferred Alternative D, have been greatly modified, to allow dogs on the bridge, Muir Beach Trail and the beach. This site supports multiple endangered species including Red-legged Frog, Coho Salmon, Steelhead as well as shorebirds. This is also the location of a large habitat restoration project to benefit the endangered Red-legged Frog and other aquatic resources.

The discussion on page 113 states that fencing would be installed to protect the dunes and lagoon, would serve as visual barrier and would enable the NPS to manage the area to protect the natural resources. It is acknowledged that the fences would only be visual barriers, and would not actually "protect resources as off leash dogs would still be able to access resources." In apparent conflict the discussion on page 862 states that the preferred alternative would "provide protection of the habitat at the lagoon and Redwood Creek...."

It appears that the NPS is going out of their way to provide dog access in this sensitive location. We have little confidence that visitors will comply with leash regulations to ensure protection of the habitat and endangered species. The DSEIS acknowledges that the proposed fencing and leash provisions will not be effective in keeping dogs out of this sensitive habitat area.

The preferred alternative might protect the visitor experience for dog walkers, but would do little to protect wildlife and habitat. Its success is based on assumed compliance which, as discussed above, is unrealistic and not supported by observations. No information is presented to change our minds that on-leashed dogs should be allowed only in the parking lot and picnic areas.

#### Marin Headlands

Alternative F for this area was modified to expand on-leash dog-walking on the Rodeo Avenue and Morning Sun Trails, also on the Lower Rodeo Valley trail corridor, the North Lagoon Loop Trail, Old Bunker Fire Road and Batteries loop trail. Allowing dogs on perimeter trails only is intended to preserve the integrity of the interior habitat. The DSEIS reports that Mission Blue Butterfly habitat is not located along the roads/trails therefore impacts would be negligible.

Again, this alternative relies on "assuming compliance" to evaluate potential impacts on Mission Blue Butterfly to be negligible. As discussed above, compliance cannot be assured. Various actions are mentioned to benefit Mission Blue Butterfly: protecting habitat outside the Headlands and Fort Baker; several past projects, and "Additional acreage of mission blue butterfly habitat that will be restored under an agreement with the USFWS." The success of the two completed projects (1984 and 2007) is not stated, nor is it clear how they would offset or render negligible impacts from dog use. They could simply be

providing more habitat for dogs to impact. Also, it is not clear what additional acreage would be restored, where and when, and whether or how these projects would minimize or offset impacts from continued and increased dog use. It is not demonstrated that the projects described would offset or mitigation the impacts of dogs on the species, but at least the impacts would largely be confined to the perimeter.

#### Rodeo Beach and Lagoon

A ROLA is established on Rodeo Beach and dog use is expanded to the entire north beach, south to the sea stacks. A post and cable fence would be constructed along the west side of the lagoon. It is acknowledged that such a fence would discourage but not physically exclude dogs and people from the lagoon area. Dogs of certain breeds would find it most inviting to leap over or under a fence to fun and swim in the lagoon. Water quality and habitat degradation are noted as causes of the listing of Tidewater Goby, which inhabit the lagoon. The discussion reports water quality and habitat degradation, both of which would result from dogs swimming in the lagoon, are reasons this species is listed as federally endangered.

Protection of any birds that may land on the beach depends on off-leash dogs being under voice control. How will the NPS assure that dogs are actually under voice control and that their owners even are paying attention to their activities? The justification for allowing unleashed dogs here is that shorebird counts on this beach are low. It does not appear to have been considered that the numbers are likely low because of dog use.

Impacts are expected to increase from commercial dog walkers but are not expected to increase enough to change the "threshold level" although what that level would be is not defined. Again, the effectiveness of these restrictions will depend on compliance which in turn will depend on monitoring and enforcement. Assuming compliance is especially troublesome at this location because few, if any, dogs are actually under voice control.

#### Fort Baker

Leashed dogs would be allowed basically everywhere except the beach area. We think there should be some trails, other than the beach, in this area where dogs are not allowed. It is important that dogs not be allowed on the beach to better ensure protection of the lagoon waters for aquatic birds.

We continue to support our previous recommendation: to allow on Bay Trail and other paved roads/trails, but not on unpaved trails.

#### Conclusion

Thank you for considering our input. We very much appreciate the efforts of the NPS to protect the natural resources of the park and we urge that you continue and increase efforts to do so.

Sincerely,

Barbara Salzman, Co-chair  
Phil Peterson, Co-chair  
Conservation Committee

PS Hard Copy will follow

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6324	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:52:28

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear National Park Service,

I am writing to support no changes be made to your current dog regulations on your properties. Having said that, I would also like to emphasize that I do not enjoy sharing many of these trails with dogs. The reason I don't enjoy sharing the trails with dogs is because some of their owners have taken the attitude that the laws/rules do not apply to them. In particular, picking up after their dogs and maintaining their dogs in control. I routinely walk your trails in Marin county with a small child and have to avoid excrement left behind in and out of bags by the owners. Have been trampled on my picnic blanket with my child by dogs not under voice control or on a leash. I have even had a dog urinate on us while on a pic-nic.

Even though, I have had several bad experiences with dogs on trails I do not want to fault the many good owners for the mistakes and bad behavior of few. I would like to encourage the National Park Services to spend more resources enforcing the current laws/rules. Dog owners who can not or will not pick up after their dogs should pay a fine. I also believe that owners who blatantly walk on trails that are not currently dog friendly should also face a fine. I realize enforcement would be costly, but enforcing a total ban would also be very costly.

I am not a dog owner but I don't want to prevent to dog owners from enjoying the same areas I use. My goal is for all of us to enjoy nature that does not include bags with feces or dog feces where we walk. I also would like to be able to sit for a pic-nic and not be worried that a dog is going to run up on me or my child. I would hope good dog owners would encourage their fellow dog owners to exercise good behavior and call out bad behavior when they see it.

I hope The National Park Service finds a fair way to address this issue and puts the resources to keep our parks clean and enjoyable for all citizens: dog owners and non dog-owners alike

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6325    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Sue Guynn



**Correspondence ID:** 6326    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Ian Saxton

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6327    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:53:22  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on behalf of the non-dog owning parents with children. If this proposed dog management plan is implemented, I'm highly concerned that my small, neighborhood parks will be over-run with people and their dogs.

Dog owners out of desperation will fill up already crowded dog parks if places like Fort Funston, Crissy Field and Rancho Corral de Tierra are cut off. I do not doubt that dog owners will not only fill the neighborhood parks, but also the baseball fields and school yards because of the lack of exercise space for their dogs.

From a parent's point of view, I find this plan unfair and biased. If my child's favorite playground was at risk of being torn down for unsupported scientific reasons, I too, would react much the same as the dog owners are.

This proposed plan poses many risks to not only dog folks but to all folks in my county.

I don't want to stop having to frequent my favorite parks with my children because of this drastic change proposed for GGNRA properties. Please consider keeping the 1979 Pet Policy - it's one of recreation, nature and comradery of all species. It ensures dogs will have their space and my children will have theirs now and for years to come

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6328    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Nir Matalon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6329    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:54:09  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Dean:

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many year (35!).

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Lucas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6330    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:58:16

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support off leash dog walking. It is so very needed in this city.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6331 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:58:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Jared

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6332 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Oakland, CA 94612  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:58:56

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Michael

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6333    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 21:59:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Page 22 of the Dog Management Plan:  
Issue. Guide dogs are at risk from off-leash dogs which can compromise the safety of the guided individual. Off-leash dogs can interfere with guide teams by attacking the guide dogs, threatening the physical and emotional well-being of guide dog teams. Even without physical injury, attacks and interference can negatively affect a guide dog's behavior and work performance. Following an attack, guide dogs may be unable to work because of physical injuries, and they may develop undesirable behaviors towards other dogs...

I am at Crissy Field multiple times a week at various times of the day and evening and almost never see Guide Dogs for the Blind training there. I know some people with guide dogs and also service dogs who need to let their dogs get off leash play time and exercise. So just because the (The Seeing Eye Guide 2011, 6) reference projects this fear, people with these working dogs need to be able to exercise their dogs and the GGNRA is a good place for them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6334    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the "preferred alternative" described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It's too restrictive and penalizes responsible dog owners by excluding us from recreational opportunities with our dogs.

The new plan doesn't reflect comments submitted by thousands of people who responded with legitimate concerns and objections to the first plan. Residents are still waiting for the legally required peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports the proposed drastic restriction of areas where we may recreate with our pets.

The GGNRA was created to be a recreation area for the residents of a densely populated city, who have

---

limited access to other open spaces. These trails and beaches have welcomed well-behaved dogs and their responsible owners since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Susan Barrows

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6335	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Livermore, CA 94551 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 21:59:48				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Karen D.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6336	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Livermore, CA 94551 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:00:20				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,

there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Ted

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6337	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94102 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Cindy Getschow  
Dog Walker

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6338	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:01:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the "preferred alternative" described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It's too restrictive and penalizes responsible dog owners by excluding us from recreational opportunities with our dogs.

The new plan doesn't reflect comments submitted by thousands of people who responded with legitimate concerns and objections to the first plan. Residents are still waiting for the legally required peer-reviewed, site-specific study that supports the proposed drastic restriction of areas where we may recreate with our

pets.

The GGNRA was created to be a recreation area for the residents of a densely populated city, who have limited access to other open spaces. These trails and beaches have welcomed well-behaved dogs and their responsible owners since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Dan Gillette

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6339	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:02:37				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The most heavily-used parts of the GGNRA are unique resources, placed within a densely-populated urban environment. They could not be more different from wilderness parks, where the standard regulations for use and for dog-walking activities must be highly restricted.				

Throughout this report, the authors provide arguments about policies and impacts that are reasonable for wilderness parks, but make no sense at all for a park located within the San Francisco city environment. Most importantly, there is no actual data showing how these regulations might or might not work in a city setting. Before imposing a huge change in policy on our entire city, I would like to see some real data showing what, if any, of the intended consequences are even possible within San Francisco. The report really has no data that is relevant to the situation in San Francisco

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6340	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:03:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Alexis Monson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6341	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:03:16				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Rebecca Coolidge

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6342	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Richmond, CA 94804 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:04:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition,



there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires.

Sincerely,

Felix Hunziker

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6343	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94158				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:04:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Sciandra & Pippa (Bulldog)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6344	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:04:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This is most unfair to animals and the kind loving people that home them. I find it ridiculous to have this as a law, as they don't bother people that litter constantly at these beaches and parks. Everyone is thoughtful and appreciative of these open spaces for our four legged kids. Our dog parks are kept clean, with water and structures and beaches are supplied with bags to pick up. I have				

---

never seen a dirty place and the animals learn to socialize in these places.

It is important and nurturing for children, older people, everybody to be around animals. PLEASE don't do this. PLEASE don't make it impossible to have a pet.

If it wasn't for my dog, whom I have had for 8 years now since she was 5 weeks old I couldn't have survived some of the stress I have been going through. To have my "best friend" alongside me in the parks and beaches has helped me cope tremendously with personal loss and loneliness. Taking walks with your dog is the most soothing helpful therapy I can imagine. PLEASE DON'T DO THIS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6345    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Angela Flores

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6346    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94108  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:07:20  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I commented earlier but I want to add a comment based on information I received at the. open house I attended.

As I said earlier, I think that humans and our domestic companions already are taking up more than our share of space I. the world, and it's way past time to do everything we can to practice compassion for wild species. The GGNRA is in the path of the Pacific Flyway, and we need to do everything possible to protect the birds that are part of this, as well as other wild birds.

Just two more points, other than the ones I previously made.

1) When I go to Ocean Beach and see dog owners let their dogs chase wild birds, as I always do, I wonder what kind of example this sets for the children who are observing this. That it's okay to harass beings that

don't benefit you in some way? Not a good lesson.

2) Even if there are enough patrols to protect birds during relatively good economic times, the new regulations must be realistic and take into account the inevitable budget cuts. How will they affect the ability to enforce the boundaries, especially if dogs can go on some parts of the beach and not others? Right now, on Ocean Beach at least, this isn't working at all. I don't think most dog owners are serious about self-policing, so I think if dogs are allowed on any part of the beach, this is an abdication to the dogs in the long run, unless the dogs are in an enclosed area with specific, visual boundaries (fences).

I really hope the interests of wild animals are kept front and center.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6347	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:07:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Lori Mazzuca

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6348	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94158 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog

management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Karen Schwartz & Pippa the bulldog

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6349	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Cerrito, CA 94530 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:09:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** The 1979 Pet Policy was two years in the making and involved many key stakeholders, including Audubon, Sierra Club, and others. That policy has worked well and should continue to stand. The National Park Service appears to have an anti-recreation agenda - - and to be unduly influenced by well-organized, well-funded, activist organizations with what appears to be an anti-dog agenda. Time and again, the claims made by those organizations - - about how destructive dogs are, about how much the public fears dogs - - have turned out to be mostly emotional arguments. The data do not support them. The NPS's data doesn't, either.

Given the strong public support for the 1979 Pet Policy and the specious justifications for making changes, I ask you to leave the existing Pet Policy in place.

Sincerely,  
Mary Barnsdale

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6350	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:12:12				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many months. My husband and I decided to move our business to SF and then rescue our puppy from SPCA in great part because this city is so progressive and friendly to pet owners. If SF wants its residents to share in the responsibility of the community's public health by caring for otherwise stray animals, then it must create conditions for those animals to remain

healthy during their life time, which can only happen with exercise in off leash areas in our county.

The GGNRA is a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area where most residents own pets. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979 and are crucial to our well being.

Sincerely,  
Ana Evans

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6351    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:12:12

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My family and I enjoy Marin's outdoors. We have been visiting our beaches with our young kids before we had dogs. Having experienced annoying dogs (mainly caused by inattentive or careless dog owners) we understand a need for better controls. However, banning canines from public lands and beaches is unjust. We feel that stronger enforcement of already in place regulations is all that's needed. Leash law, voice control and, most importantly, "picking up after your pet" (including horses in my opinion). Just like the wild animals we are trying to protect, humans and dogs have a right to enjoy our Marin County as long as there is respect for other users and a care of the environment. I would like to see more emphasis on educating the public (in schools and outdoors). Sometimes age old advice is best: give a man a fish, he eats for a day. Teach him how to fish he eats for a lifetime. Let us teach people to care for our land and respect each other. Please keep our current pet policies in place!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6352    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Newark, CA 94560  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:13:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

James Locke

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6353    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:14:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** PERMITS FOR COMMERCIAL DOG WALKERS

Why should the GGNRA value the livelihood of commercial dog walking businesses over the public visitor's experience at any of the parks? How would permits be monitored or enforced? at what cost? I recently saw a couple with 22 out of control dogs between them completely monopolizing a large area at Ft Funston. They made no pretense of caring what kind of experience anyone other than themselves and their dogs could have with them there. Please don't allow commercial interests to dictate the parameters of public access to public land.

Please take Ft Funston back from dog walking businesses and return that irreplaceably beautiful spot to human visitors to enjoy. Dogs can't appreciate those stunning views; make it a park for people again, please.

#### OCEAN BEACH SNOWY PLOVER PROTECTION AREA, STAIR 21 TO SLOAT BLVD

It's unclear what option F is proposing. No regulation for this area except for the walkway by the great hwy? or no dogs allowed ever? I am in favor of no dogs ever; give the plovers a break, they deserve not to be harassed endlessly.

Seasonal leash laws don't work, not enough signage, no compliance, ignored by all but a few dog walkers. If dogs are allowed in this area it should be only on leash ever. Preferably keep this a shore bird sanctuary; it's the spot they've chosen, give them that small space.

#### OCEAN BEACH NORTH OF STAIR 21

How will the GGNRA clearly distinguish this area from the SPPA? How will dog walkers know not to continue allowing their dogs to run wherever they like, chasing whatever they see?

#### FORT FUNSTON

This entire site is one giant dog park, rendering it inaccessible to regular visitors hoping to take a walk without being harassed by dogs.

At present, there are way too many dog owners with enormous numbers of dogs - more than they can reasonably be expected to control.

While attempting to walk there recently, I was nearly knocked to the ground by two dogs leashed together. Once their owner - who was off trying to corral other dogs- noticed, she acted like it was my fault the dogs were inconvenienced. Sounds like an exaggeration, but it isn't.

I've felt threatened there by unruly dogs whose shouting owners seemed oblivious to anyone's experience other than their own. Voice control doesn't work; in addition why should anyone have to listen to scores of owners shouting at multiple dogs anyway?

One dog owner recently voiced a doubt I had a right to be at the park without a dog, putting into words the reality - Ft Funston has been degraded into one enormous dog park, there is no room for non dog owners at this public recreation area.

How can the NPS preferred option F be to concede to dog owners such a large and vital portion of this site to be designated ROLA? That would mean Ft Funston will effectively remain one large dog run, while continuing to be off limits to regular visitors.

I would like to see any ROLA area at Ft Funston fenced off from the paths and kept to one or two clearly designated areas. Give people a chance to use the trails again, please.

Why show greater preference to dogs than people? really. I would hope to see not only the number of dogs per person limited but the total number of dogs at this site brought under control. When visitors are outnumbered 10:1 by dogs, it's not a public recreation area anymore, it's a dog park.

Thank you for soliciting input from the public. It is such a vital piece of keeping public recreation areas available to all the public and not for the exclusive use of special interest groups.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6354    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:14:35  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Cassandra E.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6355    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:14:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** The beaches are over run with dogs. They should have a fenced in area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6356    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:16:24

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I strongly advocate for Plan A, under which current dog walking practices would continue. There are very few places for dogs and their owners to enjoy public spaces together in the Bay Area and there is an historic precedent, for several decades, of homeowners and the general public walking their dogs at Rancho Corral de Tierra. I would especially argue for the flat area between Montara's Farallone Ave. to the south and the horse ranch to the north, just before the North Peak Access Road, to continue to be accessible to dogs, as this is the most-used area for local dog walkers and not as utilized by horses or mountain bikers.

Montara is an extremely dog-friendly community. People literally walk their dogs here every day. They have have moved to Montara just to be near this open space or they obtained dogs shortly upon moving here, like me.

It is against the public interest and will of the local community to prohibit dog walking.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6357	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome, especially their dogs.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Cyrus E.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6358	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:16:50				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	OPPOSE all Fort Funston Alternatives				

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in OPPOSITION to the current proposal set forth by the GGNRA for the 'Preferred Alternative' Draft Dog Management Plan, as it applies to Fort Funston. In fact, I am opposed to all the



alternatives shown for Fort Funston.

1) Fort Funston is heartily enjoyed by a great many Bay Area residents as the best place to enjoy the outdoors with one's dog, allowing the dog to be off-leash under voice control. The elderly and disabled are able to enjoy this beautiful spot for that purpose as well as others. It is safe and very friendly, and at least in the uplands areas, the vast majority of off-leash dog walking is on the paved path.

2) My wife and I have visited Fort Funston with our dogs hundreds of times over the past decade and have never experienced any untoward events related to dogs. The owners are in very large part responsible, sensible, self-policing, and respectful of one another and the dogs. The dogs that come to Fort Funston in turn are almost completely well-behaved, to an extent that is remarkable.

3) The reports of dog-related violations in the Draft Dog Management Plan are not broken down as to types of incidents; it is quite likely that a large portion of those reported are merely leash-law violations and the like. The failure of GGNRA to include such a breakdown to allow discernment of this type itself should cause great concern regarding the fairness and accuracy of the report/ plan.

4) It is critical that Fort Funston continue to allow off-leash dog walking on the paved pathways. In addition to the benefits to visitors, including the elderly and disabled, there is a real risk associated with requiring leashes in the constricted pathways, with tangled leashes around people's feet and ankles, risking falls and rope burns. These are neither trivial nor merely theoretical concerns; as a physician I have seen both kinds of injuries from dog leashes more than once, as well as other orthopedic injuries associated with the use of leashes. It appears to actually be safer in many respects for dogs to be off-leash when circumstances allow. The very fact that the current de facto off-leash dog walking protocol at Draft Dog Management Plan has continued without noticeable incident during our very frequent visits indicates that this situation does not need to be restricted.

5) Moreover, the paved areas are surely not where one needs to protect wildlife; adding restrictions to these paved areas is a misconstrued effort to fix something that is not broken.

6) Finally, the prospect of funneling off-leash dogs deliberately into the areas shown in the Preferred Alternative would be an enormous risk to the dogs' health, as these areas are full of "foxtails", which are very dangerous to dogs' health. The GGNRA would be acting recklessly to encourage such activity.

The obvious neglect of the entire Fort Funston area for the past several years by the GGNRA itself indicates that there is no urgency in going forward with the Plan at that location. Simply keeping the paved path clear to allow passage by the elderly and disabled, and fixing the nearly completely deteriorated signage and fencing, would be sufficient to allow continued enjoyment with safety and no additional environmental impact, at least as concerns the upland areas.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6359	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:16:59				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As 30 year residents of sf, we enjoy off leash dog access at fort funston and crissy field.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6360	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:19:21

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** A key piece of evidence cited throughout the report is the data showing 95 dog-attack incidents in the GGNRA from 2008 to 2011. This is cited as an argument in favor of a change in the dog management policy, because it seems to reflect an unacceptable number of such dog bites and attacks. However, the more I think about this, the less convinced I am that this data indicates a truly unacceptable problem.

I've noticed a significant difference in the behavior of dogs when approaching each other on leash, as opposed to the approach when off leash. On a normal city street, these encounters are generally marked by lots of barking, growling and hostile behavior, driven by the insecurity of the dog on a leash and their uncertainty about their mobility and ability to defend themselves.

In contrast, the incidence of hostile behavior among unleashed dogs, such as at Ft. Funston, seems to be significantly lower - especially given the high density of dogs in that environment.

My conclusion is that unwashed dogs are much less likely to exhibit hostile behavior, and that the present policies have contributed to a relatively low number of dog bites. I would like to see the report discuss the rate of dog attack for leashed -vs- unleashed dogs before imposing a leash-only policy. Otherwise, I fear that the proposed policy changes will lead to a dramatic increase of dog bite incidents in San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6361 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:20:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am distressed by the extreme nature of the proposed changes in the GGNRA dog management plan/SEIS. and at a loss to understand the severity of the proposed changes. I have never witnessed the problems caused by the presence of dogs on or off-leash. Please reconsider the radical restrictiveness of these rules. Dogs are one of the universe's greatest creations (as is the GGNRA). Dogs benefit greatly from the recreational opportunities at the GGNRA and their humans gain an immense amount from their companionship and well-being, especially in a gorgeous natural setting.

Please reconsider for the benefit of ALL OF US - Man and canines alike.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6362 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Pleasant hill, CA 94523

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Please continue to allow dogs to come to these parks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6363    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:20:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I oppose the proposed draft of the GGNRA Dog Management Plan because I haven't heard a reasonable explanation as to why it makes sense to take away recreational resources that are depended on by myself and others to exercise the most beloved members of our families, our pets.

I attended the open forum on January 30th at Sterns Grove and I left extremely disappointed in the GGNRA. I expected them to provide hard facts and justification as to why they were making the changes that they were proposing. Unfortunately, they did not. If anything, I am further angered by the fact that they are proposing these changes without hard research and facts, and without engaging the government and citizens of the City of San Francisco, as well as those of the other affected cities.

I walk with my dogs at Fort Funston at least once per week. One dog walks with me off-leash while under voice control. One walks with me on-leash. I live in San Francisco, so I cherish these moments when all three of us can get away and exercise in the quiet beauty that is Fort Funston. Dogs and humans all co-exist together. It never feels crowded, because there is so much space designated for our use.

I have no children. My dogs are my family. It's important to me that I am able to use Fort Funston as a recreational outlet WITH MY FAMILY, in a way that allows us all exercise in a free and enjoyable way. Proposing fenced-in pens does not allow us all exercise in a free and enjoyable way.

I sincerely hope that someone is actually reading these comments.

Sincerely,  
Nicole Kurth

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6364    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an animal lover, of both wild and domestic, I am distressed at the thought of the GGNRA wildlife coming into contact with off-leash dogs.

There are plenty of existing dog parks in the city, and when I feel like enjoying the company of domestic pets I visit such a park. However, when I feel like enjoying wildlife, I visit the GGNRA to immerse myself in the natural environment. The last thing I'd like to see on a hike is a lovely snowy plover being run down by someone's pet pooch.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6365    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:21:24

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I attended the Stern Grove meeting and felt the person with the physical disability was only representing his own view, not those of us who have other mobility issues. I have recurring foot and leg issues with occasional flair ups of knee arthritis and so from time to time have limited mobility. A couple years back I had to wear a "boot" for 4 months. During these months, the only way for me to get my dogs exercise (and I had a new puppy at that time) was to drive to Crissy Field, which I live near, sit on the sea wall and throw the ball for the dogs. I could walk out and clean up after the dogs but that was as far as I could venture. I was not be able to walk the dogs on leash to adequately walk them for months.

If the only off leash area is the middle beach, I will not be able to exercise my dogs. My puppy is not even 3 years old yet and needs lots of running. My dogs are very responsive to voice control, having been through multiple training courses offered at the SPCA and are the kinds of dogs who deserve the kind of freedom earned by being well-behaved. Their occasionally mobility-limited owner deserves it too.

I can't see how only offering the Middle Beach can comply with ADA being so far from the restrooms. Whether or not you think it may, it will negatively impact me and my access to use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6366    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94122

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:21:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

David Evans

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6367    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sf, CA 94121

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:21:50

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a native san franciscian. While much of my city has been taken over by non-natives, what hasn't is our beaches and our parks. Having designated off leash dog walking areas has been my saving grace, as well as my dogs. It gives us a chance to escape from the chaos of city living and enjoy the natural part of sf. The beauty that brought my grandparents here. The beauty that keep my parents from moving away from here. Our dogs are part of our families. I love that there are places they can run and be dogs. Places that we can enjoy together. I have 2 small children and 1 on the way. I've been to other counties and states where dogs have to be leashed everywhere, where there are few and far between dog parks and it's horrible. Trying to walk my 2 leashed dogs w/ 2 active kids or a stroller. It's not enjoyable for anyone. Please don't take that away from us. We need our nature, and we need to be able to enjoy it's beauty w/ our dogs who need a slice of it too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6368    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:21:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Concerning the proposed new GGNRA's Dog management plan:

1. The longstanding (as restrictive as it is) 1979 pet policy must be maintained.
2. The changes made in the 2013 SEIS do not adequately address the criticisms and concerns expressed in comments filed in 2011, and that comments in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.
3. The SEIS contains no peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as REQUIRED BY LAW to initiate such a dramatic change to the public's use of THEIR public lands.
4. The SEIS preferred alternatives will force us into our cars, in search of places to walk with our dogs. This is bad for the environment and bad for Marin County.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6369    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Fort Funston should be enjoyed by all walks of life which includes dogs...dogs love sunshine and fresh air as much as humans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6370    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Newark, CA 94560

United States of America

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Lauren Locke

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6371    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:25:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The GGNRA was set up to be a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Thank you for considering this point of view.

Sincerely,  
Gabriel Reilly  
San Francisco, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6372    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:25:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Katherine Gray

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6373	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I will be very dissapointed for the residents of this city if Fort Funston is no longer a free area for people and their pets to enjoy this public space equally. An off leash environment is what makes it so special and over the last 7 years I have not once seen an incident where both people and dogs couldn't share in its fun and beauty.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Chris Crow

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6374    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:27:31  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a frequent visitor to Crissy Field. On warm weekend days, such as this past holiday weekend, there can be a diverse mix of users, including family picnics, and people enjoying the space with their dogs. Unfortunately, these days are rare in SF, and the vast majority of days offers a colder, windier, foggier experience. On typical SF days, almost all of the people experiencing Crissy Field are people with their dogs.

If this use was eliminated, the beach areas of Crissy Field would experience a dramatic reduction in use - this may be the goal of the policies preferred by the park service, but this would be a truly sad loss of public use and enjoyment of these lands.

To me, the majority use of these spaces is for dog walking, and the majority of this use is truly harmless to others, to the land, and to the wildlife. I cannot understand the stubborn determination of the Park Service and its intent to treat Crissy Field as if it was nowhere near an urban center.

Please leave Crissy Field as it is - there is tremendous public use and no harm. A policy change will cause huge problems of enforcement, public outrage, increased costs, and other unpleasantness. All for what?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6375    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,



Erika Chan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6376    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:28:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a dog owner, a taxpayer, a voter, and a citizen, I have strong opposition to the changes being proposed by the new GGNRA dog management plan. It is overly restrictive, will be a setback for both canine and human health, and fails to achieve any of the goals theoretically proposed by the plan. I use GGNRA land for my and my dogs' exercise multiple times per week. The new plan will prevent me from doing that.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Proponents of the plan would have you believe that other recreational uses are impossible while off-leash dog walking is allowed. Comments at meetings and in public forums imply that the elderly, families with children, and non-dog-owners can't enjoy the GGNRA facilities currently. They would have you believe that eliminating off-leash dog walking is necessary in the name of fairness and equality so that they may enjoy those facilities. This is nothing more than an example of the false-middle fallacy.

The current situation best reflects equality - everyone can enjoy the GGNRA lands today. Nowhere is there a policy that prevents any citizen from using the GGNRA without a dog. There are no child-free parks; there are no dog-only parks. If someone wants to enjoy GGNRA land without dogs, the answer isn't to eliminate dogs, it is to suggest that they select a different park for their recreational activities. 99% o GGNRA lands already do not permit dogs - why must they take the remaining 1% fom us? If I were to point to a park with a children's playground and demand that it be removed so that I could use the park people would find that ridiculous. The GGNRA must serve all the citizenry, including those with dogs who need an urban recreation area.

Sincerely,  
Scott W. Kurth

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6377    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:29:49

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Cindy Valencia

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6378    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94111  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** test

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6379    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:30:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---

populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Mark B

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6380    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:30:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the proposed dog management plan, and support status quo of historical off/leash dog walking at fort funston and ocean beach. Thank you, Ryan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6381    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:30:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** My comments are related to Fort Funston, the enjoyment of which would be significantly marginalized by the proposed changes. The primary use of Fort Funston is by those who walk dogs and use the park in harmony with not only each other but those there without dogs. Spend a day at Fort Funston and one will see the constant joy of dogs running around the grounds and down to the beach, and the joy of their owners, and realize that the proposed changes come from a place of ignorance of how the park is actually enjoyed most and how the changes will harm the dog loving community in San Francisco, a city where dogs outnumber children. Anyone who sees how and how much the park is enjoyed would never support limiting the use of the park or the freedom and joy being off leash allows the dogs lucky enough to enjoy Fort Funston. It is truly very difficult to make sense of the proposed changes, and the use of the park should remain as it is and dogs should be allowed to remain off leash on GGNRA grounds and particularly Fort Funston. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6382    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:30:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6383	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.				

I regularly take my dog to (put your preferred GGNRA trails and beaches here).

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

I am extremely disappointed in the National Park Service. If this passes, I will no longer buy my annual passes. This is a very sad day if you allow this Management Plan to succeed.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6384	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:33:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	PLEASE DO NOT TAKE AWAY THE AMAZING OPEN SPACE THAT DOGS AND DOG LOVERS ALIKE LOVE TO EXPLORE. THIS IS ONE OF THE BEAUTIFUL ASPECTS ABOUT LIVING IN SUCH A DOG FRIENDLY CITY; THE PARKS, THE HILLS, THE TRAILS. IT HAS CREATED AND FOSTERED SO MUCH JOY IN MY LIFE TO SOCIALIZE MY DOG AND SEE HER INTERACTIONS AND PLAYFUL NATURE WITH OTHER DOGS.				

---

PLEASE BE WISE AND THOUGHTFUL ABOUT THIS DECISION, IT IS WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT.

THANKS FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION.

CHEERS!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6385    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Benjamin couch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6386    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:35:36  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Muir Beach and Ocean Beach and I want to continue to do that.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6387    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Palo Alto, CA 94305  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:35:37

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I work in Palo alto, but am a regular visitor to the parts of san francisco that allow dog walking, such as the airfield and Ft. Point. I love to come up to the City because of the scenery and the opportunity to walk about in a dog-friendly environment. This is truly one of the best features of the city.

I read the report, and appreciate that the use of the lands in these areas is very different from the use of lands in the other national parks. However, I think these spaces are special, featuring a mix of paved walkways parking lots, picnic areas, and recreation areas for dogs that are established and highly-functional. A change in the policies governing these areas will cause confusion and anger, and will require a huge increase in staff to enforce, explain, and deal with all of the unhappiness that will be caused. I think this would be doomed to failure. Certainly the national parks have better things to do with their time and energy and limited resources than to try an transform this part of San Francisco into a wilderness?

Please don't do this!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6388    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:35:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support the Draft Dog Management Plan / SEIS and commend the improvements from the 2011 draft. I await the passage and implementation of the Plan. As one who shares a household dog in Marin, I feel there are ample dog-friendly locations (GGNRA and otherwise) available to residents. Although it is not a requirement of the Park, the Park has done a great deal to provide areas for dogs and their owners to recreate. I feel that dogs in natural areas, especially when off-leash, can interfere with others' enjoyment; I have experienced this first-hand as a casual ornithologist and naturalist. The impacts have ranged from unattended dog waste (bagged or unbagged); excessive digging to disturb the natural profile of the beach; dog bites; and wildlife harassment in the form of waterbird chasing (a common phenomenon at Ocean Beach). The GGNRA serves as a sanctuary for wildlife and humans who enjoy that wildlife within the Park's urban surroundings. It should remain so; and what the park can do to increase biodiversity in the face of so many unknown future factors should be encouraged. That includes setting aside areas where sensitive plant and animal species have taken residence for some or part of the year, like snowy plover and coho salmon.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6389    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Carmel, CA 93923  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:36:07**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** beaches and parks off leash, are the places where we can play fetch and run with our four legged family members and most importantly bond further, and socialize to take this away is totally unfriendly, and totally unsatisfactory. There are enough "Dog on leash parks and beaches" for those who are wanting no dog beaches already.. We NEED dog friendly beaches! Otherwise we will end up with happy dogs everywhere I socialized and mean like most dogs in Japan.

Lisa George ( Fukuda)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6390 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:36:44**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am concerned about the Preferred Alternatives put forth by your Dog Management Plan. They seem to have selected areas doomed to fail.

For example, even though page 27 states this:

The literature review found very few investigations or peer-reviewed, scientific studies that document the isolated effects dogs have on water quality in recreational settings. Water quality has therefore been dismissed as a resource topic in this document due to lack of literature. There is concern about potential impacts of dog waste from a proposed regulated off- leash area (ROLA) on the airfield at Crissy Field on the water quality in Crissy Marsh. This is because the eastern 1/3 to 1/2 of the airfield directly connects to the marsh through perforated underdrains that connect to the stormwater system, which ultimately drains into the marsh in this area. During rainy periods, especially large rainfall events, contaminated runoff from dog waste could drain into the marsh and negatively impact water quality. However, compliance with regulations to pick up dog waste and organized pet waste clean-up days for this area would minimize this threat to water quality.

...the area you have chosen for a ROLA is the area next to the lagoon. So as it's not shown yet but if you produce data later that shows a bit of run off into the lagoon (If it ever rains again) you can just close off this area of the airfield. Why not choose the middle portion of the airstrip or more importantly: **KEEP THE AIRSTRIPOFF LEASH COMPLETELY AS IN PLAN A TO DISPERSE THE DOGS OVER A LARGER AREA SO AS NOT TO CONCENTRATE THEIR WASTE MATTER.** If there has been no problems as of yet, why set it up so that problems **MIGHT** occur later on.

Secondly, at Fort Funston, you have chosen to require leashes on the sand ladder and on the path from beach to trail on the north end of the beach. Have you ever walked with a dog on a leash up or down either or those? **THIS WILL SET THIS UP FOR FAILURE AS THE ELDERLY OR ANYONE WHO HAS A DOG OVER 20 LBS WHO PULLS ON THE LEASH (AS ALL DOGS CAN DO) COULD DESTABILIZE THE PERSON AND CAUSE INJURY.** Currently, dogs can take themselves up the leash. There are **SO SIGNS** that inform owners that dogs should not go off the paths anywhere along the sand ladder or on the path on the north end. It is unfair to report incidents of dogs going in those areas as a negative incident without having put up **SIGNS!** Much more public education is needed.

**INSTEAD OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS TO MAKE ALL OF US CRIMINALS IN OUR OWN BACK YARDS, HOW ABOUT \$1-\$2 MILLION IN SIGNAGE AND PUBLIC EDUCATION AND getting**

more involved with the dog groups to produce volunteer corps to perpetually educate the public on a daily basis.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6391    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:37:35

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** My name is Jeff Ubersax, age 38. I have lived in San Francisco for 15 years. I enjoy San Francisco's proximity to wilderness areas, including the GGNRA. I visit Crissy Field weekly and Fort Funston monthly. I make trips to Muir Beach and Rodeo beach a couple of times a year. I am a dog owner. I have a Ph.D. in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology from UCSF. I am currently employed by Amyris as the Director of Biology where we are working to make renewable chemicals to displace petroleum usage. I am a current member of REI and the Sierra Club and consider myself an environmentalist.

I have a well trained and well behaved dog and get great enjoyment from walking him off leash. I have invested significant amounts of my time in training him to be under tight voice control and keep him from going into restricted areas such as the tidal marsh or dunes of Crissy Field, the habitat restoration areas along the sand ladder at Fort Funston, and the lagoons at both Muir Beach and Rodeo Beach.

Prior to being a dog owner, my wife and I visited Crissy Field and Fort Funston a few times every month. We enjoyed walking along the beach and taking in the beautiful scenery and watching other people's dogs run and play off leash. Watching dogs run and play off leash was a major reason for us going to these two areas and added greatly to the recreational value of them. The SEIS has not taken into account the fact that many people who are not dog owners, including many of my friends and family in San Francisco, gain significant recreational enjoyment from watching dogs run off leash in these areas.

The GGNRA is located in and adjacent to a large urban center. Much of the land is no longer in a pristine native state. I applaud and support efforts to restore the GGNRA to a more native state, as has been done at the Crissy Field tidal marsh. That said, much of the areas around Fort Funston and Rodeo Beach have been highly impacted by military use. The military planted large amounts of ice plant to stabilize the sand dunes at Fort Funston and Rodeo Beach. Parts of the SEIS that treat these areas as pristine wilderness are misguided.

The SEIS makes a number of general statements about the negative impact of dogs. The SEIS fails to present any site specific evidence of these impacts caused by dogs on soil, vegetation, and wildlife. The SEIS needs to show evidence that dogs have negative impacts on site specific soil, vegetation, and wildlife to justify restrictions on dog activity. The SEIS is full of possible impacts of dogs on wildlife and vegetation and other visitors that 'could' occur, but there is little evidence that these impacts do occur. The SEIS should base its management plan of actual observed impacts. The SEIS uses anecdotal evidence of negative impact of dogs as a way of supporting the proposed changes. In science, a common statement is that the plural of anecdote is not data. Any proposed rule changes that are meant to limit the recreational use of a GGNRA site must be based on data showing a negative environmental impact. Anecdotes do not meet this standard of proof. Furthermore, these points were raised by comments in the DEIS and should have been addressed in the SEIS and were not.

The SEIS fails to note that there is conflicting scientific evidence about the impacts of dogs on birds and vegetation. There is no scientific consensus that restrictions on off-leash dogs are needed to protect

---



wildlife and vegetation. Forrest and Cassidy St. Clair (2006) and Warren (2007) show that there is little to no impact of off-leash dogs on bird diversity, abundance and feeding. The SEIS needs to test the hypothesis that off-leash dogs are harmful to these sites before it can justify further restrictions.

There is evidence that humans alone and humans with leashed dogs have greater impact on the environment. Knight and Miller (1996, Wildlife responses to pedestrians and dogs) shows that the flush distance of birds is greater for human or humans with leashed dogs than unleashed dogs. This suggests that the birds in this study view humans as more of a threat than dogs. The SEIS needs to present a balanced view of the scientific literature and as there is no consensus about the impact of off-leash dogs, site specific studies should be carried out. It is often very difficult to differentiate the impact of dogs vs humans in an area. The raw data in the studies presented in the SEIS often shows that the conclusions reached in those studies and in the SEIS are not supported by the data.

My own observations suggest that humans have a bigger impact on many of the areas sited in the SEIS. I have seen far more people and children climbing and degrading the cliffs at Fort Funston than I have seen dogs. The SEIS should observe and report of the frequency of violations by people vs. dogs.

Furthermore, standard practices in land management, such as better fencing, signage, and enforcement of current rules, could demonstrably mitigate any negative impact of both human and dogs to many GGNRA sites, including Crissy Field and Fort Funston. The fencing between the beach and the dunes of Crissy Field is very effective at limiting both human and dog intrusions into this sensitive environment. Better fencing along the sand ladder at Fort Funston is all that is needed to preserve the dunes in this area.

The SEIS suggests that dogs are the main driver of complaints by visitors. Complaints about the smell of urine around the batteries of Fort Funston have no evidence that those smells are coming from dog urine. In my many visits to Fort Funston and the Marin Headlands (Battery Rathbone), there has been the smell of urine around old batteries. There have also been beer cans and cigarette butts in the area. I find it much more likely that the smell of urine is from human urine rather than dog urine, especially as there are dramatically fewer dogs at Battery Rathbone than at Fort Funston.

Problem interactions between park visitors and off-leash dogs represent a tiny fraction of the total incidents and citations issued by the GGNRA. Visitor fears of being attacked by an off-leash dog are fears based on emotion, not empirical evidence. The vast majority of citations in the GGNRA are leash law violations or being in closed or restricted areas and did not reflect any safety issues between dogs and park visitors. It is unfair to restrict a class of users from the GGNRA based on the irrational fears of another class of users. The GGNRA should focus on enforcement on the small number of people whose dogs misbehave, not on excluding the entire class of users.

I had numerous comments about the compliance-based management strategy in the DEIS and find the monitoring-based management strategy of the SEIS to be a slight improvement. My main issue with the MBMS is that it assumes that rangers will begin to do a new activity that they should currently be doing. I find this unlikely to happen or to happen very sporadically. At Fort Funston, as an example, ranger patrols of the sand ladder or beach would already be enough to mitigate damage to the dunes or other guest experiences. I would support more ranger presence at sensitive areas under the current rules. Changing the rules without increasing ranger patrols will be ineffective.

As a whole, I find that the SEIS does not adequately consider comments to the DEIS from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. The SEIS appears to pull many comments from people opposed to dog walking and very few from people who support dog walking, even though there were far more comments from supporters of dog walking. I find myself disappointed in the NPS for being biased in their approach to the SEIS.

Furthermore, the SEIS misrepresents the enabling legislation and the reason for the founding of the GGNRA. It says the GGNRA's purpose is to offer a "national park experience to a large and diverse urban population" (p. 1). However, the enabling legislation says the purpose of the GGNRA is to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" (Enabling legislation, first paragraph). The SEIS notes, in a negative way, that "In many parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, residents have come to expect that GGNRA lands will be available for dog walking and other recreational activities." (p. 19). Yet that is exactly what Congress intended when it created the GGNRA in 1972 - "The objective of [the creation of the GGNRA] is to ... expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region." (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972)

The SEIS continues to not allow any off-leash dog walking on new lands acquired by the GGNRA in the future, even if dog walking has traditionally occurred there. This is not in the spirit of the original mission of the GGNRA.

I could support modifications to the preferred alternatives at Crissy Field and Fort Funston, the two areas I use most frequently. At Crissy Field, the shift of dog activity to West Beach should only happen if similar facilities to those provided at East Beach are provided at West Beach, perhaps by the Sports Basement site. As a minimum, rest area or portable toilets and free parking should be provide. Right now, there are only about 20 parking spots to the west of Sports Basement that are free and then many paid parking spots (\$3/hr) and no restrooms. The lack of these facilities will discourage an entire class of users from enjoying the site.

At Fort Funston, the sand ladder should be off-leash and more fencing and enforcement should be provided.

If no modifications to the proposed alternatives are offered, then I support the Alternative A plan (no change or no action) along with additional visitor education and enforcement. I believe that this plan will help bring together dog owners and the GGNRA. This plan best represents the original intent behind the GGNRA as a way to preserve open spaces for recreation.

Respectfully,

Jeff Ubersax  
129 Lincoln Way  
San Francisco, CA 94122

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6392	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94903 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Marin Conservation League Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:38:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 18, 2014 [Revised from earlier letter]				

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg. 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Re: GGNRA Dog Management Plan and DEIS [revised]

---

Dear Superintendent Dean:

The Marin Conservation League previously commented in 2011 on GGNRA's Plan to provide clear, enforceable policies to determine the manner and extent of dog use in various areas of the park. On the basis of information in the Plan and DEIS, we concurred at that time with the NPS selection of the Preferred Alternative for all seven sites in Marin, as a reasonable compromise between the Environmentally Preferred Alternative "D" and the other "action" alternatives.

We have a similar response to the revisions in the Draft Supplemental EIS: We support the National Park Service's (NPS) Preferred Alternative "F", with one exception - see Muir Beach below), in that it balances the need to protect natural and cultural resources and ensure visitor safety with the designation of appropriate areas in the Park for no dogs, or dogs on- and off-leash. We are fully aware of the potential for adverse effects of large numbers of dogs caused by trampling vegetation, depositing dog waste, and adding nutrients. Such degradation of high quality habitat can result in displacing wildlife from preferred habitats, with eventual loss of species from the area. For each of the seven sites in Marin, the Draft SEIS identifies sensitive species, habitats, and/or cultural resources that may be threatened by dogs and has recommended an appropriate response. Therefore, where a choice must be made between allowing dog access and protecting native wildlife, endangered species or sensitive vegetation, the Draft SEIS tips the balance toward protecting the resource. We believe that this approach accommodates a variety of recreational experiences, both with and without dogs, while ensuring that these resources are protected for future generations.

Other comments are as follows:

1. Under Alternate F, the NPS Preferred Alternative for Muir Beach is generally appropriate for that site to protect the restored habitat at the mouth of Redwood Creek and several sensitive species. The Preferred Alternative in the Draft Supplemental EIS allows access for dogs on leash on the beach. MCL believes that an unfenced ROLA should be designated on the southern portion of the beach. This provision would still ensure protection of sensitive resources and at the same time offer a practical solution to dog-owning residents of Muir Beach who have long-frequented the beach. The large expanse of Rodeo Beach provides that opportunity, but it is distant from Muir Beach.
2. The on-leash access proposed for the Oakwood Valley Fire Road under Alternative F would remove the fence and gates proposed for the fire road and thus remove a barrier to wildlife movement. Hikers, bikers, and equestrians will share the fire road with on-leash dogs. The Fire Road is currently used by all three, and the almost parallel Trail is used by hikers and dog walkers only. That trail will be closed to dogs under Alternative F from Tennessee Valley Road to the junction with the Fire Road, and thereafter open to dogs on leash to the junction with the Alta Trail. We agree with this approach, which will keep dogs off the lower wooded section of the Trail.
3. MCL also agrees with Alternative F's general approach to trails in the Marin Headlands, which is to allow on-leash dog access on the perimeter of the area, while protecting the integrity of wild inner portions frequented by coyote, bobcat, and other wildlife with large territories and need of protections. This approach safety also enhances visitor safety.
4. The revised Monitoring-Based Management Strategy is less rigid than the previous compliance-based strategy, which did not consider the trail context. Nonetheless, given the size and diverse conditions of GGNRA and a limited number of personnel, the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy needs to be supported by clear standards and vigorous enforcement that includes (a) visible increase in uniformed law enforcement presence; (b) increased issuance of citations, particularly to aggressive violators; and (c) tracking of repeat offenders. We agree with others that enforcement of regulations sends the clearest

message to people about what is expected of them. Clear and prominent signage is also important.

Finally, the effectiveness of Alternative F in protecting resources and enhancing safety of visitors and dogs will depend heavily on the combination of responsible observance by dog walkers and enforcement actions taken by GGNRA. Because neither of these can be assured, adoption of this alternative should be conditioned on establishment of a date-certain to allow for review of the Plan's effectiveness based on monitoring of user compliance.

We appreciate the NPS's efforts to inform and engage the public in this long and difficult task, and look forward to your responses.

Sincerely,

Jon Elam Nona Dennis  
President Chair, Parks and Open Space Committee

Cc: Supervisors Kate Sears, Steve Kinsey,  
Susan Adams, Katie Rice, Judy Arnold  
Congressman Jared Huffman  
Linda Dahl, Marin County Parks Department

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6393	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:38:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Emmanuel Romero

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6394	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:38:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To the reader:

If I could give you one piece of advice it is this:

Consider how the problem with the terminology "under voice control" is that it is baldly illogical,so patently hollow, naked and preposterous that a reasonable person who expects to be engaging in civil discourse is like a person at sea for the first time and in a squall at that. The deck of the dialog is heaving and bucking trying to bounce the sane person off the legs of her logic. But the person used to reasoned sober choice of words is at a disadvantage when the opposite persons corrupts logic with inside out constructions such as "under voice control."

Dump "under voice control" it is like unto the Gordion knot. Slice it away from the heart of reasoned dialog on the limits of dog owners uses of their dogs in the park.

Dump "under voice control" it is an albatross around the neck of the people and species the park is here to serve and protect.

Dump " under voice control" it is a red herring used to confuse the good natured and civilized persons who want to get along with others. This confusion is even a systemic poison on the heart of this topic's civil discourse.

Dump "under voice control" the quicker the better and the sooner the wound it leaves behind can be healed. Good will follow. The other dog management matters will fall more easily into a sensible balance.

That being the best I can suggest I will stop while I am ahead.

And now dear reader, I thank you for putting up with my perspective. Please use these words ,if you can find a way, in any way that serves the protection of the parks integrity and its products of health and wellness for the society and the biosphere.

Best Wishes,  
James Marks, a citizen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6395    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:39:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

John Guiral & Laura van Hoff

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6396	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Sonoma, CA 95476 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:39:23				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am against the expansion of dogs into any additional natural areas. Dogs should be limited to the most developed, least sensitive natural areas. Dogs can introduce a variety of illnesses and diseases into nature. These include: canine distemper, rabies, parvovirus, plague, giardia, muscle cysts, and leptospirosis. They also transport ticks, keds, tapeworms and fleas. Dogs can bite or attack other hikers. This opens the NPS up for liability. Dogs can be bitten by rattlesnakes or other wildlife. Dogs are best left out of wilderness areas.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6397	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Get Along Little Doggies Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Lori Olivero

**Correspondence ID:** 6398    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94014  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:40:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Cynthia DelCorto

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6399    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:40:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** As a resident of southern Marin county, I would like to focus my comments specifically on the areas in southern Marin where I, my wife, and my 11-year-old daughter most frequently walk our 2 dogs: Muir beach, Oakwood Valley and the Marin Headlands. My wife and I have lived in Mill Valley for 17 years and have, throughout this period, regularly taken our dogs to the aforementioned areas. Over this period, my wife and I have frequented these areas with our dogs, on average, several times a week, and throughout this period, we have never once witnessed any kind of incident in which the presence of a dog in these areas posed an issue either with another visitor to the area, or to any native wildlife. I am truly perplexed as what outstanding issue would be addressed by further curtailing dog access in these areas. As a matter of fairness and balance, we feel that the policies currently in place already represent a rather severe limitation on the areas where dogs are permitted, either on-leash or under voice control - a further limitation beyond those currently in place strikes us as unfair, unbalanced, and draconian towards the sizable segment of the population of this area who are dog owners and enjoy taking their dogs to the limited number of open spaces where they are permitted. For those people who wish, for whatever reason, to avoid dogs, they can already do so in most of the area under GGNRA jurisdiction.

Moreover, it is our understanding that, historically, these areas have not always been part of the GGNRA, and that where dogs were previously permitted, an agreement was reached, when these lands were turned

---

over to the GGNRA, to the effect that dog-owners would continue to have access to some areas, with their dogs, where they had previously been permitted. Indeed, in the Draft Dog Management Plan, that is the explicit rationale for the current policy at variance with the policy in effect in other National Park lands. Since the policy of the National Park Service is, in fact, whatever the National Park Service decides upon, it strikes me as arbitrary to assert that the same policies regarding dogs must apply uniformly throughout all park lands. To now reverse a long-standing agreement, in order to favor one segment of the population, whose wishes vis-a-vis dog restrictions are already given precedence in most of the GGNRA, over another, equally deserving segment, seems an act of bad faith. As far as any disruptive effect on native wildlife, where such an effect is truly a factor (such as habitat of nesting birds) I am completely in favor of restricting dogs from those areas. But any native wildlife, in Oakwood Valley or the Marin headlands, that could not easily and with trivial effort remove itself from threat by a domestic dog, would long ago have been devoured by a coyote, bobcat, hawk, owl, or some other far more capable predator, of which there are many in these areas. So I find the argument that dogs in these areas are disruptive to wildlife to be insultingly specious.

In summary, I do not object to the principle that, in the Park Service's policies, various interests must be weighed and addressed, and that some degree of regulation is essential in achieving a reasonable balance among the competing interests. But if "balance" is truly the desired end, I feel it important to acknowledge that if the existing policies are left in place, these policies already represent a significant curtailment of access to GGNRA lands by dogs and their owners - a curtailment I am willing to accept. But Alternative F, in particular, would represent an extreme departure from the policies currently in place that have, to my knowledge, worked quite well in the areas I frequent, and would represent an act of bad faith on the part of the agency whose responsibility it is to administer these public lands fairly and reasonably.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6400	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:40:19				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** Please retain the safe and joyful off-leash areas in the Bay Area! I have taken my parents' dog to several of the areas in jeopardy, and it makes her, me, and all of us so happy for her to frolic, fetch and swim. I've never encountered an unfriendly dog or irresponsible owner - and if these exist, do not punish the majority for the sins of the minority. City dogs especially need outlets where they can burn off energy and run free. Please do not take this away!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6401	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Palo Alto, CA 94306 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:40:22				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. I consider it too restrictive. If implemented, the proposed changes will affect negatively my longstanding habits of recreation in the area.



The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

- -Jacobco Valdes

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6402	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94014 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:41:55				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Louis DelCorto

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6403	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To whom it may concern,				

I write because I am concerned that the most recent data released by the GGNRA shows that in the last year out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs, there have only been reported 6 dog

bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. And the reported incidents involving people are much higher. This data does not support the request the need for a change. Moreover, this data does not support the request for \$2,000,000 for more rangers.

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Making the proposed change will also greatly affect the people of San Francisco. Being able to take our dog out of our tiny apartment to give her the freedom to run around (supervised of course) is one of my most treasured activities. It is one of the things that makes this city great. Please don't take it away.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dani (and Kingsley the dog)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6404	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:42:43				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I have lived in the Inner Sunset in San Francisco for almost seventeen years and I have owned a dog for the last five years. I regularly visit GGNRA lands to enjoy hiking, beach access, and historic sites. Since becoming a dog owner, I have continued to take advantage of the opportunities for recreation in the GGNRA. I take my dog to Crissy Field once a week and to Fort Funston about once a month. I am a responsible dog-owner who walks with my dog under voice-control, respects areas of the GGRNA that are restricted to dogs, and always cleans up after her dog.

I submitted several objections to the Draft Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) released in 2011 and I do not believe the recently released Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) adequately addresses them. For this reason, I remain opposed to the planned changes to the GGNRA dog policy. Specifically, I object to the decrease in areas allowing off-leash dog walking and the plan to automatically ban off-leash dog walking in newly acquired lands even if it has traditionally been allowed.

A major flaw shared by both the 2011 DEIS and the 2013 SEIS is they provide no site-specific studies or evidence to support their strongly stated conclusions that allowing dogs access to limited areas in the GGNRA results in a negative impact on those areas. This process has been going on for more than eight years, giving the GGNRA ample time to gather data demonstrating a severe negative impact from off-leash dog walking, but they have chosen not to do so. The report continually treats as fact the idea that dog waste contaminates soil and water and poses a threat to human health but provides no data to support this. It would not require a tremendous amount of resources to test samples for microbes commonly found in dog waste, but I suspect the GGNRA fears the results would not support their conclusions. For instance, the GGNRA often cites the Crissy Field tidal marsh as a particularly healthy body of water, even though Crissy Field is currently a widely used off-leash dog recreation area. Also, the lack of an epidemic

of microbial infections in the Bay Area would seem to be proof itself that the current dog policy in the GGNRA represents a minimal, if any, risk to human health.

Like the DEIS, the SEIS also fails to put many of their claims about the negative impacts of dogs into context. The report states as fact that dogs cause soil erosion or the degradation of vegetation, but it makes no attempt to rigorously document this claim let alone compare it to the levels of erosion and degradation caused by humans. I have personally witnessed adults and children climbing up the coastal cliffs at Fort Funston and, surely, dogs are not responsible for the graffiti that can be seen carved into the cliffs. I have also witnessed people walking on the dunes near Funston Beach Trail South and using paths other than the sand ladder to travel between the upper section of Fort Funston and the beach. The SEIS also emphasizes the incidence of hazardous interactions between dogs and people in the GGNRA. No one would suggest that these incidences are not serious, but the report implies they are the norm rather than an extremely rare event. Although this information is not presented side-by-side in the report, by gathering data from separate sections of the SEIS, I estimate that there were ~140 hazardous dog citations over four years (2008-2011) in all GGNRA lands out of ~2000 total dog incidences in the same period, or less than 10%. There were 95 documented dog bites in all of the GGNRA during those four years or approximately 24 per year. The GGNRA estimates 15 million visitors every year and estimating that ~20% of those visitors are accompanied by a dog (3 million), that puts the rate of dog bites at 0.000008%. When put into this context, the threat from dangerous or aggressive dogs is vanishingly small and does not justify the disproportionate focus of the SEIS.

The SEIS also fails to investigate the effect of improved enforcement of current rules, increased citations of violators, and improved signage and fencing on minimizing negative impacts on habitats and wildlife while still maintaining the more permissive current dog policy. The Crissy Field tidal marsh provides an excellent example of how a combination of consistent enforcement, clear signage, and effective wire fencing led to a thriving protected area coexisting with an extensive off-leash dog area. I have been going to Fort Funston for seventeen years, and I am still unsure of which areas are protected habitats and which are open to hikers. I often see people with AND without dogs walking on the cliffs north of Funston Beach Trail North, although I believe this is a restricted area. I have never seen a clear sign explaining that or any park staff informing visitors or issuing citations. The post and cable fences along this area are mostly eroded away or buried by sand, making entry into the protected habitat, intentionally or otherwise, almost unavoidable. The GGNRA could have spent the last two years-or even better, the last eight years-on a concerted effort to educate visitors about the existing restrictions in areas of the GGNRA and determined if such an effort would achieve a state of dog-human-habitat interactions that is acceptable to all parties.

I also oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy (MBMS) described in the SEIS, which I feel is not a significant improvement over the Compliance-Based Management Strategy outlined in the 2011 DEIS. The MBMS is still a subjective system that gives GGNRA staff unchecked decision-making power over what constitutes unacceptable levels of compliance and what can trigger long- and short-term closures of areas of the GGNRA to dogs. There is no requirement to present scientific evidence or to prove negative impacts have occurred nor is there a sufficient mechanism for the public to appeal such a decision, both of which are necessary parts of a fair monitoring policy.

A fundamental question not thoroughly explored in the SEIS, as it was not the 2011 DEIS, is why a drastic change in the mission of the GGNRA is justified at all. When Bay Area cities and counties turned over much of their open spaces in 1972 to create the GGNRA, they did so with the understanding that all residents of their urban areas would continue to have a place to enjoy open-space and experience nature under a variety of circumstances. The founding legislation cites as the primary goal provid[ing] for recreational and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management not the reverse. The GGNRA was never meant to be exclusively a nature preserve and

certainly not to offer visitors a national park experience as the SEIS states. It is vital that it continue to balance the recreational needs of the community, including dog-owners, with its commitment to the environment. For this reason, it is important that, as the GGNRA expands in the future, it incorporate established dog policies into its management of newly acquired lands rather than automatically restricting access for dog walkers.

I believe off-leash dog walking is an essential part of the founding mission of the GGNRA to preserve recreational open space for the urban environment. A small, designated off-leash play area for dogs or on-leash only paths cannot adequately replace the experience of hiking with an off-leash dog. My dog and my two-year-old walk at very different speeds, and having the freedom to responsibly let my dog play off-leash in parts of the GGNRA while attending to my child is a rare and invaluable experience for us in the Bay Area. It would be difficult to engage in outdoor activities as a family without it. Access to off-leash dog recreation areas also allows those with limited physical capabilities such as the elderly or disabled to provide their pets with sufficient exercise. Additionally, the veterinary community recognizes that off-leash, open-space interactions between dogs reduces overall aggression and is an important aspect of dog socialization.

Since the GGNRA first tried to unilaterally impose changes on the existing dog policy more than eight years ago, this entire process has left me with the sense that the NPS and the GGNRA management do not take the negotiated rule-making process seriously. Rather than engaging with the public in the development of a dog policy that represents a compromise between various constituencies, the NPS treats the process as a pro forma exercise, temporarily delaying the implementation of their predetermined agenda. For no other reason than continuity as far as I can tell, the NPS wants to place the GGNRA under the same regulations it applies to all national parks under its purview, even though the lands are meant to serve a very different purpose. This agenda is apparent in the SEIS, as it was in the 2011 DEIS, when one analyzes the instances of inherent bias within the report.

Although public comments for the 2011 DEIS were roughly 3:1 opposed to reducing access for dogs in the GGNRA, the authors of the SEIS overwhelmingly chose to quote comments from those supporting the proposed restrictions to the dog policy. The report repeatedly cites the same handful of irrelevant studies with no bearing on the question of dogs in the GGNRA specifically, the Seeing Eye Guide 2011 being a particularly egregious example. Worse than non-peer-reviewed studies, the report relies heavily on anecdotal reports and observations by park staff (the very definition of bias) without demonstrating such observations were done in any sort of systematic way. Often the SEIS refers to negative consequences that could or might occur without even a minimal effort to justify such a view or confirm its likelihood. The SEIS is full of seemingly unreasonable statements about the burdens dogs in the GGNRA place on staff and resources-for instance, citing the cost and labor required to collect garbage from garbage cans, which strikes me as a legitimate responsibility of a public park regardless of whether it is a human or a dog who creates the garbage.

For the reasons stated in this submission, I oppose the changes being proposed to the dog policy for the GGNRA. As a member of the community who enjoys visiting the GGNRA regularly, I ask that the GGNRA responsibly study the problem of dog-walking within park lands, reevaluate the assumptions underlying their conclusions about the impacts of dogs, and take seriously the founding mission of the GGNRA before restricting access to the GGNRA for a significant population of frequent visitors.

Thank you,

Sarah Green

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6405	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:42:48

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed change in limiting off leash areas which dog owners have come enjoy for years is dramatic and harsh to dog owners. This will force more dog owners into smaller more concentrated areas which creates an unhealthy environment for all concerned. Congress was clear about the purpose of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (notice the operative word RECREATIONAL in the name)- concentrate on the outdoor recreational needs of the people. These people include dog owners. If anything, changes to off leash areas should be increased. San Mateo County is particularly hit hard, virtually eliminating any off leash areas. This draconian change needs to be adjusted to substantially increase off lease areas in San Mateo County. Considering the love President Teddy Roosevelt had for animals, he would be sorely disappointed if he were alive today to witness your plans to so dramatically reduce the areas made available to people allow their dogs to run free. 25 year resident of Pacifica CA.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6406    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:43:09

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please do not get rid of off-leash areas! They are very important to dogs and their owners!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6407    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:43:44

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have carefully read more than 300 pages of the draft dog management plan.

I find a preponderance of unsupported statements about the impact of dogs on the areas of the Recreation Area. Many of these statements make no sense to me, given the spaces that are being considered for a dramatic change in use policy.

I find many statements that could be true in a remote wilderness area, but make no sense at all when placed in the context of park spaces in the middle of San Francisco. Fort Mason, for example, is within 50 meters of a Safeway, and is surrounded on 3 sides by Bay and Van Ness streets. There are fire engines, ambulances, cars, motorcycles and aircraft in the air and on the ground around Ft. Mason. . The Ft. Mason parking lot has food festivals, music festivals, a farmer's market, and many other uses. This is not a space where sensitive birds come to find undisturbed rest or where sensitive plants need to be protected from people and their pets. It is absurd to apply the standards and goals of the national parks to these areas, because there is simply no possibility of achieving the "preservation of natural habitats" that is the normal objective.

I read the report, and I just don't understand how most of it applies to these spaces in San Francisco.

I appreciate the national parks, and the beauty provided by the preservation of truly wild spaces. However, these values and objectives just don't apply to the situation here.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6408	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Olema, CA 94950 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:43:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I wish to express my support for the National Park Service's goal of finally creating a Dog Management Plan (DMP) for Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). Of the six alternatives being considered in the Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, I most strongly support "Alternative D: Most Protective of Resources and Visitor Safety," but I am extremely disappointed by how much of the park would still remain open to pets, and I am very opposed to the proposals to allow off-leash pets in any area of the park. National Park Service (NPS) areas are not the appropriate location for dogs, let alone for dogs to be allowed off-leash. The NPS's mission is to protect the natural and cultural resources; not to allow recreation to undermine it.

While I recognize that the NPS has long been involved in trying to find the right balance for protecting the natural values of the GGNRA and meeting the demands of a variety of park users, I strongly believe that pets should not be permitted in any NPS area. NPS areas- -particularly wild areas- -are not the appropriate location for dogs; they should be reserved for native wildlife and for human visitors who are willing to take only photos and leave only footprints, hopefully leaving the park in a better condition than when they arrived. There are so many other public lands on which pets are permitted throughout the nation- -and the San Francisco area already has a very high concentration of other public parks in which pets are permitted, both on- and off-leash (there are more than 28 official off-leash dog areas in the San Francisco city park system- -more off-leash space per capita than any other U.S. city, according to city officials)- -that there is no need to allow pets in NPS sites- -areas in which we as a nation are, if the rhetoric is to be believed, trying to provide some of the greatest protections for wildlife against human-related disturbance. The NPS set a horrible precedent when it didn't restrict pets when the GGNRA was created, and this DMP, to a large degree, just perpetuates that terrible decision.

If dogs are to be allowed in certain areas, they should be restrained on leashes at all times, as they are required to be at other NPS sites. And those areas in which on-leash dogs are permitted should not be near to or within wildlife habitat. Recognizing that the NPS will inevitably cave to those who believe that they have a god- and/or dog-given right to take their pets with them wherever they go and let their dogs run amuck, I encourage the NPS to modify the SEIS as described below.

Leash requirements must be strictly enforced throughout the life of the policy. Otherwise proposed on-leash areas will become de facto off-leash areas, as has already happened under the old rules. Any DMP or EIS Alternative must also include funding for thorough enforcement. As it is, dog owners recognize that there is little chance that they will encounter a law enforcement ranger, so they readily let their dogs off-leash and/or take their dogs into closed areas without fear of negative repercussions. The DMP should establish a simple and effective violation reporting system to provide a means by which park visitors can easily and effectively report non-compliant behavior.

I would prefer to see the DMP completely abandon all proposals for regulated off-leash areas (ROLAs).

---

The SEIS provides no evidence and fails to establish that "voice control" is a valid method of controlling off-leash dogs or protecting people, natural resources, or other dogs within GGNRA. A few pet owners may be able to keep their pets under "voice control," but in my experience, the vast majority of pet owners who let their dogs off-leash in "voice control required" areas have no ability to recall or control their pets with just their voice. Far too many times I've encountered pets well out of ear-shot of their owners, or pets that just ignore their owners. When asked to better control their dogs and keep them from chasing after shorebirds, people, or other dogs, these owners invariably insist that their dog is under control. And my anecdotal accounts are born out by the fact that the NPS records hundreds of Criminal Incident Reports relating to out-of-control dogs each year; more often than not, the dog owners and walkers do not have any voice control over their dogs. The adopted alternative should, at a minimum, require that all off-leash areas be enclosed or in some manner separated to protect other park users, wildlife, and other dogs and limit off-leash recreation to areas where it will not have negative impacts on sensitive wildlife and habitats. Park visitors should be given a choice about whether they will interact with off-leash dogs.

GGNRA is the world's largest urban park and provides critical habitat for some of the state's most rare and threatened species. There are over 80 rare or special-status wildlife species currently identified as permanent or seasonal residents of the park or dependent on park lands and waters for migration, and there are 38 rare or special-status plant species currently identified within GGNRA. I am concerned that the DMP could lead to changes that would continue putting sensitive park resources and public safety in jeopardy. Numerous academic and government studies identify off-leash pets as threats to visitor safety, wildlife, and the integrity of natural and cultural resources. For example, a study by the American Humane Association documented injuries to humans, wildlife, and pets as a result of unleashed pets and recommended that pets be leashed in public areas set aside for natural resource protection purposes. GGNRA records indicate numerous incidents of dog bites, threats of dogs to park visitors, and instances where park rangers were forced to risk their own safety to rescue uncontrolled pets and pet owners trapped on cliffs or in the ocean. Over the years, the Golden Gate Audubon Society has documented that approximately 2/3 of dog walkers in the Crissy Field Wildlife Protection Area (WPA) ignore the leash requirements and let their dogs roam off-leash even while the threatened Snowy Plover is present. The rates of non-compliance are even higher on Ocean Beach and at Fort Funston.

I am please that, aside from at the north end of Funston Beach, the NPS has eliminated seasonal closures from most of the alternatives. To adequately protect wildlife, current and potential nesting areas should be off-limits to dogs year-round. Seasonal closures are largely ineffective, even with the best of signage and education campaigns. By permitting dogs near Bank Swallow habitat during any portion of the year, the park will reduce compliance with regulations when the swallows are present, as many people will not realize that the closure is seasonal. I frequently visit the beaches of Point Reyes National Seashore (PRNS) where there are seasonal closures for beaches upon which Snowy Plovers nest and elephant seals haul-out. I have lost track of the number of times I have encountered people with dogs- -usually with the dog off-leash- -in areas closed to dogs, and when I inform the owner that pets are not permitted there, the response is often to the effect of "but the beach was open to dogs a few months ago." It doesn't make sense to open an area of the park for just a couple months each year to allow a small segment of the population to conduct an activity which has proven to be disruptive (and even deadly) to the wildlife the park is supposed to protect.

The DMP is also inadequate for protecting Snowy Plover habitat because it does not include the entire portion of Crissy Field and Ocean Beach. It draws imaginary boundaries that do not comport with typical visitor's understanding of GGNRA, and the plovers are not, to the best of my knowledge, able to discern where these boundaries are either. A typical visitor with a dog will not always know if he or she is entering an area where pets are restricted, especially if the regulatory signs are vandalized or torn down by individuals who disagree with the rules, as too frequently happens. This, again, will invite violations of

pet regulations as people claim ignorance or confusion over the exact boundary. A closure prohibiting pets- on- or off-leash- -should apply to all of Ocean Beach and Crissy Field.

The DMP would also preclude the possibility of the Snowy Plover or other shore birds from ever adopting many coastal areas of GGNRA as nesting areas. According to the background information printed in the Federal Register during a previous comment period pertaining to dogs on Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, "Snowy Plovers do not nest in the park; they overwinter from approximately July through April. During the overwintering period, Snowy Plovers rest and feed to gather reserves necessary to successfully breed at other more suitable nesting locations up and down the Pacific coast." Given that Snowy Plovers nest on the beaches of Point Reyes, I would assume that Snowy Plovers used to nest on the beaches of the San Francisco peninsula, beaches which are now part of GGNRA. Aside from disturbance by dogs and humans, are there any other factors that prevent Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, and other park coastal areas from being suitable nesting locations for Snowy Plovers and other shorebirds? If not, then the presence of dogs and humans in these areas during the nesting season is likely the reason why the Snowy Plover has to migrate to other locations. And, by allowing pets in these areas when Snowy Plovers would otherwise be nesting, this will surely prevent the plovers from ever selecting Crissy Field and/or Ocean Beach as a nesting site. And given how few suitable nesting sites are left for the Snowy Plover, it is incumbent upon the NPS-which is mandated to protect the wildlife unimpaired-to do everything it can to preserve whatever habitat there is for the plover to thrive. The NPS should therefore restrict dogs and other pets from potential nesting areas throughout the year.

And it's not just Bank Swallows and Snowy Plovers that are negatively impacted by dogs in GGNRA. Too many times I have witnessed off-leash dogs in NPS areas chasing after and harassing birds and other wildlife. A friend has related to me how, on a weekly basis, she witnesses a professional dog walker release up to 6 dogs to run and chase each other and wildlife in Oakwood Valley, trampling and tearing up the host plant to the endangered mission blue butterfly. I've heard other friends describe witnessing off-leash dogs in national parks attacking or harassing pinnipeds and chasing after shorebirds, including the threatened Snowy Plover. These reports lend more validation to the argument that dogs- -especially off-leash dogs- -have no place in national parks.

But it is not just park flora and fauna that are negatively impacted by pets. On several occasions as I have hiked in national parks or strolled along a park beach (more often than not where pets are prohibited, but also frequently in areas where they are at least required to be on leash), I've encountered off-leash dogs running out-of-sight of and well ahead of their owners, and frequently out of earshot. A number of these dogs have charged me, and many have made contact. So far, I have been fortunate and have not been bitten or injured. The same cannot be said for many of my friends or their pets which were on-leash. When I politely try to inform the dog's owner of the park regulations pertaining to pets, the owner more often than not interrupts me and generally is downright rude, making comments such as "Mind your own business" or "Go home." My friends relate similar stories. Granted, many pet owners are responsible and do not take their dogs where they do not belong, but it seems as though many of the pet owners who take their dogs to national parks are not amongst the ranks of the responsible or courteous. I grew up with dogs and am therefore familiar with them and know how to react to the dogs charging at me, but it still is not a comfortable situation to be in- -not knowing whether the dog will actually attack or not. And for those who are unfamiliar with or afraid of dogs, such encounters are terrifying.

As a result of these encounters, I endeavor to hike on trails and visit areas where pets are prohibited. The DMP would provide those of us who share such sentiments with few trails within certain sections of GGNRA where we would not likely encounter dogs. It is disturbing how little of our nation- -let alone the San Francisco Bay area- -is left for those of us who wish to visit natural areas without encountering dogs- -or cell phones, guns, horses, bicycles, ATVs, aircraft, etc. We as a nation are quickly destroying wildlife habitat and the wilderness in the pursuit of doing whatever we feel like doing with no regard for how it



affects others.

GGNRA is also perpetuating a horrific precedent that will reverberate throughout the National Park system by having regulations pertaining to pets at odds with those at nearly every other NPS site. I already encounter many pet owners walking their dogs on the trails of PRNS who express surprise that pets aren't permitted on these trails given that they frequently walk their dogs in GGNRA...and aren't both PRNS and GGNRA NPS sites...and if they can walk their dogs on GGNRA trails, why not within PRNS?

By establishing some areas where pets are prohibited, others where they are permitted on-leash, and then others where they are permitted off-leash, GGNRA and the NPS just seem to be doing their best to confuse the public and to give pet owners the excuse of ignorance when they are caught with their dogs in a closed area or off-leash in a leash required area. The NPS should have uniform regulations pertaining to pets throughout the system. And in order to protect the wildlife, their habitats, as well as other visitors, the only sensible conclusion is to prohibit pets from all NPS sites. By maintaining one park-system-wide pet policy and instituting a nationwide education effort to inform pet owners about the policy, pet owners won't have an excuse for not knowing that pets are either prohibited from national parks or are at the very least required to be on-leash in a handful of specific areas at NPS sites.

And prohibiting pets at NPS sites would reduce another problem I frequently witness: dogs left in vehicles- -often very hot vehicles. Another excuse I have frequently heard from those walking their dogs in areas where pets are prohibited is that they didn't want to leave their pet in the vehicle. This is understandable. I am outraged when I see a pet locked inside sun-heated vehicles while their owners are off hiking. I would assume that many dog owners, having become accustomed to hiking in GGNRA or other non-NPS public lands with their dogs, automatically take their dogs with them whenever they go hiking thinking that they will be able to go for a hike with their dog like they do at GGNRA. But then they arrive at parks like PRNS and realize that dogs are not permitted on the trails. They have a choice to make: leave the dog in the vehicle, take the dog on the trails despite the regulations, or to go home or elsewhere where dogs are permitted. Far too many people choose one of the first two options. If the dog is left in the vehicle, it frequently sets to barking non-stop until the owner returns, sometimes several hours later. The rate at which pets would be left in vehicles or taken on trails because the owner didn't want to leave the dog in the vehicle would likely be greatly reduced if pets were prohibited in parks. Pet owners would hopefully have heard through a public information campaign that pets aren't permitted at NPS sites and will leave the pet at home if the owner wants to visit a NPS site.

And then there are all the dog owners who refuse to clean up after their pets, and all of the resultant disease and pollution issues, which are well documented and upon which I won't elaborate in this comment. But dog feces which are not cleaned up is just one more reason to prohibit dogs from NPS sites.

If pets are permitted within GGNRA, park visitors should be limited to two dogs per visitor. On trails, visitors with more than two dogs have a wider space requirement and have the potential to impact other park visitors by disrupting or impeding their progress along the trail. In off-leash areas, few dog owners or walkers are capable of exerting voice control over one or two dogs, let alone more than two at the same time.

Commercial dog walking should not be included as a component of whatever alternative is adopted. Commercial dog-walking constitutes an economic use of park lands that is not permitted by the NPS's Organic Act, the GGNRA enabling legislation, the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998, the National Environmental Policy Act, NPS Management Policies 2006, and Director's Order #53. Commercial activities within the National Parks are allowed only to the extent that they support the park mission to protect resources and enhance the visitor experience. Commercial dog-walking constitutes a

use of the public land that puts a drain on park resources without any financial or mission-oriented returns for the Park Service.

Some may argue that a prohibition against pets in NPS sites is excessive and unnecessary; that proper signage of where pets are and are not permitted would be sufficient. Those who make this argument must either willfully ignore or be blissfully unaware that a large number of pet owners are, apparently, oblivious to signage relating to pets or are somehow incomprehensibly ignorant as to what the signage means. Pet owners can pass by multiple signs indicating that pets are prohibited or are required to remain leashed, and when they are informed that they passed by such signs, they declare that they never saw the signs. Or, if they did see the signs, they claim that they thought that the signs meant something else. I've had a staggering number of individuals who must have thought that I was an idiot or extremely gullible tell me that they understood the signs with the red slash through the silhouette of a person with a dog on leash to mean that dogs were permitted to be off-leash.

Some who want to maintain the destructive status quo may argue that they have long been able to walk their dogs in certain areas, even before GGNRA was established, and that the NPS has no right restricting their ability to continue walking their dogs there. Following this rational, upon those lands that the NPS has acquired which have been previously logged, mined, or hunted, logging, mining, and hunting should be allowed to continue largely unabated. Except for a few exceptions, these activities are not permitted. When NPS sites are established, we- -as a nation through our elected representatives- -are agreeing that these areas are special and deserve the highest level of habitat or cultural resource protection and that any activities that might have previously occurred there will be ended if such activities do not leave the "scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife...unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." When NPS sites are created, activities that impair park resources are, more often than not, ended. So, logging was prohibited within Sequoia National Park, Olympic National Park, Redwoods National and State Parks, and a number of other sites, when these areas were designated as National Parks, even though people had been logging in those areas for, at times, generations. Similarly, mining, hunting, and other extractive activities have been prohibited at various sites when they are included within National Parks.

Granted, dog walking is not an extractive activity; it's recreational (although far too many birds and other wildlife have been destroyed by dogs in parks). And while dog walking may not impair park resources to as great of a degree as logging, mining, and hunting, no one can truthfully claim that there is no impairment caused by dogs to park resources. With regard to other recreational activities, when the use of Personal Water Craft (PWC) was deemed to pollute park waters, disrupt the natural quiet, and disturb park wildlife and visitors, PWCs were banned from many NPS sites where they had previously been permitted. There are many other recreational activities which the NPS has curtailed or prohibited because of the activities' negative impacts to park resources. But for some bizarre twist of logic, the NPS at GGNRA has created a large exemption for dog owners, which continues to result in the impairment park resources. Why? It's not as if the NPS will be prohibiting the pet owners from walking certain trails or visiting favorite beaches. Pet owners would be more than welcome to visit these sites, so long as they do not bring their dog along for the hike. It isn't in any sense different from PWC enthusiasts wishing to go to, say, Tomales Bay within PRNS. They are welcome to visit and kayak and participate in other low-impact activities on Tomales Bay, but they may not use their PWCs. And loggers, miners, and hunters are all free to visit National Parks, but they are prohibited from logging, mining, and/or hunting during their visit. If a pet owner wanted to go for a walk with a dog, the pet owner would have to find a different location to do so- -similar to how a hunter has to find other locations than national parks at which to hunt.

Regardless, I am unaware of any other regulated recreational activity that the NPS allows to continue within parks with such high levels of non-compliance. Maybe I'm wrong, but it seems as though the NPS would prohibit any other activity with similarly large numbers of participants refusing to adhere to

pertinent regulations. What is so different about visiting parks with dogs that results in this special treatment?

National Parks and National Recreation Areas have been created to conserve the resources in those areas in an unimpaired state so that current and future generations may experience and enjoy those resources. "The mission of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is the preservation, unimpaired, of the natural and cultural resources, and scenic and recreation values, of the park for present and future generations to enjoy." The NPS, therefore, cannot legally permit activities that would harm or impair those resources, lest the resources be lost to future generations, regardless of how much enjoyment current visitors may obtain from participating in those activities. Nor should the NPS allow activities by some that negatively impact the enjoyment of the park by others. Yet the NPS and our government seems to quickly cave-in to every user group that claims their rights are being infringed upon because the NPS prohibits a particular activity that is detrimental to the wildlife and habitats which the NPS is supposed to protect. Why can't the NPS adhere to its mission?

In light of NPS officials inevitably bowing to political pressure from pet owners and considering that much of GGNRA is already urban and heavily developed, GGNRA would be one NPS site where I can understand bending the rules by allowing a few areas to be opened for walking pets on leash, so long as those areas are adjacent to San Francisco residential neighborhoods that have no other parks where pets are permitted, and so long as those areas do not include wildlife habitat or sites on the Marin Headlands. And under no circumstances should pets be allowed off-leash outside of a handful of areas.

I strongly support prohibiting dogs in the picnic areas and parking lots at Stinson Beach (Alternative D) to remove the potential for conflicts between dogs and visitors and to provide visitors the opportunity to experience Stinson Beach without the presence of dogs. If the NPS does not choose Alternative D, but instead chooses Alternative F, I hope that dogs would be restricted to the northernmost Picnic Area and that the southernmost and middle Picnic Areas would provide visitors the opportunity to picnic at Stinson Beach without the presence of dogs.

I support Alternative D's providing visitors the opportunity to experience Homestead Valley without the presence of dogs by limiting on-leash dog walking to only the fire road. This would also better protect native plant communities and wildlife, including habitat for the federally listed northern spotted owl. I am disappointed that under Alternative F, there would be no trails in Homestead Valley where one could walk without the near certainty of encountering dogs, and that Alternative F would not provide the most protection for native plant communities and wildlife.

I am concerned that Alternative F would not adequately provide protection for contiguous habitat beyond the Oakwood trail and fire road junction and would increase the potential for dog/coyote interaction. Nor would Alternative F provide protection for potential habitat for species of concern, such as the mission blue butterfly habitat nearby and possible habitat for the northern spotted owl.

Similarly, at Muir Beach, Alternative F would not provide the most protection to sensitive dune, riparian, and wetland habitats, nor to species such as the federally listed steelhead and coho salmon- -which will continue to suffer impacts resulting from dog waste and disturbance in shallow water areas- -nor wintering and migrant shorebirds. I also support Alternative D at Muir Beach in order to provide visitors a no-dog beach experience.

I am very disappointed that the preferred alternative for Rodeo Beach includes a ROLA adjacent to Rodeo Lagoon, much less that the preferred alternative was modified to extend the ROLA the entire length of the main beach. What is the rationale for designating a ROLA immediately adjacent to Rodeo Lagoon, which serves as critical habitat for the federally endangered tidewater goby and is considered sensitive waterbird

and shorebird habitat? Does not the SEIS elsewhere state: "NPS Management Policies 2006 require that NPS 'ensure that conservation will be predominant when there is a conflict between the protection of resources and their use.' A ROLA is inappropriate in areas where there is core habitat, including habitat for listed species and habitat, which can be harmed by off-leash dogs."? Given the number of off-leash dogs chasing birds on the beach and given that park staff "observe dogs in the lagoon at least once a week and during good weather on a daily basis," it's not too surprising, that "compared to other beaches within Marin County, shorebird counts along [Rodeo] beach are considered low... ." And for the NPS to then conclude that low shorebird counts "allows a ROLA with minimal disturbance to shorebirds" is a bit of a stretch, especially when the NPS is hoping against all evidence and reason that "compliance in the ROLA would not allow dogs access to Rodeo Lagoon or along shorelines used by shorebirds, wading birds, waterbirds, and other wildlife." And doesn't the NPS memorandum of understanding regarding migratory birds, signed in 2010, require park units to restore and enhance migratory bird habitat and support conservation of migratory birds. And despite the SEIS's claim that "this site is considered a low conflict area and due to the large size of the beach, other users such as school groups would continue to safely use the area without conflicts," I have yet to visit Rodeo beach without some off-leash dog under "voice control" bounding unbidden towards me. Only Alternative D would improve resource protection of Rodeo Lagoon (maximizing resource protection would entail prohibiting dogs completely), better providing habitat for resting and feeding for shorebirds and waterbirds in the area, be compliant with the 2010 memorandum of understanding, and provide visitors the opportunity to experience a portion of the beach without the presence of dogs.

Allowing the other trails in the Marin Headlands to remain open to dogs, as per Alternative F, would not maximize the protection of park resources nor maintain the integrity of the native plant communities and wildlife habitat, including habitat for the federally listed mission blue butterfly.

Please modify the Upper Fort Mason component of Alternative D and F to provide visitors the opportunity to experience portions of the Great Meadow without the presence of dogs by limiting dogs to the southwestern section of Great Meadow, i.e., change Map 9-C so that the Great Meadow ROLA would be a Leash Required area. Although it would be in contravention with NPS policies requiring pets be on leash at all times, the Laguna Green ROLA is one of a couple ROLAs proposed in this SEIS that could be deemed not irrational. It would provide an area in a dense neighborhood for those who want to let their dogs run amuck to do so.

I don't understand why, in the Environmentally Preferable Alternative (Alternative D) for Crissy Field, the NPS would locate a ROLA adjacent to the WPA, or in the NPS Preferred Alternative (Alternative F), the NPS would locate a ROLA adjacent to the Tidal Marsh and along Central Beach. As noted in the SEIS, "the park has installed fencing to restrict access by dogs and people to Crissy Field Tidal Marsh, and signage has been installed to educate visitors on the access restrictions." Yet, this has not been effective enough and "dogs gain access to the marsh through the tidal channel under the pedestrian bridge, and have been observed by park staff in the tidal marsh." Again, "NPS Management Policies 2006 require that NPS 'ensure that conservation will be predominant when there is a conflict between the protection of resources and their use.' A ROLA is inappropriate in areas where there is core habitat, including habitat for listed species and habitat, which can be harmed by off-leash dogs." Please modify the Crissy Field component of Alternative D and F to eliminate each alternative's ROLA, or at least limit the ROLA to solely the eastern portion of the airfield (area east of the easternmost north/south path). And make the western portion of the airfield a location where visitors will have the opportunity to experience a grassy section of Crissy Field without the presence of dogs

Alternative F does not adequately address safety concerns for visitors and dogs on the Fort Point Promenade, which is between the edge of a heavily used roadway and the edge of the seawall, and on trails in the Fort Point area that are heavily used by visitors and can be congested. Even with the current

requirement that dogs be kept on leash, during my visits to the area, I noticed a number of dogs off-leash. Please adopt Alternative D in order to better reduce the potential for conflicts among users and the possibility of interactions with aggressive dogs and compromised visitor and dog safety.

Allowing pets along the eastern section of the Lands End Coastal Trail, as permitted under Alternative F, will not provide visitors more than a handful of short trails in the Lands End area where one could experience the area without the presence of dogs. Please adopt Alternative D for the Lands End area.

I am very disappointed that under Alternative F, "areas for a no-dog experience would not be available due to the small size of [Sutro Heights Park]." The SEIS attempts to provide some solace to those who wish to avoid dogs, noting that "A no-dog experience would be available on the no-dog trails at Lands End, adjacent to Sutro Heights Park," yet appears to not realize that the number of no-dog trails at Lands End under Alternative F are, as I noted in the above paragraph, a handful of short trails. Given the frequent weddings and other special events, in addition to the formal landscaping, the only sensible alternative for Sutro Heights Park is D.

Similar to Rodeo Beach and Crissy Field, the NPS's preferred alternative for Ocean Beach once again, inexplicably, places a ROLA right next to a WPA, this one for Snowy Plovers. I am please to see that Alternative F would impose a year-round prohibition against dogs in the Snowy Plover Protection Area(SPPA), but having a ROLA immediately to the north of the SPPA is just an invitation for off-leash dogs to disturb the plovers. Please, at least adopt Alternative D for Ocean Beach. The on-leash designation at the north end of the beach would reduce the potential for conflict among visitors in the heavily used north end of the beach, closest to the parking lot, and would maximize protection for wintering and migratory shorebirds south of Sloat Boulevard.

After the Laguna Green ROLA at Fort Mason, the ROLA in Alternative D for Fort Funston, while, again, in contravention of NPS policies, would not be completely unreasonable. Alternative B, with the modification of the beach area north of the Funston Beach Trail North being closed to pets, would be more consistent with NPS policies. I am pleased that Alternative F includes this closure in order to provide visitors the opportunity to experience the area without the presence of dogs and to provide protection for wintering and migratory shorebirds and the seasonal Bank Swallow colony in the sand cliffs at the north end of the Fort Funston beach.

Alternative F for Mori Point does not maximize the protection for newly restored, sensitive habitat and for the federally listed California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake. Please adopt Alternative D.

I urge the NPS to better protect the federally endangered mission blue butterfly, San Bruno elfin butterfly, San Francisco garter snake, and California red-legged frog and their habitats that exist at Milagra Ridge by adopting Alternative D, which would be more consistent with the park wide management of mission blue butterfly habitat areas than Alternative F.

To better protect mission blue butterfly habitat and a large area of relatively undisturbed, contiguous native habitat, and to be more consistent with regulations of adjacent lands managed by the San Francisco Public Utility Commission, please adopt Alternative B for the Cattle Hill/Sweeney Ridge area.

There is little debate that off-leash dogs both harm the natural resources- -primarily by harassing and scaring off the wildlife- -and that off-leash dogs negatively impact the enjoyment of other park visitors who don't appreciate or might be frightened by large dogs bounding toward them, or by scaring off the wildlife other visitors may be observing. For these reasons- -along with promoting humane treatment of pets and providing uniformity between national park pet policies- -I encourage the NPS to prohibit pets

from GGNRA- -or at a minimum to prohibit them from all but a few locations and to vigorously enforce the Park Service leash policy where pets will be permitted. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Christopher Lish

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6409	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I walk with my dog in the GGNRA on a weekly basis and am opposed to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It's important to me as a dog owner that I'm able to walk my dog off leash under voice command in these public areas.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Bradley Collier

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6410	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94122 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:43:54				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I have lived in San Francisco for seventeen years and frequently visit the GGNRA. Since getting a dog five years ago, I go to Crissy Field every week and to Fort Funston about once a month. I enjoy walking with my dog under voice-control in these areas and I always make sure to have my dog in sight and to pick up all pet waste.

In a separate comment I submitted in response to the SEIS, I expressed my objections to wide-ranging changes to the dog management policy in the GGNRA; however, after following the process of the development of a dog policy in the GGNRA for many years, it has become clear to me that the NPS and the GGNRA are determined to implement their plan regardless of public opinion. Consequently, I would like focus in this comment on several changes to the Preferred Alternatives for Crissy Field and Fort

Funston that I feel are imperative to making the impending changes tolerable for dog walkers.

Regarding the Preferred Alternative for Fort Funston, I feel it is unreasonable to require dogs to be on-leash on the sand ladder along Funston Beach Trail South. I do not understand why the two trails down to the beach (North and South) are treated differently in this alternative. To a frequent user, both seem to be of equal difficulty and average steepness. The sand ladder can be difficult to negotiate without being tethered to a dog and could become dangerous for those walking dogs if they are forced to leash up their pets before ascending or descending. I frequently go to Fort Funston with my dog and my two-year-old, and I feel it would be impossible for me to ensure my child's safety on the sand ladder while holding onto my leashed dog. If dogs are truly under voice control, other visitors on the trail would not be exposed to any significant risk of injury from off-leash dogs, at least not more so than from a child running ahead of his or her parents. With some initial fair-minded enforcement and judicious citation, the GGNRA could help establish a culture of responsible off-leash dog ownership. Adequate fencing flanking the sand ladder, which does not currently exist, would prevent dogs from veering off the trail. There is sufficient space between the trailhead at the cliff top and the parking lot to ensure owners have ample time to leash their pets upon ascent without risking any dog-car interactions. For these reasons, I submit that the south Funston Beach Trail should remain an off-leash trail.

I believe there are several outstanding issues with the Preferred Alternative at Crissy Field that must be rectified before that option could represent a legitimate plan. If all visitors to Crissy Field that are accompanied by dogs, a number I estimate to be about half of all the visitors, are to be concentrated on the east end of the airfield and the Central Beach area, then improvements to the parking in that area need to be made. The parking lot near East Beach provides 400 spaces of free parking available seven days a week. The parking nearest to the proposed off-leash dog area consists of roughly 30 free-parking spots behind Sports Basement and street parking for a fee along Mason Street with fees enforced seven days a week. This strikes me as grossly unbalanced and unfair. Also, in contrast to the situation at the East beach parking lot, visitors parking in the central area of Crissy Field need to cross Mason Street to access the GGNRA lands. Additional pedestrian safety measures such as a crosswalk or stop sign accessing the airfield are needed to protect the influx of park visitors redirected to this area. Parking near the proposed off-leash dog area will become an even more pressing issue once the Presidio Trust settles on a development plan for the site currently occupied by Sports Basement. If this area becomes a citywide cultural destination, the volume of people visiting the Mid-Crissy Field area will increase even more dramatically, making parking virtually impossible without an equivalent increase in available spots.

Another improvement to the Crissy Field Preferred Alternative I believe is vital is the installation of bathroom facilities and showers/water spigots near the border of the airfield and the tidal marsh. The East Beach has bathrooms both near the parking lot and in the Crissy Field Center. There is also easy access to water for hosing off dogs or children. The closest bathrooms for the Central Beach area are in the Warming Hut, which is both a great distance away from the proposed off-leash dog area and on the other side of a dog-restricted region of the beach. If the GGNRA demands that visitors to Crissy Field accompanied by dogs confine themselves to a particular section of the parklands, it is only fair to provide this segment of park patrons with the same level of access to facilities as other patrons.

Without the above-mentioned changes to the Preferred Alternatives for Crissy Field and Fort Funston, I feel the proposed changes to the dog policy at these sites represents an undue burden on park visitors that would significantly curtail their ability to enjoy the recreational potential of these areas of the GGNRA. Since recreation is the founding principle for the establishment of the GGNRA more than forty years ago, the Preferred Alternatives should not be accepted as is.

Thank you for considering my comments,

Sarah Green

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6411    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:44:18  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6412    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:44:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely

---



populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

-Greg Sottolano

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6413	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:46:14				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear superintendent Dean,				

One of the greatest aspects of living in s.f is the number of off leash areas for sf residents and their dogs to enjoy. In my 5 years of living in s.f, I've yet to encounter a dangerous situation with other pets and their owners. I believe most residents of the city are responsible with their pet ownership and the few that aren't shouldn't represent the majority.

Having grown up with fenced dog parks in Sacramento, I've witnessed more than 3 dozen unsafe incidents involving dogs and their owners. I believe the fenced atmosphere creates a stressful environment for the dogs causing more aggressive incidents. I've also noticed owners are less mindful of their dogs in a fenced setting due to the false security of the enclosures.

I'm fortunate enough to live near stern grove and fort funston and grateful to be able to utilize the off leash area on a daily basis. I can't imagine where I would take my dogs should these two areas be restricted.

Sincerely,

Jamie

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6414	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Grace

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6415    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Muir Beach, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:47:02  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm writing in response to your request for comments about dog policy at Muir Beach. In no way do I consider this to be public comment because there was no way to respond in an open forum, At all the meetings I attended public comment was not allowed. All we have is the word of the park service that they will read this and may publish the text. Why are the posts allowed to be anonymous? Why is there no link to comments as they are written?

I have lived in Muir Beach for 13 years and have owned a dog for most of that time. I walk the beach in the morning and at night most days. I am arguably the most frequent visitor to the beach. I would like to voice my choice for alt A (no change to current policy).

The park service has claimed that dogs are doing harm to the beach. My question is how do they know? in my travels to the beach I have not seen one researcher doing a study. Never have I seen a dog running down the beach with a salmon in it's mouth. What I have seen is trash everywhere especially on a holiday weekend. If it not for myself and a few neighbors the beach would be a wreck.

I did some research and looked at the environmental impact report for Dog beach down in San Diego. It unlike the report that this proposal is based on is site specific and peer reviewed. Dog beach is adjacent to a major breeding ground for several endangered shorebirds. they found that the birds were doing just fine even with up to 200 dogs at the beach at any given time. Maybe the park service just needs to stop driving bulldozers through the marsh every 3 years

This is not a national park, Its name is GGNRA and I believe the R stands for recreation lets maintain the status quo and keep the dogs at the beach where they belong.

Thank you for allowing me to post my concerns,

Chris Gove

Sunset way Muir Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6416    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94158  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:47:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan.

It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Michael Vincent

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6417	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94116				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Rafi Mamalian

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6418	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Dublin, CA 94568				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:47:59				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Joanne Lim

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6419	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:48:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Judith Rich

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6420	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:49:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, Superintendant  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendant Dean,

In addition to my previously submitted comments, I would also like to point out some specific problems with your plan. While I strongly believe the entire plan is ill-founded and set up for failure, these are just a few specific proposals that I would like to point out.

1) At Fort Mason, the area has long been used for dog walking, both on leash and off. It is a convenient location for many SF residents who need to walk and recreate with their dogs before and after work. In order to separate the dog walkers, you have set aside the green space on the corner of Bay Street across from Safeway for off-leash walking. This land slopes directly into the street! If dogs are allowed to play here off-leash there will surely be balls and dogs going into the busy street, which would be disaster. I imagine the only way to rectify this would be to build a very tall, expensive and unwanted fence. This will block views and destroy the open space San Francisco have enjoyed for a very long time.

What is more important, I was at Fort Mason walking my dogs in January, during the unusually warm weather, and came upon an incredible amount of trash strewn all across the great lawn under the palm trees. It was disgusting. Beer bottles, wine bottles, leftover food in styrofoam containers, used napkins, paper and plastic shopping bags, just to give you a taste. I took a photo and would be glad to share it. How can it be that dogs are not allowed to recreate here but people who trash it are?

2) While the middle beach at Crissy is often a great place to walk dogs, there are times when the tide is so high that the beach virtually disappears. At these times it becomes almost difficult to walk that part of the beach, particularly if there are a lot of other dogs there. And with the ocean level predicted to rise two feet in the not so distant future, that beach will likely be inappropriate for walking dogs, even in low tides. That would leave no beach access at Crissy for dogs if you close off East Beach. How can you deny access to possibly the most common users of East Beach?

3) It does not make sense to close off part of the lawn at Crissy (old Crissy airfield) to off-leash dog walking. My greatest concern here is that you build an unwanted fence around the section you think makes sense for the only of leash dog area. How else would you be able to enforce this? Like most dog owners who enjoy recreating on this large green lawn, the joy would be lost if you closed in the area. Dogs, including mine, enjoy running free here, and I have many happy photos I could share of this as well. Please leave this the beautiful open space that it was made to be and allow dogs to run free on voice control. It works.

Again, these are just a few examples of where your plan is seriously flawed. Please go back to the 1979 Pet Policy and figure out better ways to enforce good behavior of the very few who are irresponsible. This plan is not what the majority wants and you have been told thousands of times as such.

Sincerely,

Leslie Dicke  
2730 Lyon Street  
San Francisco, CA 94123

CC: Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi  
Senator Diane Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6421    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Letter #1  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Diane McDermott

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6422    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Prosh Pets Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:50:55  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As a longtime SF city resident, I understand the concern with preserving our national parks for all citizens to enjoy. But this should include their pets as well! There is not one single reason why a person should not be able to walk their dog off-leash in a permitted area, as long as they exercise control over that dog and pick up after it. As a permitted commercial dog walker in San Francisco, I understand the problems presented by irresponsible dog walkers and owners who let their dogs run amok, unsupervised and unleashed even if they are not friendly dogs. BUT why not just enforce the rules already in place, rather than punish everyone? For every irresponsible dog walker/owner, there are at least 7 responsible, alert and very attentive walkers/owners. So why punish the larger portion for problems created by the very few? Why not just ENFORCE the rules that exist? It makes so much more sense to me to simply do this rather than go and re-write tons of existing policy.

---

I appreciate your time and attention in looking over this matter and hearing the comments stated above.

Many thanks,  
Diane Corso  
Owner/Operator Prosh Pets  
Dog Walking and Pet Sitting

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6423    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:51:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the Dog Management Plan proposed and believe A/no change should be implemented.

I hope the Supervisor of the GGNRA will respect the wishes of the SF Board of Supervisors, the Marin County Board of Supervisors, Representatives Speir and Pelosi of the populations and areas affected and 71% o the respondents to the plan 2 years ago along with the SF Park and Recreation Department and stop the implementation of any plan that will restrict traditionally off leash areas in the GG National RECREATION Area.

Please respect our local culture. We have all been very disturbed by the disrespect shown the Drake's Bay Oyster Farm that had responsibly run a local culture business for 100 years, (and provides 30% o the oysters farmed in this country) as long as San Francisco has been a vibrant city. I have never felt any connection to the Tea Partiers but for the first time I am surprised how I finally understand their call for more local control of a local area, a respect for local culture. If homogenization is your goal, then please let us disappear as a culture that sets trends in technology, culture, environmental protection, agricultural production and everything else that we lead the country on (as the 7th largest economy in the world). There is a reason for this. Let us set the example for the rest of the world.

Your data shows you are FAR more safe from a dog bite or attach within the GGNRA, where our dogs are off leash and know how to behave due to their experience with it, than in any other part of the United States as a whole.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6424    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:51:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a citizen and resident of San Francisco, I am writing to oppose the Preferred Alternative in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan/supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS). I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive.

As someone who has lived in San Francisco for over 18 years, Crissy Field has been a primary outlet for both my and my dog's recreational activity. I now have a 20-month toddler, and we have added frequent trips to Crissy into our weekly routine.

I have participated throughout both draft EIS and public comment periods and have taken a considerable amount of time to review and try to understand the issues and impacts being raised within the new draft plan. However, I feel strongly that the new dog management draft plan continues to be too restrictive, and I believe the GGNRA intentions with the dog management plan are misguided and biased as a process.

1. The GGNRA is an urban RECREATION AREA. The language of the enabling legislation states the park's purpose as recreational open space in an urban environment.

I feel strongly that RECREATION should continue to be the unique value to visitors and residents in consideration of a balanced plan. For example, when I am at Crissy Field with my dog, I am enjoying the time with my dog off leash as much as I myself am enjoying Crissy. My dog and I walk the stretch of beach and grassy meadow from East Beach to the Warming Hut picnic area and back. The new Preferred Alternative would directly impact MY quality of recreational experience and value.

2. Despite the initial public comments GGNRA received during the first public comment period, I do not feel the new plan has been modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who took the time to submit their comments. You can bet for your average citizen of San Francisco, or user of the GGNRA, this public comment process is not an insignificant gesture of civic action. It has involved a significant commitment of time, energy and faith in the process.

3. Given the points above, in addition the final examples I would cite below - I have concluded and strongly believe that both the process and language in the new draft plan is biased and not objective.

Example #1 - the language in the Preferred Alternative for Fort Point reads as follows:

Alternative F- Fort Point

Alternative F: Preferred Alternative. The preferred alternative is the same as alternative B. On-leash dog walking would be allowed along the Fort Point Promenade, the Battery East Trail, Andrews Road, the Presidio Promenade, and the grassy area near the restrooms.

\*\*The chance of park visitors and staff encountering uncontrolled aggressive dogs would exist. Although dogs would be on leash, there would still be the chance of dog bites and other physical injuries occurring.\*\*

The language in this Preferred Alternative would infer to the reader that dog violence was an issue.

However, within the SEIS report, the number of incidents reported at Fort Point during the four-year timeframe of 2008-2011 included only ONE dog bite/attack:

a total of 23 pet-related incidents were recorded at this site. Pet-related violations included 15 leash law violations, 3 cases of visitors walking dogs in closed areas, ONE dog bite/attack, and one pet rescue (table 36). No unattended pet or pet excrement violations were documented at this site between 2008 and 2011.

Example #2 - I believe that residents and agencies that utilize and represent the GGNRA's recreational value should have been involved and solicited as an advisory committee or cooperative to help the GGNRA reach a more balanced solution to dog management (e.g. SF Board of Supervisors, Rec and Parks, and the various dog owner groups such as Crissy Field Dogs). In the latest draft plan, the Presidio Trust is cited as an agency "cooperative": I do not feel that the Presidio Trust represents the public's recreational value and needs - as they have a vested commercial interest and stake in the properties adjacent to the GGNRA recreational area.



Thanks for your consideration of these important objections to the Preferred Alternative.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Suh

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6425	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Camila

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6426	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Marin Hills Med Group Inc Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:51:57				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I do not think forbidding dogs from GGNRA lands is reasonable.				

If owners have abused the privilege, enforcement of the existing laws would be an excellent idea, but many people who have dogs depend upon access to these lands for proper exercise for the dogs and for themselves.

The people own the land. You should be able to arrive at a solution.

Thanks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6427	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	mill valley, CA 94941 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Letter #1  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6428    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:52:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I do not always agree with the National Park Service, but as a dog lover and owner, I am satisfied that the GGNRA Dog Management plan has reached a balance between off-leash dog recreation (of which I take advantage) and dog-free areas. The National Park Service has worked to uphold its responsibility to protect wildlife, especially on or around its beaches and waterways. These areas are obviously important to creatures such as shorebirds who, by definition, can live nowhere else, as well as other wildlife.

While I do own a dog, and love to see it run free, GGNRA's plan does not- -no matter how SFDog yells- -ban dogs or off-leash walking, and in fact leaves huge swaths of land on Ocean Beach and Crissy Airfield for off-leash play that will exhaust most any dog.

My most serious disagreement with GGNRA is that they haven't used the Northern Arizona University poll, which showed that a majority of Bay Area residents do not want dogs off leash in National Park lands. As far as I know, this is the only independently run, academic poll on the opinions of Bay Area residents.

Furthermore, I am baffled that GGNRA has not reminded San Mateo County residents that their county bans off-leash dogs entirely. Why should the GGNRA go against what is rather obviously the opinion of county residents?

But beyond these disagreements, GGNRA has reached a balance that will allow dog owners like me to walk their dogs off-leash, and has an enforcement mechanism so that continued flouting of leash-laws will result in further restrictions. Without this enforcement mechanism, the dog community- -me included- -will have no incentive to ask as the community we are, and ensure that other dog owners don't end up ruining the privileges we will have under the current plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6429    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:53:42  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Ellen Soohoo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6430    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:54:50  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** 18, February 2014

Attention:

Frank Dean  
General Superintendent Golden Gate National Recreation Area Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Re; Draft Dog Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Paula, I live in San Francisco, Southern California and Montana. When I am working in San Francisco, I walk my dog once or twice a day in Crissy Field. I belong to the Crissy Field Dog Group.

We meet with our friends nearly every evening in the recreation area on the airfield and walk for a hour. We often run into our friends in the morning on the airfield as well.

Our dogs are very well behaved, mine is under-voice command and is well known to the staff that maintains Crissy Field. Many times I have heard she is their favorite dog in the park because she listens, is mellow and careful with people and other dogs. When she is off leash on the green space, she approaches slowly to make sure people or dogs are okay to interact with. She will stop in her tracks if she senses any strange behavior in a human or another dog. I have brought her to Crissy Field since she was 8 weeks old. People who visit the area take extremely good care of their dogs.

The people who visit Crissy Field pay a premium to live in or near the park. The dogs who visit have their shots and are well trained or on leash. Over the course of my 15 (with a dog) - 20 years (visiting dogs on my runs/walks) walking in the park, I have never seen a problem with a dog and a human - or - a dog and a dog. I clean up after my dog and carry extra bags on me. I keep her out of the Snowy Plover area, etc.

It is important that the entire green space/airfield remain off leash. The area tiny off leash green space proposed is inadequate for exercising a dog of any size. We need peace in our lives, ample exercise and socialization. This means, in fairness to my dog, walking a few miles each day. Our walks keep us healthy. When we are happy, and healthy we contribute more to the tax base overall.

There are 130,000 dogs and 70,000 kids in the Bay Area. The number of children in San Francisco is declining each year (in the low thousands each year). The number of pets is growing. In San Francisco, in 2011 there were about 110,000 dogs, that number has increased a dramatic 20,000 in only 2.5 years. This is a national trend as well in cities like New York, Austin, etc. If the issue of off leash adequate free walking on open green space as a necessity is ignored, it will come back to the stewards of the recreation area and on the national level again and again. It will also push dogs into already over-burdened areas of the city of San Francisco and Julius Kahn Park.

I do not agree with the GGNRA's current preferred alternative as it significantly restricts and eliminates off leash dog walking in many areas within the GGNRA. The proposed changes to the existing conditions (1979 Pet Policy) and to the new lands in San Mateo County are not based upon sound science or long-term monitoring of site specific conditions.

I am concerned about the long-term preservation of the GGNRA's natural resources and want to protect these important natural areas, but other options (besides restricting dog-walking access) need to be vetted out completely.

Some specific problems with the DEIS include the following points. Please revise the DEIS to correct these errors.

This DEIS and Plan doesn't recognize that environmental values include both recreation and nature. In many places, the DEIS treats the environment and recreation as opposing values, i.e., that recreation only harms natural resources. The document doesn't acknowledge that people care about both and that people with dogs are often also extremely good stewards of the environment.

I've noticed destructive behavior on the part of moms & dads with children on West Beach (digging deep holes, building castles, pushing strollers, lugging umbrellas and beach gear, flying drones, running electric cars both on the crushed walk path and under the fence on W. Beach). This behavior is far more destructive than anything a dog has ever done anytime I have been there. Dogs typically, run in the water, chase a stick or ball and then move on with their owners. People set up camp, stay for hours and leave behind trash & toys in the designated Snowy Plover area. Humans should have been banned from the area long before dogs. This can be proven in a balanced observation of the area.

With a rate of 93% human violation (all human crimes), 7% animal violation (animal complaints) in the GGNRA the human issue is more urgent than the off leash dog recreation issue. (See the history of GGNRA complaint records)

Without access to the already restricted areas of land we have to walk in the GGNRA, I am very concerned that many dogs and dog guardians will not have sufficient opportunity to exercise and recreate. This will have an effect on the health of the dogs and dog owners.

GGNRA should be a partner with the City of San Francisco and other communities, not act as an adversary. The DEIS doesn't recognize that many areas of the GGNRA are located in or next to urban neighborhoods. The DEIS excludes the quality of the urban environment from its scope, saying it's not significant. The GGNRA provides much needed open space in a major urban area. This omission is disconcerting because the fundamental purpose of creating the GGNRA was to provide open space for recreation (including dog walking as a form of recreation) to serve the metropolitan Bay Area. The dynamic interrelationship between GGNRA and our neighborhoods is exactly the human environment that the EIS is required to study, but failed to do so.

The DEIS notes some studies and general tendencies of dogs to harm natural resources, but with few exceptions, there is little documented site-specific impacts to support the restrictions of the preferred alternatives. Further, there is insufficient documentation that considers other impacts - other park visitors that disturb and impair the natural resources, other wildlife, Mother Nature, boot camps, moms and babies, drones, electric cars, crowd attracting events such as Fleet Week, bicyclists, festivals and Walk-a-thons. The proposed broad limitations in the DEIS are without site-specific science that demonstrates that problems with the quality of GGNRA's natural resources are actually attributable to dogs and not to other factors.

The DEIS needs to provide full disclosure to the public and decision makers. If dog-related disturbances are having a significant negative effect on wildlife, for example, the DEIS needs to provide site-specific scientific evidence as documentation and undertake a scientific evaluation as to whether people or other factors are also causing or contributing to the problem noted. The science needs to be sound and the consequences need to be fully and fairly disclosed for everyone - so that an informed decision can be made.

1979 Pet Policy has been working where sensitive species are not present. Please keep it the way it is. We do not desire a change to our rights to walk freely in the recreation area which was created for the good of the people and their dogs who live near, work in or near, and support the recreation area.

Warm Regards,

Paula  
San Francisco

CC:  
Nancy Pelosi,  
Diane Feinstein,  
all local San Francisco Representatives

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6431	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Brigitte Kunde

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6432    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I support Alt A for Mori Point, dog walking has existed on and around Mori Point for decades. Providing opportunities for on leash dog walking when visiting Mori Point will engage acknowledge a large segment of not only the Fairway neighborhood residents who promoted the transition of this property into NPS holdings, but the thousands of visitors from afar that frequent this park with their dogs every month.

I support Alt A on Map 19 A , Cattle Hill Sweeney Ridge area.

The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.

Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing human-dog walking opportunities is critically important to these historically dog friendly lands

I support map#20-E Alternative E for Pedro Point.

This area is highly disturbed from past uses, and would be suitable for dog walking on the entire parcel.

Spreading out user groups is key in our highly populated area to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing human-dog walking opportunities is critically important to these historically dog friendly lands

I support map 21-A Alternative A for Rancho Corral de Tierra.

Also,

All NPS trails-lands above Seton hospital to above Park st, referred to as Vicente Ridge on NPS maps should be all be open for dog walking.

The parcel consists of existing ranch roads multiple loop trails for excellent dog walking options Lines of sight are ample,leash enforcement is complimented by these fire roads trails easily accessed from multiple locations by NPS patrol vehicles.

The value of loop options is paramount in spreading out user groups.

Spreading out user groups is a key to ensure a pleasant park experience for all including dog walkers.

Providing expansive dog walking within the Rancho will engage a valuable segment of trails users in protecting these remote coastal lands.

Providing ample human-dog walking opportunities near every neighborhood surrounding the Rancho is paramount in reflecting the National "Recreational" Area aspect of GGNRA's mission in serving the broadest segment of citizenry.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6433	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:56:02				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean:				

As a senior who lives in the Marina District of San Francisco and does not own a dog, I oppose the Preferred Alternatives proposed in the SEIS of the Dog Management Plan because they offer inadequate access to lands that were given to the National Park System for the specific use as a NATIONAL RECREATION AREA. These lands were handed over willingly to federal stewardship with the caveat that existing recreational uses, specifically including dog walking, be maintained in their existing locations.

The DEIS/SEIS is not a management document - its proposed form of management is simply to eliminate the perceived problem of dogs. Management could be easily accomplished by simply enforcing the existing rules in place under the 1979 Pet Policy.

The funds proposed for implementing a new plan based on suppositions of what could happen and on insufficient (and sometimes incorrect) data would be a waste of taxpayer money when it would cost far less to more uniformly and clearly implement the existing policy.

The fact that the numbers of dog-related incidents within the GGNRA are just a small fraction of the human-caused incidents (as outlined in the DEIS/SEIS and in figures just released by the GGNRA for 2012-2013) makes one ask why management resources are not being better focused on these far-more-serious threats to visitor safety.

Due to those incident numbers, I feel safer walking on a beach or pathway frequented by dogs and their guardians than on those that are not.

I am appalled by how much money has been spent to date on producing these obviously biased documents, but cannot justify that as a reason to choose any of the alternatives proposed.

I do support formalization of the existing 1979 Pet Policy as was recommended by the federal commission that reviewed this issue in 2002, plus providing for off-leash access in San Mateo County and on any new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6434    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Kalinda Law

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6435    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:56:34  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I am an SPCA dog trainer and walker who uses the GGNRA on a frequent weekly basis to exercise and socialize the dogs in my care. I have attended numerous open houses, meeting, town hall events on the off leash debate over the past 10 years. I even attended the 2005 City Hall meeting that the GGNRA tried to give back the lands they had acquired to the cities and towns they boarder. I know this has been a struggle for years and there are many passionate people on both sides.

My surprise has always been that there has never been any input or consult from Bay Area Dog Training Professionals on this specifically dog focused legislation and its restrictions. The GGNRA and the DEIS reporting has never sought out the advice and suggestions from this highly canine educated population who are here and more than willing to contribute. These people also frequently use these off leash areas because of the benefit it provides to dogs in their care (both personal and professionally) on so many levels: mental stimulation, socialization, exercise and all around positive effect of these factors results in a more behaved dog.

What I can predict from the legislation and reduced areas of off leash access is many folded. Smaller dog areas and more ON-leash requirements will escalate the number of dog fights especially in a group



setting. The familiar "flight or fight" response: Dogs who will feel threatened or scared and can not create space to make them selves safe will have to fight because they have no choice. Which will inevitably result in more dog on dog and dog on human altercations which will only reinforce the nay-sayers who were against dogs all along. The dog community is strong in numbers, although not that vocal compared to other groups. By utilizing this local dog resource group we could have been so much more effective by educating the dog owning public and the dog walking companies by advising them on where to walk, where not to walk, what to do with ill behaved dogs, how to use voice control effectively and if not to put them on leash since it is a privilege not a right.

Additionally, as a business owner focused on dogs and a San Francisco resident is does not make sense that the GGNRA and the City of San Francisco have 2 different numbers of dogs that can be walked LEGALLY off leash. Right now the GGNRA is swamped with commercial dog walkers who are abusing the infinite number of dogs that they can walk. When the ruling changes to 6 at the GGNRA those walkers will infiltrate the city parks and bombard the surrounding communities: parking, barking, erosion, other public park users, etc. It only makes sense if the reciprocity in numbers was consistent.

I strongly feel that the draft needs to be redone including the input of dog care professionals along with establishing outreach programs for dog owners on how to respectfully share the park with other users and wildlife.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6436	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 22:57:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	A great deal of the report deals with the impact of off-leash dogs on trails in wilderness areas of the Marin Headlands, and I can appreciate that these are sensitive areas with a high density of wild animal species and unique vegetation.				

A great deal of the actual use of the GGNRA happens in the parks at the northern edge of San Francisco - such as Ft. Mason, Crissy Field, and Ft. Point.

To me, the flaw in this report is that the comments about goals and considerations are equally applied to these very different spaces, even though the benefits of public use are immensely greater in these SF city areas, and the potential improvements for habitat and wild animals are basically non-existent in these areas. Crissy Field East and West beach are mostly barren sand-scapes without any fragile vegetation, and no native wildlife. Aside from some very infrequent disturbance of the Plover habitat, these beaches are areas without any real opportunity for protection, which also provide an immense public recreational benefit.

Unfortunately, the report fails to distinguish these areas from each other. In failing to do so, the report fails to provide any true appreciation for the benefits of public use - instead, preservation of habitat for plants and animals is treated s an absolute objective second to none.

I think it is essential to understand that the mostly urban park circumstances of Crissy Field, Ft. Point, Ft. Mason and similar spaces MUST be considered in a different way than a trail at the top of the marin headlands, far from the noise and craziness of the city

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6437    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Fremont, CA 94536  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:58:06  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE SAVE THE OFF LEASH PARKS. It is where dogs can have a fun joyous time. Be with each other without leash aggression.  
Going to Fort Funston with our dog, Banjo, is some of our most fun and memorable times.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6438    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:58:48  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Kristine and TiCo

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6439    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 22:59:58  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** As an animal lover I have no problem with dogs being allowed throughout the GGNRA. However, I have had many unfortunate experiences attributed to the lack of concern and control that many dog owners have over their pets while visiting the parks.

First, it seems I can't walk any trail any more without finding bags of dog feces left behind on the side of the trail. The dog owner takes the time to bag it, but just leaves it on the side of the trail. So we have gone

---

from a naturally biodegradable product to wrapping it in plastic and littering, brilliant!

Second, leash laws must be enforced. Recently, my wife was sitting with our 14 month old son in the grass when a 100 lb. Rottweiler comes running straight at them at full speed. My wife grabbed the baby and cradled over him to protect him. The Rottweiler lifts his leg over her back and completely drenched my wife in piss. She was completely soaked! The owner come running up about 10 seconds behind his dog and was very apologetic and felt horrible. Not only could the situation have been made much worse had the dog reacted in a violent manner but the entire situation could have been prevented had the dog been on a leash.

Lastly, most dog owners say that their dog is "sweet". While that may be how your dog interacts with you, the one that feed him, it doesn't mean that that is how your dog is going to interact with complete strangers. And no matter how comfortable you are with your dogs temperament, no one else feels the same way.

It all comes down to dog owners taking full control of and responsibility for their dog so that it does not interfere with the experience of others. I ask the National Park Service to keep your current regulations but spend more time and resources actively enforcing your regulations to ensure an optimal experience for all.

Best,  
Don

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6440	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:00:11				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Margaret McNamara

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6441    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:00:27  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6442    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Ramon , CA 94582  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6443    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:01:45  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am in strong opposition to the Dog Management Plan proposed by the GGNRA, to anything other than plan A. The main reason is that this plan will continue to reduce the area in which

---

dogs can be off-leash. When a dog is off-leash, it learns how to communicate with it's owner. When it is limited to small area dog parks and doesn't practice it's voice control in larger areas/distances such as on roads, paths and trails, those skills are limited and can be lost. The ACC and the SPCA are in opposition to limiting off leash opportunities.

GGNRA is part of San Francisco and should be a part of it's culture.

My example is that my first dog in SF was always off leash on the streets and in the GGNRA and everywhere. My ex moved back to NYC and took her. She lived on leash in the city for years and so lost her training and her communication with her owner. On a trip to visit the countryside, she saw a dog across the road and didn't listen to voice control which she had always been perfect at. She had lost her training living in a city that requires a leash and only allows her to play in fenced in parks. She ran across the road at age 8 and was hit by a quick on-coming car. She died.

I would hate to see the GGNRA contribute to the loss of training and the loss of this great San Francisco culture of communication with our dogs, our friends, friends we created, since civilization began. Hence they are part of civilization!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6444	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94609 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:02:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Vanna

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6445	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:02:50				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6446    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill valley , CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** TSProductions Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:03:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Your restrictions on dogs are already substantial, with many places allowing no dogs (Tennessee valley), and many trails requiring leashes (much of Mt. Tam). You are not only over-reaching by making these rules more stringent and exclusive, but you are betraying the motivation and struggle of people, small groups and large, who fought to keep this space open. Because of them, you have the stewardship of these lands and the responsibility to keep access as open as possible, not as limited as possible.

Sincerely,  
Terry Strauss

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6447    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:04:05  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Please keep the off leash dog areas alone! I am an owner of two dogs that love being outside, exercising and playing with other dogs. It is crucial to have these different places to take dogs. Taking them away is equivalent to taking away parks for kids. Unacceptable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6448    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:04:22**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am a lifelong bay area resident and have grown up enjoying the out of doors - with my family, and with our dogs. One of the great joys of living in the bay area is being able to hike, trail run, walk empty beaches - with my family, and with our dogs. The beauty of this area is that, with a little planning and effort, you can get away from other people, other dogs, etc and enjoy peace in the out of doors. Yet, your proposed plan will remove that ability, will forcibly remove a key piece of the good life here in the bay area. And, this change will have a significant effect on dog owners and non dog owners alike.

Taking away access to the various beaches and trails that we visit now will not only have a drastic effect on our entire community. Dog parks will become over-run. Vehicle traffic will increase in densely populated areas at these said dog parks. Dog owners will flock to any open space available simply for their dog to have a really good, stimulating work out which will inconvenience children, schools, etc. Inevitably causing animosity between dog folks and non-dog folks.

Off leash areas are notably lacking in this plan, and where present are confined to limited areas. Many dogs - my own included - do not do well in these confined, dense spaces, and are happiest and healthiest when able to walk trails or beaches off leash. Again, many of the areas that are currently open to off leash walking feature low usage once one makes their way away from the trail head. Our dogs - as are the vast majority that we encounter - are well behaved and kept under control when we encounter others, but often we'll enjoy a long walk and see only a handful of other people. Why remove the ability to walk a dog off leash when there is so much lightly used space in which to enjoy this activity?

The proposed plan will negatively impact quality of life here in our beloved bay area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6449 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The National Park Service needs to adopt stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

It is highly unfortunate that the GGNRA at one time adopted a policy of non-enforcement of the National Park Service's leash law. It was the wrong thing to do and it is way past time to correct that mistake and bring the GGNRA into line with other parks throughout the country.

We need more trails and other areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs whether on- or off-leash.

Off-leash areas should be marked off with fencing or natural borders such as bushes; signage is insufficient.

Park officials need to enforce dog-related regulations more vigorously - - for the survival of wildlife, the safety of law-abiding dog owners and their dogs, and the enjoyment of all park users.

The GGNRA's proposed plan is an important step toward balanced, sustainable use of the park. It will protect wildlife and meet the needs of the many people who want to enjoy the park's natural beauty without constant interaction with dogs. At the same time, it will still provide over 21 miles of trails and beaches for dogs and their owners.

I support the adoption and implementation of the proposed plan, with the addition of fencing for off-leash areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6450    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109-4002  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:05:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I support the NPS plan to exclude dogs from sensitive areas of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. It is the function of the National Park Service to protect the resources of our parks - the landscape and the critters - from any and all negative impacts. That includes people and dogs among other potential threats.

Dogs on voice control is a farce. Many owners cannot control their dogs this way. There are many incidents where out of control pets have attacked birds, people and yes, a ranger and his horse. Law enforcement records document this.

Pet owners find it easy to talk about decades of use on these public lands. Forty years ago Fort Funston was overrun by motorcycles and dune buggies. The Presidio was under the control of the US Army and their beaches were not open to this public use.

Let the National Park Service do its job and protect these public lands for all of us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6451    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:06:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please preserve off-leash access to the GGNRA. It is a great opportunity for people to enjoy the outdoors with families, friends, and animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6452    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Palo Alto, CA 94306  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:06:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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



health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Barbara Villalonga

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6453	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:06:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	When I saw the sections titled "Cultural Landmarks", i was expecting to read about burial grounds or ancient archaeological sites. I was surprised to read that the gun placements along the west side of the city are considered to be "cultural landmarks"! THese are only about 70 years old. These were constructed using methods that the National Parks would strongly object to. The residue of these materials (Cement, Iron, and Explosives) is more consistent with a toxic waste site than something requiring protection.				

Is the National Park Service really concerned that some dog urine is a threat to these gun placements? The report says so!

I think some sections of this report, and especially these sections about protecting the gun placements from the loose dogs, is just plain absurd. The NPS should pick a few vital things to defend instead of pretending that every square foot of the GGNRA is a fragile and defenseless resource that is to be protected from people and their dogs at all cost.

I could be persuaded that some changes are necessary and appropriate. However, the proposed changes are so far-reaching, and have such a huge impact on the public use of space in the middle of San Francisco that the entire thing loses credibility. I can agree that some parts of the GGNRA are fragile, but there are other parts that we should be allowed to trample on and enjoy. If the Park Service is unable to appreciate the value of public use of public land in the middle of the city, someone else should be asked to manage the park.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6454	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Fremont , CA 94536 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:07:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

---

**Correspondence:** Please let Fort Funston remain an off-leash area for dogs. There are so few places in the Bay Area where dogs can share the pure joy of running in an open and natural area with their humans and dog friends. Our dog has bad joints, and his vet recommends a sandy beach as the ideal place to exercise him with minimal stress to his ankles. We love and respect the coast and always clean up after our dog, as well as ensure that he is well-behaved so that equestrians and others are not disturbed. I hope you will consider keeping Funston as a place where we can continue to share the great outdoors with our canine kids.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6455    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Anna Salcone

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6456    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

This is the WORST IDEA. Where are we supposed to let out dogs run?? Cruel to own an animal without letting it have some fun and freedom.

Sincerely,  
Sarah Baughn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6457    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94102

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:08:38

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The beauty of the restored coastal areas adjacent to the Golden Gate Bridge are among the most beautiful and inspiring in the entire United States. My wife loves to visit this area and walk the path near Crissy Field, and I used to join her until recent years when this amazing place has become overrun by dogs. The entire experience of this area is now a hugely negative one, for me and many others I know who used to go to there to reconnect with the natural world. On weekends dogs running through fragile and protected areas, jumping on people, shitting on the beach and barking at their owners to throw them balls has ruined the experience of the area to the extent that it is no longer an enjoyable place to visit. Recently I had relatives in town and they wanted to go there and once I told them what a terrible place it was because it had been turned into one big dog park they agreed that this was not somewhere that we wanted to go. The fact that dogs have destroyed this special place is an embarrassment for the city of San Francisco and I hope that you will take action to restore it to be an inspiring and uplifting place for people of all ages to enjoy without the disturbance and danger of our four-legged friends, the dog. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6458    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94611

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:09:55

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a longtime supporter (both physically and financially) of the NPS, State Parks, and regional open space lands. However, I cannot and do not support the direction of the proposed dog management plan.

The trails and beaches in the Bay Area as multi-use and shared space to exercise, enjoy nature and be with my family was absolutely the primary driver for buying a home in this location. We have invested in this region, built roots, contribute to the community and the economy. The plan impacts our desire to live and work in the SF Bay Area.

The plan is unfair and I'm disappointed that the overall impact to our community has not been a consideration. I question the decision-making from the NPS and will be selective and apply increased scrutiny to ongoing support of the organization.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6459    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94188

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** San Francisco League of Conservation Voters Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** OfficialRep

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:10:21

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** February 18, 2014

Frank Dean, Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent Dean:

We are pleased to offer the comments of the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters (SFLCV) on the proposed Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS for the GGNRA. SFLCV was an official participant in the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee for Dog Management in the GGNRA process, and we are pleased to see this management proposal at last (for a second time!). The GGNRA is an extraordinary unit of the National Park system, and its rich and unique resources are imperiled by the current levels of off-lease dog walking in particular. This supplemental draft plan is a major step toward ensuring better protection for these resources for future generations.

There are many threats to the irreplaceable species, habitats and historic resources of the GGNRA. Some, such as climate change, cannot be stopped on a local level and can only be adapted to as best as possible. However, those threats that are within the abilities of park management to control and prevent must be addressed firmly and with aggressively, as islands of species diversity such as the GGNRA are the best hope for the survival of what remains of the planets rich and varied ecosystems. Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons, the use of this park for recreational off-leash dog walking is long past the point of causing serious damage to the very resources this park was created to protect. We are hopeful the final plan will reverse this trend.

We will, further in these comments, address the site-specific proposals in the draft plan. However, there are certain overarching principles we believe must be noted. While our strong belief as an organization would lead us to support Alternative D for all situations (and there may be a few instances where we might suggest that alternative does not go far enough), we recognize - as evidenced by our participation in the Neg-Reg process - the necessity of some compromise.

There are several general concerns we wish to note here:

There was an agreement by all parties in the Neg-Reg process that park visitors who desired to have a no dog experience of the park should be able to do so conveniently. It is our belief that the preferred alternative does not meet this goal in all areas, particularly in the portions of the park within San Francisco. We would encourage further examination and expansion of opportunities for those people desiring an experience of the richness of this park without encountering canines to be able to do so.

While we have deep concern about the precedent-setting nature of the proposed Regulated Off-Leash Areas (ROLAs), we grudgingly accept this inevitability. However, we continue to strongly request that the park find clear ways of physical separation of ROLAs from non-ROLA areas, preferably by means of a clear barrier. We are not asking for an impenetrable barrier - in most cases, a post and cable fence as is used in many areas of the park already would be acceptable. On beaches, other solutions may need to be found. We are simply concerned that for there to be sufficient enforceability of these rules, boundaries between areas must be abundantly clear and not open to any question or interpretation.

Commercial dog walking has been a source of some of the worst resource-damaging abuses of off-leash activity. We strongly encourage that it be banned within the GGNRA. There should be steep fines for

violations above those which are levied on dog owners for violations. If commercial dog-walking is allowed, which we oppose, it must be strictly regulated and fair fees must be required. We concur with these comments submitted by the Wild Equity Institute (and others):

The SEIS does not demonstrate that commercial dog walking meets the criteria to qualify for Special Use Permitting under NPS Directors Order #53. Commercial dog walking will not support the mission of the Park Service, will not add to the public understanding and enjoyment of the GGNRA, will not promote a sense of ownership and stewardship for the Park and its resources, will not enhance the protection of park resources and values, and will not provide for an increased level of visitor safety. Furthermore, commercial dog walking is contrary to the purpose for which the park was established, may create impacts on park resources and values, may disrupt the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, may create an unsafe environment for other visitors, and may result in conflict with other existing uses.

The entire success of this plan lies in the concept now referred to as the monitoring based management strategy. If this management strategy fails, these rules become meaningless, and we are not just back where we started, but worse. We understand the problem posed by picking a 75% level of compliance measured by violations, which we already suggested were too lax. We are encouraged that the monitoring will look at sites more comprehensively, and in particular paying attention to habitat destruction or other impairment of park resources. We are frustrated, however, that the details of the monitoring plan have yet to be developed, so must yet have to go through yet another public planning process. We encourage the Park Service to embody habitat and resource protection as the primary focus of the strategy guidelines. We also note with concern the Park Service's acknowledgment of limited staffing resources, and encourage NPS to recognize those sites where it has insufficient resources to adequately protect the park from either on-leash or off-leash dog impacts and eliminate those sites as areas where dogs are allowed.

## Site-Specific Issues

### Marin County

We find the proposed preferred alternative either desirable or acceptable in the following sites, assuming the incorporation of our general comments: Stinson Beach, Homestead Valley, and Marin Headlands trails. In particular we commend not allowing dogs on the South Lagoon trail, Smith-Guthrie Loop, South Rodeo Beach and the Coastal Trail in the Marin Headlands.

Oakwood Valley Trail and Fire Road, Alta Trail, Orchard Fire Road and Pacheco Fire Road - We support the Preferred Alternative treatment of Oakwood Valley Trail and Oakwood Valley Fire Road, and the elimination of the proposed ROLA. We prefer the Alternative D treatment of the Alta Trail, Orchard Fire Road and Pacheco Fire Road because of habitat concerns. If sufficient means can be found to protect the Mission Blue butterfly habitat along these trails, we would find the preferred alternative acceptable.

Rodeo Beach - we feel that many visitors who may desire a no-dog experience at Rodeo Beach will be disappointed. This is especially true of park visitors taking advantage of bus transit from San Francisco that only brings people as far as the Marin Headlands and Rodeo Beach. We appreciate the proposed improved access and no-dog status of South Rodeo Beach. We support the construction of the proposed fence around the west end of the lagoon, and propose a double fence to create a connection between the North and South sections of the Lagoon Loop Trail, to protect hikers from unwanted dog interactions.

Fort Baker - We generally support the preferred alternative, with the exception of Drown Fire Road. We believe the mission blue butterfly habitat should not be subjected to sacrifice for personal recreation. This

also prevents visitors staying at the conference center from enjoying a nearby dog-free hiking experience in nature.

#### San Francisco

We find the proposed preferred alternative either desirable or acceptable in the following sites, assuming the incorporation of our general comments: Fort Mason, Baker Beach and Ocean Beach. We are very pleased to see substantial areas without dogs on both Baker Beach and Ocean Beach. This is good for wildlife, vegetation and people

Crissy Field - we support the preferred alternative here also, though note that this area will require more intensive and ongoing management than most. Resource monitoring will be very important here.

Fort Point - We continue to believe there is a decided lack of opportunity to have a no dog experience or to even avoid unwelcome approaches by dogs, given the narrowness of many of the trails. However, we understand the NPS' rationale.

Lands End and Fort Miley- We commend and strongly support the elimination of dog activity in East Fort Miley.

Sutro Heights Park - We continue to prefer seeing a greater accommodation to those visitors who would prefer a no dog experience, which here could include a number of people with physical challenges that would find it more difficult to visit other units of the GGNRA.

Fort Funston - We appreciate that this is a challenging unit for the GGNRA, and strongly support the modifications from the previous plan.

#### San Mateo

We find the proposed preferred alternatives either desirable or acceptable in all the San Mateo GGNRA units, assuming the incorporation of our general comments. While again, we would prefer full resource protection, we believe the proposed preferred alternatives provide adequate accommodation for dog walkers and adequate options for visitors seeking a no-dog experience, as well as habitat protection.

We would like to once again express our appreciation for all the hard work that has gone into the preparation of these plans to manage dog walking activity in the GGNRA. We are eager for the impacts of previous lapses in proper enforcement and communications to diminish, and to see the park fully live up to its Organic Act mandates. We look forward to visitors seeking experiences that do not include dogs to regain access to some of the amazing portions of the park that have been less desirable to visit as a result of unregulated dog activity. We will be happy to work with park staff in the future to assist in any way with the further final adoption of these rules and their subsequent enforcement.

Respectively Submitted,

Amandeep Jawa, President

Steven Krefting, Board Member and SFLCV Representative,  
GGNRA Negotiated Rulemaking Committee for Dog Management

**Correspondence ID:** 6460    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94105

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:10:40

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am fervently opposed to the draft dog management plan. I take my dog to Crissy Field to swim at least twice per week. It's the availability of off leash areas like this that add TREMENDOUSLY to the quality of life in San Francisco. Having areas that I can walk my dog off leash is quite possibly the BEST thing about living in San Francisco for me. I can honestly say I don't know what I would do without it to exercise my dog, who has severe arthritis and loves to swim.

I have not observed that the current system is broken. What are you trying to fix with this new plan? The effect will be to alienate and infuriate those residents of this city who want to enjoy the natural beauty of our city with their dog. I HATE the idea of establishing "dog areas", which are glorified pens. How is this fair? There are many, many days when I am out at Crissy, and the weather is not nice, and the wind is blasting, and the beach is nearly deserted, except for me and a handful of other dog folks. We are the REGULARS, and the vast majority of us are responsible and sensitive to the environment.

I have been fuming ever since I heard about the potential changes. Dogs are not allowed off leash, or at all, in almost every National Park, State park, and County park - such as the Mid Peninsula systems of parks. This means these parks are basically off limits to me, too. This is not in keeping with the charter of the National Park System, which is to foster RECREATION AND ENJOYMENT, as well as preservation. We are talking about URBAN parks here, not pristine remote areas. People impact the park environment as much - or even more - as any dogs I have seen.

Don't take away one of the best qualities about San Francisco. It's a benefit to us ALL.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6461    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** san francisco, CA 94158

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:11:42

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** please don't enforce leash laws at existing dog parks, it would be a huge loss to a very important part of the community fiber. leash laws work for certain areas but places like fort funston will forever be different, and not in a good way, with them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6462    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:11:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is

way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely, Lovise Mills

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6463	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Oakland, CA 94618 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

Every time I visit Ft. Funston with my pup, I take a deep breath and think "this is the reason I moved to San Francisco." I have lived in San Francisco for 6 years and recently moved to the East Bay. I still make the trip with my dog because it is a place where I can really feel at peace and the scenery is breathtaking. My dog, Ella, also loves running free on the trails - you should see her smile from ear to ear. Please reconsider before taking away this one piece of joy in our lives. There is no other place like it.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Angela

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6464	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94158 United States of America				

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

The off leash areas are part of what makes our city so special. Our dogs are a vital part of this community. If you restrict the off leash area this will ruin one of the most unique and worthwhile aspects of living in our city. Please do not destroy the lifestyle of all the families in our community with pets.  
Sincerely,

Rebecca and joe Blum

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6465    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Gardens by Lovise Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:15:07  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

I regularly take my dog to Oakwood Valley, parts of Alta Trail and Donahue as well as Stinson, Rodeo and Muir Beach.

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

Lovise Mills

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6466    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:15:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Moraima Pagan, PhD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6467    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I bring my dogs to the grassy area that was the airstrip for the Presidio in the world wars. I understand that the draft dog management plan wants to restrict the use of this space for off-leash dog recreation, and that one of the arguments is that the pollution associated with dog urine is a threat to the estuary just east of the airfield.

Does anyone in the Park Service remember that the airfield was once a military airfield? The toxic waste, spilled fuel, and lots of other residue of the military use of this space has to be substantially more threatening to the estuary than a million dogs urinating in unison.

I can understand that dogs have some negative effects, but we're talking about the Presidio here. This isn't some piece of remote Utah landscape.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6468    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** East palo alto, CA 94303  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

---

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Nico Valdes

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6469	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:17:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly disagree with the proposed Draft Dog Management Plan, as defined in the Fall 2013 Plan/ EIS. The NPS does not demonstrate a need for action. The Plan argues for action because the parks resources and values "could be compromised" and speaks in ifs and mights but does not make a reasonable case for change.				

The proposed Alternative F represents a heavy handed unilateral rollback of the recreational mandate that created the GGNRA and the need for the plan is not supported by the data. There is no compelling need for action, and no ability to force action without countering the recreation mandate of the GGNRA. Each of the sites should be assessed individually and factual proven data should be provided on any negative effects that the presence of dogs is creating in these areas. especially given its urban location.

I believe that an acceptable dog management plan must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed plan on neighboring city parks, on the health and well-being of people who enjoy recreational dog walking, and must respect the recreational values that are part of the GGNRA's original mission (to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space), which this plan fails to do.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6470	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Blu Bungalow Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:17:08				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Do NOT limit this park to on leash only. We LOVE Fort Funston being a great off-leash park and would be devastated if this were to change. We love seeing our dog so happy at this off-leash park.				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6471    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA,( I am a born and raised San Franciscan and graduate of UC Berkeley), I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. For goodness sake apply some common sense to this as this is not a wilderness area let alone Yosemite. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

samantha

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6472    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** The Domestic Animal Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:17:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

As a dog owner and professional dog trainer/walker in San Francisco, I would like to object to the preferred alternatives labeled as Alternative F for each site in the Draft Dog Management Plan. While I completely support the Park Service's need to regulate the park's use and I acknowledge the fact that certain areas like Fort Funston are overrun with irresponsible commercial dog walkers and private handlers, so greatly limiting the access to Regulated Off Leash Areas (ROLAs) is not the way to approach it. With the current state of no enforcement at the parks, it is obvious that individuals will do as they please unless someone with a badge is immediately ready to ticket them. If you plan to enforce the new regulations, you will only be cramming the same number of off leash users into a smaller area, which will only increase the number of public safety issues as off leash dogs need plenty of space from each other to ease social tension.

As a professional dog handler, I never walk more than 3 off leash dogs at one time, require impeccable recall and voice control, and pick up all of my dogs' refuse and any litter that I find along our way. I've documented how projects like the Mark di Suvero installation on the Crissy Field lawn and regular human activities such as birthday/company parties have resulted in tremendous amounts of plastic, zip ties, and other refuse collecting on the dunes, around the lagoon, and in the grass. I've also watched how irresponsible handlers use the parking lots at most dog-friendly GGNRA locations as off leash areas (recently watched a pro playing fetch with her whole group there) and leave their bags of poop behind thinking that they'll remember to get it later.

I'm an avid birdwatcher, and I can often be seen with my camera shooting the birds and connecting with other nature lovers in the park. It is very important to me that the longevity of the GGNRA is preserved and activity is reasonably managed throughout the park system. One way this could be done is by having volunteer park monitors or designated users with badges authorized to remind park users of proper park etiquette. I once saw a sign for the SF/SPCA's open space etiquette course at Crissy Field, but it was buried behind a construction notice. Etiquette courses should be held AT THE PARK and open to casual park users to join. The GGNRA should have the same permitting standards as the City of San Francisco already has. While I don't believe these permitting standards are tough enough, I do believe they provide a basic structure for reasonable regulation of the professional users in park areas.

There are ways to allow reasonable co-recreation between off leash dogs and other park visitors without so significantly slashing the ROLAs.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6473	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:17:52				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6474	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:17:58

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment. The following are my comments regarding the Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (draft plan/SEIS).

First of all, I want to comment on a personal note that I myself have been injured due to off-leash dogs in the GGNRA at Fort Funston. Back in 2011, I twisted my ankle on the beach and while resting my injured angle on my way back to my car, I was painfully knocked off my non-injured leg onto my injured leg by two off-leash dogs playing. An emergency room visit revealed that my ankle had three torn ligaments and required months of healing.

Off-leash dogs can be a serious safety risk and are a huge disturbance to the increasingly smaller numbers of wildlife that remain in the GGNRA. There is no easy way to balance human pets and wildlife in the GGNRA, but the scientific evidence presented by the National Park Service and independent experts clearly point to the conclusion that dogs must be on leash or excluded from any GGNRA area where endangered and threatened wildlife and their habitat, plus native plants, have been documented.

Please protect the wildlife in the GGNRA parks as wildlife in the GGNRA have become the embattled minority. Wildlife protection is truly an issue of diversity and highlights the importance of identifying all species that use the GGNRA and then giving all those diverse species an opportunity to use and enjoy the GGNRA safely and without disturbance.

Humans and dogs do need to exercise and some small areas of the GGNRA have the potential to be used as off-leash areas as identified in the SEIS. As pertains to any off-leash dog areas, these areas must be enclosed with a physical boundary in order to protect dogs, humans and the natural environment surrounding the off-leash area. These boundaries could be post-and-cable fences or natural features. But if a physical boundary cannot be placed around a specific off-leash area, than that area should not be an official off-leash area. If a dog is allowed off-leash in any open park area, including the GGNRA, the vast majority of dogs will naturally and normally chase wildlife, thereby disturbing the wildlife and the experience of park visitors enjoying the presence of the wildlife. There is no scientific evidence to support the proposition that dogs are not natural predators and will not uniformly chase wildlife if off-leash. Please limit any off-leash areas in the GGNRA to small areas already damaged by previous dog use and/or areas with little or no existing environmental value. Then enclose those off-leash areas completely.

Any regulations that address "managed dogs" by including dogs off-leash can not adequately address the issues of public safety and wildlife disturbance as off-leash dogs will never as a species or individually be completely under the control of their owner/human companions at all times. Or in other words, the only way to prevent or reduce disturbance of wildlife and concurrently address the issue of safety is to require that the definition of "managed dogs" only applies to dogs on-leash. As currently defined, "managed dogs" is entirely subjective and not legally defensible. There is no scientific evidence to support the conclusion that voice control of dogs is effective in preventing harassment or harm to other animals or humans. The federal regulations must address this discrepancy and limit the definition of "managed dogs" to on-leash dogs.

Please address the fact that the SEIS is using a subjective unenforceable definition and standard for "controlled" dogs. Please identify a scientific basis for using "controlled" to define behavior that is not definite and is variable for each dog subject to the standard. Most, if not all, dogs will exhibit different behaviors in the context and presence of variable factors, including different humans, other dogs and

multiple species of wildlife. Many dogs will exhibit erratic behavior if confronted by unfamiliar circumstances or circumstances that they perceive to threaten their owners/human companions. Please identify scientific evidence that supports the definition/standard that "controlled" as used to describe dogs is a reliable and effective standard to support a federal regulation.

As a resident of San Mateo County, I am directing my more specific comments on parks in San Mateo County, yet I urge the Park Service to adopt Alternative D or Alternative F in all GGNRA parks with the caveat that I am open to the potential of a few off-leash area in those areas specified, but only if the off-leash areas are completely fenced or include areas that are completely enclosed by physical boundaries. I support Alternative D especially in areas where endangered, threatened or sensitive species habitat exists.

Please adopt Alternative D or F in San Mateo County, especially in Mori Point, Pedro Point and Rancho Corral De Tierra. Please minimize use of GGNRA lands by commercial/professional dog walkers. Keep the GGNRA safe for all users.

The DEIS documents disturbance of wildlife such as plovers and other birds which are often disturbed by dogs, which they see as natural predators, and disturbance triggers reactions that can lead to death of these birds. Disturbance of wildlife by dogs has been recorded within the GGNRA and documented in several published studies and reports, many of which are cited in the Draft Dog Management Plan DEIS. Please adopt the alternative(s) that are supported by the studies and experts cited in the SEIS.

In addition, the Park Service has a fiscal obligation to taxpayers to minimize the cost of habitat restoration from any dog use of the GGNRA. Please recognize that in park areas such as Fort Funston where the ecosystem damage from off-leash dog use is extreme that habitat restoration is useless unless dogs are required to be on-leash in the future, and is a waste of taxpayer funds.

Thank you for protecting our environment, supporting species diversity and elevating the issue of public safety in the SEIS.

Celeste Langille

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6475	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:18:10				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>					

I don't even understand the park area I live by without the freedom of taking my dog for a walk.

There are a thousand other remedies to people who don't like dogs and still want to use the park.

I seriously think this plan should be reconsidered.

-j

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6476	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:18:32**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I'm opposed to segregating dogs into fenced areas. I don't have a dog because my apartment doesn't allow it, so I love to see the dogs running on the beach and in the Parks without leashes! It adds a lot to my enjoyment of the outdoors and to have dogs on leashes seems to go against one of the very reasons why we have the parks- -to remind us of what it's like to be free. Dogs without leashes are great reminder of that. Go ahead and ticket irresponsible dog owners but don't penalize everyone for the sins of a few - - or the fears of a few. Thanks for your consideration. I'll be looking forward to your response.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6477 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94901  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:20:05**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I have been a regular member of and contributor to the Parks Conservancy since 1998, appreciating and valuing the unique opportunities a National Recreation Area brings us in the Bay Area. I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. I regularly take my dog to Rodeo Beach, Muir Beach, and frequently to Chrissy Field.

Dogs are already not allowed on over 99% of the GGNRA land. There is not a compelling reason to limit dogs to even more of the land of the GGNRA. As a responsible dog owner, I rely on these lands as a place to bring my dog to run off leash and allow me to enjoy the GGNRA lands. If I can't bring my dogs to these places, I will not use this precious national resource for myself, either, since when I enjoy the outdoors I like to bring my trusted companion with me.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area is not like other national parks such as Yosemite or Yellowstone. Since it is situated in an urban area, many Marin residents rely on the open space provided by the GGNRA. This requires a different land management strategy than a National Park.

Access for all users, including people and their pets, was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. This policy is not broken - so please leave it be.

I urge you to listen to the many voices of the people who support Alternative A - the No Action Alternative. I am feeling great sadness and frustration at the thought that the National Park Service would take any sort of action to further limit access to the people's land. This unique land in this spectacularly beautiful place deserves a unique plan of action for our four-legged family members. Please do not further restrict our access. Please, please, please.

Thank you for listening,  
Elizabeth (Betsy) Muir

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6478 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:**

---



**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:20:15  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir/Madam,

Among the many things that make San Francisco unique is its dog-friendliness. I have always been proud that this city has many dog parks where 'men's best friend' can roam around off-leash. It is a sweet freedom for one hour a day in their life the most. I grew up in a country where dogs weren't as fortunate as their peers here. Until today I am still haunted by my family's treatment to our family dog, who I loved dearly. He was leashed every day until the day he died. Therefore living in San Francisco where dogs are family who actually get to enjoy off-leash experience in the nature, has special meaning to me. I hope that this little warm feeling will not change in the future.

Being able to bring our dog to the park has also helped us a lot in our life. Both my husband and I are busy professionals who commute long hours every day. We don't get to spend time with our dog much. We like taking little hikes in the city's parks on weekends. Being able to bring our dog with us has allowed us to enjoy our life and taking care of our dog as a responsible owners at the same time.

Experience in the city's park will not be the same anymore if my dog isn't allowed in certain areas, or that I can't see his happy expression when chasing the balls we throw. I ask you to reconsider your plan.

Sincerely,  
Shinta Halim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6479    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:20:26  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** The proposed changes to the off/on leash policy along ocean beach and fort funston are outrageous. In such a densely populated city there are not many places for dogs to interact with one another and run free. By putting leash restrictions, it would totally damage the atmosphere of these areas. Additionally, there is just no reason for these restrictions to be put in place. There are never any aggressive animals or incidents in the current off leash areas and I go there ever day with my dog!!! Who ever is reading this, I hope you take this seriously and don't make a decision based on money or some selfish issue because in the end the ones that suffer are the dogs, many of whom are locked in a kettle or cage when there owners aren't around. Let the dogs play, socialize and most of all run without restrictions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6480    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:20:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Based on what I've seen in my 21 years of living in San Francisco and visiting many areas of the GGNRA, it is my strong feeling that dogs need to be more carefully regulated in the GGNRA.

---

One thing that would help and is absolutely necessary is to have off-leash areas entirely enclosed. Dogs can't read signs and many dog walkers (owners and paid walkers) don't pay much attention to where their dogs are going. (Or just don't seem to care.)

Enforcement is another key piece of the puzzle. In my experience, folks will do what they want (for example, let their dogs chase birds, run off-leash in leash-required areas, etc), unless there's a clear incentive to follow the rules. Citizens attempting to enforce the rules themselves is not a good plan. I've had way too many scary experiences with dog walkers when I try to point out signage, for example, that says dogs need to be on leash.

To sum up, I feel strongly that the GGNRA should be regulated in a way that makes it safe and usable for everyone. Right now, that's not how it feels to me, and I'm convinced we can do better.

Also, let's protect the birds and other wildlife who need the GGNRA to survive. Seems like the least we can do since we've mucked up so much of their other habitat.

If the city of San Francisco needs to build more dog parks to accommodate the booming dog-walking business and the city's large dog population, so be it. The GGNRA shouldn't be used as release valve for (what I'm assured are) over-crowded dog parks.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6481	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94109				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:21:26				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Steve

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6482    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
pat lopez

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6483    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:22:25  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Thanks for soliciting our input.

I walk on the trails almost daily. There is no day that I see lose dogs running around doing what dogs do when unleashed. Running, exploring, playing and taking a dump whenever they feel the need, which is quite often. About 50% o the dog owners are responsible people and have a certain degree of control of their dogs. They clean up after them and have them on a leash.

Unfortunately, about half dog owners dont give a damn about other people. Their dogs come first and when confronted they react aggressively.

Heres an example that happened last week. It had rained and the trail was muddy. Out of the blue a labrador runs onto me and starts jumping on me getting my clothes dirty with mud. When I finally managed to gain control of the dog, his owner comes to me screaming LEAVE MY DOG ALONE!

I reminded him that dogs should be on a leash at all times, especially the ones that are difficult to control. His response:

If you cant handle a dog you shouldnt be in an Open Space, asshole!

I pulled out my camera to document the incident and when I was about to take a picture of him and the dog I thought he would hit me so I just left as fast as I could. The incident wasnt worth a fight.

Its this kind of people who ruin everything for everybody.

I love animals but humans are humans and dogs are dogs. You never know what they will do next. Often they mean no harm. Often they just want to play. But they are unable to distinguish those who are in the mood for playing and definitely have no concept of hygiene. They poo whenever they feel the urge. Mud is just part of the fun. Thats why they should be on a leash.

Please maintain the leash policy for dogs.

Thanks again,

Jim Barton  
Jbarton91@yahoo.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6484	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Berkeley, CA 94702 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:22:42				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am quite concerned about the public use of our lands. As a dog owner I walk my dog where-ever I can find an off leash venue. Fort Funston is a wonderful place, where I am able to be comfortable and enjoy the beauty of our coast, the dunes and the freedom of my dog being off leash. There are few enough areas enabling us to be free together. there are many places people without dogs can go for a beautiful refreshing day where dogs are not allowed. Those same people can enjoy Ft Funston freely. We are tax payers and there are many many of us enjoying the area. Please, leave the park open to us all.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6485	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94012 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:24:33				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a huge supporter of Fort Funston being the one of the largest parks in San Francisco as an off-leash dog park. I am a dog owner who has a dog walker that takes my dog to the park on a weekly basis. I also come visit the park during the weekends with my pup and enjoy having the freedom to walk the park without a leash. Keep Fort Funston as an OFF-LEASH park!				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6486	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Anselmo, CA 94960 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

#### Why we oppose the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's Dog Plan

Areas where our dogs have been welcome to walk or play off-leash for decades could be severely cut or banned outright under the revised GGNRA dog plan. The new rules would affect off-leash as well as on-leash access at Crissy Field, Fort Funston, Muir Beach, Rancho Corral de Tierra on the slopes of Montara, and many other parklands.

The San Francisco City Council recently unanimously passed a resolution objecting to the GGNRA plan, which prompted the head of the Sierra Club to say that SF is pandering to a small group of dog extremists.

However, we believe that as responsible citizens, we must be realistic and fore-thinking about how to accommodate more than 100,000 local dogs in a city with limited space.

There hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA should be obligated to provide a factual report before they pass legislation.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979.

If the dog management plan is adopted, the majority of the Bay Area's dogs will have to find somewhere else to go, overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves.

We are not suggesting unlimited dog walking access, and we advocate responsible dog ownership in all GGNRA lands. But there is no credible reason to deny fair and reasonable access for both on- and off-leash dog walking that has taken place on GGNRA land for more than 50 years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6487    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:25:51

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am writing specifically to protest Alternative C which proposes an off-leash fenced dog area between LeConte and Tamarind Streets, Montara, CA.

---

With the vast land which makes up the Rancho, it simply makes no sense to have the park infringe on the privacy of residents and potentially endanger the children in the school on the park's perimeter.

There are decades of history where dogs have walked off-leash in the Rancho. It is a very tiny portion of the park. It makes the most sense to me to officially adopt this area to be used in the manner in which it has been used for decades. The remainder of the park could then be closed to dogs or be dogs on leash.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6488    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As an SF resident, taxpayer, local physician, and a omeone who walks regularly with my Rhodesian ridgeback Oscar in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

One of my favorite things to do with out-of-town guests is to take them to fort funston. It is tejly a magical place got dog lovers and their dogs. Nothing like it exists in the rest of the country. Every single person I have taken there has said they wished they had something like it where they live.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Sherry Goldyn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6489    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash

access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Anne Arnhym

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6490	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:28:36				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				

**Correspondence:** The off leash areas of ggnra are one of the biggest reasons we choose to live in sf. We have kids and a dog and we spend every weekend in one of the ggnra off leash areas. Its an integral part of our life in the city. Since the charter of the ggnra is for the enjoyment of all we fully expect that dog owners deserve these areas as much as our fellow citizens. We are responsible dog owners who want to coexist in harmony with our neighbors. Exclusion is a terrible proposal for dog owners with few options in the city.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6491	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:29:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Amy Mugg MD, MPH

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6492	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Anselmo, CA 94960 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Nature in the City Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:30:07				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear GGNRA,				

The Dog Management Plan is a welcome step in your efforts to manage dogs in the GGNRA. The main issue I hear about from friends and colleagues who are reasonable people, and yet are skeptical of your dog management efforts, relates to enforcement. My understanding is that upon the conclusion of this process, the Park will finally be empowered to enforce the law with respect to dogs in the GGNRA. I truly hope that is the case. Please find the resources to enforce the law that emerges from this process.

The whole issue of dogs in San Francisco (and in the other counties, but mostly the city) has become one of the biggest political footballs in our local community. But the challenges are not insurmountable, assuming that people are willing to have productive dialogue. Your Dog Management Plan is the product of community dialogue, however chaotic and stressful it can be. The Dog Plan is a reasonable compromise that the overwhelming majority of San Franciscans would get behind. Naturally, the GGNRA will not hear from a representative cross-section of the public, as only those who have been directly engaged in this debate will weigh in and will convince their friends and colleagues to comment. I hope that you consider the actual demographics of the city and the probability of views of the majority of the public when you make your final decision about dog management in the GGNRA. Off-leash dog walkers are not the majority of the population of any of the three counties.

From the first EIS to the SEIS, you have made a dozen changes to the preferred alternative, all of which are increases in dog walking opportunities. Many of these are logical and reasonable, and they are all in response to listening to the dog walking community. You should feel confident and satisfied that you have made a strong effort to respond to the needs of the dog walkers while working to protect natural and cultural resources and the diversity of visitor experiences at the GGNRA. The proposal to keep dogs on leash on all trails is absolutely logical, reasonable and critical for the overall National Park visitor experience.

Some problems do remain with the preferred alternative, however. For example, I believe you should have left Rodeo Beach the way it was in the first EIS. Visitors who want a dog free experience should not have to go so far away for that. They already had to go most of the length of the beach, and now they must go even further. I am concerned about Baker Beach and Muir Beach in terms of the proposal for on-leash only. As someone who wants a dog-free experience at the beach, I like these proposals, but given the reality of dog owner behavior, I am concerned that these are unsustainable from an enforcement perspective. While I believe the Dog Plan should be about encouraging some new - more ecological - behavior (and philosophy) change, the community has its limits. I would recommend you think about how you would reasonably manage the Muir Beach and Baker Beach proposals in the preferred alternative.

All of these beaches have sensitive habitat, and so there is absolutely no reason why they cannot all have dog exclusive fencing, such as exists at Crissy Field. The fencing at Baker Beach should be improved, and Muir Beach should definitely have fencing to protect the endangered species habitat. Rodeo Beach also has important wetland habitat for birds, mammals, amphibians and rare plants, and so good fencing is



absolutely warranted there as well. No dogs along the Snowy Plover habitat at Ocean Beach is absolutely crucial and sensible. We can refer to both coasts for heroic efforts to steward plover habitat on popular beaches.

In San Francisco, I see several areas where dogs are only allowed on leash. Given the phenomenal, epidemic number of dogs in the city, I would encourage you to think about places that are not sensitive that could be fenced off ROLAs, more like the DPAs on the City properties. I understand that the jury is out as to the effect on the City's natural areas that your plan will have. But let's be precautionary, and assume that the possibility is real that decreasing off-leash access in the GGNRA could put more pressure on the City's Significant Natural Resource Areas, as well as areas of land with habitat value that as of yet, do not have the Natural Area designation, and also have not yet been discovered by dog walkers. I think it was smart to put a ROLA into Fort Mason, and the placement is appropriate, not taking away from the majestic beauty of the site. Fort Point should not have a ROLA, both due to natural and historic resources, but also because of very high tourist visitation. Tourists come to see sweeping vistas and natural and cultural landscapes, not dogs running amok. At Baker Beach, there may be some candidate Monterey Cypress-Ehrharta erecta biological wastelands - sufficient distance from the restored dunes, Battery Chamberlain and other resources - that would be appropriate for a ROLA. Similarly, there are probably like areas at Fort Miley, though I confess I am not as familiar with that site and do not know the pattern of use. The same logic applies to Sutro Heights Park, but here again, I am not familiar with the site to recommend anything, and I know that this is also used by tourist, as is Lands End now more and more.

Finally, I do not support commercial dog walking in the GGNRA. That is an environmentally exploitative private enterprise for profit that has no place, and no Park-serving function at the GGNRA.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments. I hope that we see a successful end to this process and a set of rules that protect natural and cultural resources and the incomparable National Park experience at the GGNRA.

Peter Brastow  
415-845-0087  
brastow@natureinthecity.org

When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect. -  
Aldo Leopold

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6493	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Individual with Dog Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:30:41				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.				

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6494    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Oakland, CA 94610  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Mary Shea Hagebols

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6495    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:31:37  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To : National Park Service / Frank Dean /GGNRA

My name is Scott Stawicki and I live at 2510 Diamond St., San Francisco, CA. As a voting resident who has lived in San Francisco for over 15 years - 5 years as a dog owner & 10 years as a volunteer for GGNRA lands - I am writing to officially comment on the DDMP - SEIS. In 2011, I publically commented on the DEIS, and rejected the plan as biased against Bay Area dog owners, flawed in both public and management practices. Furthermore the DEIS was grossly deficient in it's presentation of scientific research and data. As a biologist I felt ashamed at the way the NPS had egregiously manipulated and skewed it's presentation to forward it's own narrow goals of eliminating dogs from the Bay Area public land. The SEIS draft mirrors all of the initial flaws of the DEIS - but does further damage by ignoring the local community and users. The SEIS sends of message of betrayal to a community that is attempting to work with the NPS to find a dog management program is evolves to the changes needs of the land and it's users.

I oppose the "Preferred Alternative " to in almost every area outlined in the SEIS. I have previous commented on the lack of scientific data (Comments to DEIS 2011) supporting the " Preferred Alternatives". Furthermore, instead of a graded and graduated approach across limited numbers of GGNRA areas - a strategy that would allow pertinent scientific data to be generated while giving communities/managers and users to explore/evaluate changes- the NPS proposes huge restrictions on decades-long dog use covering most of the GGNRA areas. This is an adolescent approach that could lead to countless problems and issues.

It is this same heavy-handed approach that led NPS ranger to use potentially lethal force on an unarmed, non-violent dog walker in 2012. No individual - even if guilty of providing false information to a Federal Ranger - deserves to be shot in the back with a weapon that could potentially kill while posing no threat of physical harm to the public or officer.

The idea for fences at Crissy Field is outrageous. Crissy Field is not a natural place which requires special protection. It was a salt marsh/ tidal wetland that was used as a dump by the US Army then filled in starting in 1846. This land is artificial, and the naïve attempts for humans to "recreate" complex ecosystems are folly. If the NPS is sincere on its attempts to protect sensitive habitat, it would be better to fence off NATURAL areas from ALL HUMAN ACTIVITY. Unfortunately, such pristine or near pristine areas are absent from the GGNRA areas. All are constructs of over 300 years of continued human/urban development. Logic would argue that maybe the NPS would start with a much more modest plan, like eliminating the Presidio Golf Course and rehabilitating the area to a park with more use to the general public (instead of a small population of "golfers" who are privileged to afford access to our "Public" land)....

As with most of the SEIS, the monitoring based system is deeply flawed. It still employs a punitive system of compliance that does not engage the dog walking community and users. Systems that only punish and do not actively partner with the dog community/users can only have the purpose = a designed failure with the purpose of removing dogs from the GGNRA.

The SEIS also seems to ignore all of the comments the dog-owning users, and SF/ Federal leaders surrounding impacts on the community at large and its outdoor space needs. With well-documented data on the amount of dog owners, dogs, and users - it is bewildering that the NPS is attempting to greatly restrict access to these areas. The NPS seems to have ignored and failed to address my own questions, as well as countless others who commented in favor of less-restrictive dog policies during the 2011 DEIS public outreach. With over 4500 comments to the DEIS by our community - why has the NPS not done justice to individuals who support expanded dog access? Where is the process to give consideration to those that support consistent off-lease access to GGNRA? The NPS and the DEIS/SEIS has systemically ignored the Bay Area dog community.

The National Park Service and its release of the 2013 SEIS has once again squandered a chance to work with the hundred of thousands of residents & dog owners around the Bay Area to craft a forward-thinking and sustainable management policy for our public lands. Millions of US tax dollars and years have been wasted by the NPS. The SEIS is an outdated and backwards approach to attempt to deceive & bully the local citizens & communities toward a goal of "sustainability" to public land - land that has thrived and prospered with a dog policy in place for decades. Instead of working with the public and citizens of the Bay Area to craft a new community-guided policy, NPS has taken an approach to polarize an issue and ignore public input from a large- perhaps largest- group of local users. The DEIS, SEIS, and the NPS's entire DDMP process is a reflection of its failed leadership. It further exposes NPS leadership's inability to distinguish/ understand/manage a National Recreation Area (not National Park) in the center of a large population center. I hold Frank Dean responsible and would look for new NPS leadership and direction to bring a more responsible and community-partnered dog management plan into consideration. If this public comment against the NPS and its DDMP SEIS seems like a pro-dog rant - it is only a reflection of the biased and thoughtless policy against the Bay Area dog community that is being proposed by the SEIS and National Park Service.

Scott Stawicki  
2510 Diamond St.  
San Francisco, CA 94131

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6496    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:32:19  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Diana

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6497    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Sierra Club Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** Member  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:32:40  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I support efforts to protect wildlife in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and call on the GGNRA to implement the Dog Management Plan (however, I wish this plan were called the Threatened and Endangered Species Protection Plan).

It is completely reasonable to require that dogs be more carefully regulated in the GGNRA and that off-leash areas need to be fully enclosed. Clear and active enforcement will be necessary for success of the plan.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6498    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

It has been my greatest joy to see my dog grow and develop the many relationships with dog owners and non-dog owners while being recreational at these amazing parks. These parks are a recreation area, NOT a national park. It is here where I been able to train him to become a therapy dog for children with special needs.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

We truly enjoy these GGNRA areas. Please don't change these areas. It will be a great shame to not only the dog owner community, but to the San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo communities.

Sincerely,  
Tara R.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6499    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:33:43  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My family and I walk regularly with our dog, Bella, in the GGNRA. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a

drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
A. Lee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6500	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:33:44				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

Over 50% ohouseholds in San Francisco have a dog in the home. These are not mere animals but valued members of the family. Restricting their rights is akin to restricting the rights of a human child. Please consider how important their role in life is to human beings. They provide companionship to the lonely, a playmate to the young and a security guard to the elderly. It is imperative to keep the emotional health and physical well-being of these members of society as its best possible level. This will in turn benefit the lives of the people who own them. Happy dogs = happy humans = less anger in the world = less violence = less people going to jail = more harmonious society - clearly a win/win for everyone!

With that being said, I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo

County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Some parting thoughts....

There do not appear to be any site-specific studies showing that off-leash dogs harm public recreation areas.

The areas slated for restriction do not appear to be pristine in any way or environmentally sensitive rather they are urban recreation lands.

Instead of imposing more restrictions which tend to complicate people's lives, let's put our resources towards educate people about caring for their public recreation areas - packing out trash, not removing rocks or plants from areas, staying on trails, picking up dog feces and disposing in proper trash receptacles etc.

I sincerely hope you take all these points to heart as there is more at stake here than meets the eye.

Sincerely,

Todd Latham

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6501	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94105 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:34:01				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

San Francisco is known as a dog lovers paradise. If this plan proceeds, then it is going to set a precedence where all public places would be deemed leash specific. These are spaces I can run with my dog without worrying about traffic, or other obstacles that could be dangerous. If your plan succeeds, I would then also like San Francisco to ban using bicycles on public footpaths and can use only designated bike lanes, no skateboarders anywhere both of which are a menace to pedestrians, ban from playing soccer or other disruptive sports in parks where the folks goes to relax and unwind etc etc. I'm not sure why this law is

being implemented and I think San Francisco would be taking a step down from improving the life of its residents

Sincerely,

Tushar Prabhakar

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6502    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

SUGGESTION:

If there is a concern regarding multi-use on trails then why not create a plan like the one on the Tahoe Rim Trail where people share the trail on certain days. If people don't want to be out there with dogs off-leash then they can choose to be on the trails on DESIGNATED ON-LEASH DAYS.

Other days can be DESIGNATED OFF-LEASH DAYS. Perhaps every other weekend and certain can be OFF-LEASH DAYS. I am so often trails during the week where I do not see anyone at all or maybe one person after several hours of hiking.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6503    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:34:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I live near the Presidio, and have watched the Doyle Drive construction project proceed for the past several years. As I read the Draft Dog Management Plan, I don't understand how the park service can be concerned about dogs in the Presidio and not be significantly more concerned about the construction equipment, truck traffic, and chaos associated with the demolition of the old skyway and the activities associated with the digging of tunnels and development of the new drive.

---



These park lands are set in the middle of a complex urban environment. It is impossible to provide the kind of protection that the National Parks can provide for remote habitats. The draft dog management plan seems to be trying to create protections that simply do not make sense in the middle of this urban environment. The arguments and scientific studies presented are all incompatible with the reality of the urban spaces that are the subject of this report.

In contrast, we have had a 50-year experience with an urban park use pattern that includes off-leash dog recreation. The present use of these spaces is extremely beneficial to the citizens of the city. This urban experiment has been a fantastic success. This report does not provide any clear evidence that the proposed changes will produce the intended benefits in our urban park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6504    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:37:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** we are walk our dog in the Fort Funston area on a daily basis and it is one of the few places near the city where she is free to run off-leash. it is healthy for her and us as we get the opportunity to experience the beautiful surrounds in a free and unlimited way. it would be a tremendous tragedy to change this and would harm the literally thousands of families that also walk their dogs in this beautiful place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6505    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:37:59  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I live in San Francisco and walk my dog daily in GGNRA (Fort Funston primarily) and local city parks (including Bernal Hill, Holly Park, Glen Park, St. Mary's, and McLaren). I oppose the Preferred Alternative as too restrictive, and support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy plus off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. Per GGNRA's enabling legislation this is a RECREATION area, for the second densest urban area in the country. The new plan does not provide peer-reviewed, site-specific studies as required to support such a major restriction on dogs, nor does the SEIS adequately address the public comments sent in response to the DEIS.

In particular, the SEIS is seriously inadequate in addressing the impact of such severe restrictions on nearby city and state parks, as well as the proposed remaining off-leash areas in GGNRA. Many dogs require regular off leash running to get adequate exercise - and sufficient exercise is perhaps the most important element in having a well behaved dog. Under the Preferred Alternative, more dogs will be concentrated into smaller off leash areas - in GGNRA as well as in local parks.

Established packs of dogs may get along well in a small space; concentrating a number of unfamiliar dogs, even friendly ones, in a space can raise the arousal and tension levels, resulting in increased dog

fight, aggressive pack behavior, etc. The parks I visit are already frequently crowded in the off-leash areas; early mornings are about the only time I can count on avoiding crowded conditions. Restricting off-leash areas in GGNRA will result in higher concentrations of dogs in the remaining off-leash areas in GGNRA as well as in local parks, compounding the problem.

Furthermore, GGNRA seems concerned with the experience of non-dog walker's interactions with dogs. How will pushing more dogs into often even more crowded (human as well as dog) urban city parks affect the experience of non-dog walkers there?

In addition, many people drive to the various parks specifically because they are looking for an off-leash experience. To the extent GGNRA is concerned about environmental impacts, what about the impact of people having to drive further to find suitable off-leash access for their dogs? I much prefer to walk my dog to a park rather than drive, but my nearby local parks are sufficiently crowded (and some now closed for maintenance as well) that I now drive some days to less crowded parks to walk my dog. If the Preferred Alternative is implemented, I anticipate needing to drive out of the city entirely on a more regular basis to find good off-leash opportunities for my dog.

I sympathize with people not wanting to step in poop, get jumped on, etc. Rather than restricting access, why not explore more alternatives such as dog training, owner education, and citation of inappropriate behavior? If stronger measures are really required, how about requiring that dogs have passed a test to obtain an off-leash license for GGNRA, rather than restricting off-leash access to everyone?

As a final note, walking a dog has dramatically increased my sense of local community. In the first month I had a dog, I met more of my neighbors than in the past 9 years in the neighborhood without a dog. While I do meet people when my dog is on-leash, the time spent and connections formed are much stronger when our dogs are off-leash, as we watch our dogs play together.

Sincerely,  
Bernal Heights resident

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6506	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:38:49				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I am writing to oppose the Preferred Alternative. I appreciate that GGNRA has made some changes in response to public comments in 2011, and I want to acknowledge the care that you and your staff have put into crafting alternatives.

My husband and I are San Francisco resident homeowners. We are the parents of a 12-year-old daughter and 2-year-old son, and we both work full-time jobs outside the home. We have very limited free time, and we choose to use a good portion of that time visiting GGNRA parks. Over the past 5 years, we have visited GGNRA parks an average of once per week - - primarily Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Fort Funston, and Lands' End.

Visiting the GGNRA brings our family exercise, fresh air, and natural beauty, but visiting the GGNRA \*with our dog\* brings us joy. No matter how many times he has been to Ocean Beach, each time his paws

hit the sand at Stairwell 21 is like the first time; he lights up with palpable, contagious joy. As much as we love visiting the GGNRA, 8 times out of 10 we might have stayed home if it weren't for our dog. He provides the little nudge we need to get out to the coast.

Visiting the GGNRA is a big part of our family life, so when I saw the Preferred Alternative maps for San Francisco county, my heart sank. With our very limited free time, we like to be together as a family of five - 4 people and 1 dog. We have enjoyed many wonderful family hikes from Seacliff through Lands End to Mile Rock Beach; but under the Preferred Alternative, our family would no longer be welcome there. We have enjoyed many weekend mornings starting with breakfast on Judah Street, then a walk along Ocean Beach to Sutro Baths and back; but under the Preferred Alternative, our family would no longer be welcome there. We have enjoyed many lazy Sundays wading in Lobos Creek with our toddler son, while our pre-teen daughter chased the dog up and down Baker Beach; but under the Preferred Alternative, our family would no longer be welcome there. I am grateful for all the wonderful memories we have made in the GGNRA over the past 5 years, but I am heartsick at all the memories we will never have under the Preferred Alternative.

I have a Masters in Public Policy from UC Berkeley, and one of the key lessons we learned is that policy-making hinges on how you define the problem. I think it is telling that the GGNRA has constructed this entire exercise around the how "to determine the manner and extent of dog use in appropriate areas of the park." If the GGNRA has already decided that dogs are the problem, then it is inevitable that restricting dogs will be proposed as the solution.

As a park user, I have difficulty squaring this view of the problem with what I have observed in my hundreds of hours at GGNRA parks. At Ocean Beach, I sometimes bring a tall garbage bag with me on the walk; before I get halfway from the parking lot to the waterline, that bag is full of condoms, food wrappers, soda bottles, and beer cans left behind by previous visitors to the beach (particularly the fire pits). I see kids digging huge pits in the sand, horses walking past (and leaving their poop behind), rangers driving their trucks on the beach, and bulldozers hauling sand from one end of the beach to another. And I marvel that, of all the factors with a negative impact on the environment here, the GGNRA has decided to focus on dogs.

At Lands End, I rarely see more than a handful of dogs on any given walk. From what I can tell, the vast majority of park users are tourists who exit tour buses on the west side of the trail, walk as far as they can (less than halfway, generally) and then turn back. They leave plenty of litter behind, but they don't bring dogs. I have trouble understanding how dog access was even identified as an issue at this park.

The GGNRA is a national recreation area in an urban area - in my urban area, my adopted hometown. I am grateful to the GGNRA for improving these areas and working to conserve them for future generations. (I have been around San Francisco long enough to remember what Crissy Field used to look like - the GGNRA has effected a stunning transformation there, and deserves acclaim for it.) But I urge the GGNRA not to lose sight of its responsibility to its neighbors - the urban users who depend on this open space for exercise, fresh air, and family recreation. In San Francisco, the majority of us are conscientious environmentalists, good citizens, and dog owners. We don't deserve to lose access to our parks.

Sincerely,

Amanda Johnson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6507    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:40:29  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear GGNRA,

I strongly oppose the proposed changes to the dog policy in the GGNRA via the 2013 SEIS in Marin and San Francisco. While I would like to focus my comments on the Marin areas in which I use on a frequent, even daily basis, I am also opposed to the proposed closure of Crissy Field to dogs in San Francisco.

In Marin County, we the citizens have worked hard to strike a balance with the GGNRA as per the recreational use of our lands. We are an urban interface with the park and we have a large population that uses the park lands in ways that are very different with most of the other National Parks and National Recreation Areas throughout the USA. The parklands in Marin County are, for the most part, not in a wilderness area, such as parts of Yosemite NP and Yellowstone NP. Our large, urban population has historically used these lands for a wide variety of public recreation, including walking and training our dogs. There simply is not enough other lands in Marin County that offer the opportunity to be in nature with our dogs, and have our dogs learn how to behave properly in a natural environment.

The value of this goes far beyond what it seems to be on the surface. It contributes greatly to our social fabric in Marin, to our health, to our property values, and to our way of life. We have been walking our dogs in the Marin GGNRA lands long before the 1979 Pet Policy, and continue to do so today. I personally have been walking my dogs in Oakwood Valley since 1988 - nearly 25 years! I do not want to see this changed unnecessarily.

I say unnecessarily because there is no significant reason to close these trails to dogs. Oakwood Valley lands and wildlife has not been significantly impacted by dog use, nor has several of the other trails in Marin that are proposed to be closed to dogs. Yes, dog poop on the trails, especially at the trailheads, is a problem that needs to be addressed - and can be dealt with. Closing the trails to dogs is not the answer. There has not been any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or science-based monitoring, as should be required by law, before effecting these large-scale changes to the public use of the lands. The public is against these changes, 3 to 1, as shown in the comments to the 2011 plan. I'll bet those numbers are even higher now in opposition to the current plan.

In reading key parts of the 2013 SEIS, I see that there is little threat to the status of endangered species or landscapes due to people walking their dogs on trails in Marin County. I understand that there may need to be seasonal or temporary closure to trails for both humans and dogs due to special circumstances in limited areas. While it may be "easier" for the GGNRA to simply close dog access permanently to so many areas, it is not "easier" for the public they serve. I believe we all need to work together to achieve a balance of use, including dogs, on the trails that we have used historically.

In talking with one of your Ecologist Rangers at a recent meeting on these issues at Tamalpais High School, we discussed that in above Oakwood Valley and along the Alta Trail, there has been identified some Mission Blue butterfly habitat that needs restoration work. I applaud that work and am sure that a way to do that without banning dogs from those trails is very possible. Perhaps the limited sections where that work is taking place could be fenced, or posted with "dogs on leash in this area" signage. Trails could be re-routed to avoid these areas.

Similarly, I was told of one report of a Northern Spotted Owl heard only once recently in Oakwood

Valley. As those birds are not disturbed much by humans and dogs, but more by habitat loss, I don't see a conflict with having spotted owls in the area. They are active mostly at night, and are generally found high enough in the trees as to not be effected by dogs. Yes, I could see the need for a temporary closure of a trail if a spotted owl happened to be nesting or fledging young in the area, much as we do for other sensitive species. It does not make sense to close this trail to dogs just because one spotted owl was heard one time. That bird could easily have been dispersing or passing through.

I was also told there was concern over dogs going down to the creek in Oakwood Valley. Actually, while dogs may access just a few points along the creek, in general the creek bank is too steep and often covered in poison oak. Most, if not all dog owners tend to keep their dogs out of the creek for those reasons, except for a small pool outside the park near the entrance to Oakwood Valley, near the bridge up the valley and at an old stock pond near the top of the valley. Dogs do not roam the creek here. That would be common knowledge if a study had been done (or through dialogue with the park users).

It is my view, and the view of many other dog owners that I have talked with, that we should have a system of looping fire roads and trails that are accessible to people and their dogs, so that we can minimize out-and-back traffic in many of our current dog-walkable areas. All current dog-walkable fire roads should be available for current use as off-leash dog walking areas, while many of the trails should also be considered for off-leash use. I am certain that a few areas may be inappropriate for off-leash dogs and those can be dealt with on an appropriate basis.

An example of a good plan for dogs in parks is close to home in the East Bay Regional Parks dog policy. In general, dogs are allowed off-leash on fire roads, but must remain under voice-control. If they demonstrate that they are not under voice control, they will have to be leashed or removed from the park. They must be on leash in parking and picnic areas, and often within the first 500 yards of the trailhead. THESE RULES MAKES SENSE! We should do this in the GGNRA as well!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6508	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:40:56				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the proposed alternative because it is too restrictive. It is very important to me to be able to exercise my dog off leash in the areas where it is currently allowed.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6509	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:41:17				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear legislation! This project Can only prove to be a failure. There are so many civilians that live in this city and the number will only rise. These civilians, many of which are tax paying adults with families, have dogs. As a citizen of this city and a dog owner myself, I have lived here long enough to see more and more local dog parks overcrowded and prohibiting off leash parks only make the overcrowding worse. Overcrowding can lead to many issues such as more frequent dog fights, lost dogs, improper cleaning up after dogs and				

---

handlers not being able to focus on their dogs to maintain order. San Francisco may be a great city but it is small, we must be resourceful and save what free roaming we have to benefit the community. Don't take away our off leash parks!!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6510	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Fort Funston Dog Walkers Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:41:25				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	From the beginning of the dog management controversy (at the inception of the GGNRA when off-leash walking was initially banned) and at every meeting or opportunity to comment to the Park Service (including almost 2 years of negotiated rulemaking) dog owners have made it clear that we want a recreational experience. Dog play areas (small areas where owners drink coffee while they watch their dogs play) are not what we have asked for. Dog owners are asking for recreational opportunities; places to hike; the opportunity to be in nature - with our well-behaved dogs. This interest is 100% aligned with the new Healthy Parks Healthy People US initiative.				

The Supplemental EIS fails in much the same way that the Draft EIS failed:

1. It assumes that off-leash dog walking has negative impacts that can only be remediated by eliminating that activity. The document is filled with might when referring to impacts, yet proposes an alternative based on the "fact" of these impacts occurring.
2. It does not consider alternatives other than restricted use and leash law enforcement. A Tag program is rejected because of cost, yet we understand that the initial annual cost of the proposed plan is over \$2M (for enforcement); timed-use is rejected as being too hard to manage, but is offered as a possibility for future changes to the proposed, reduced off-leash areas.
3. It seems to be the assumption in the SEIS that conflict disappears with the proposed plan; that under the current rule there is conflict, but when you drastically reduce the area we're permitted in, conflict disappears. This makes no sense. We've asked for a recreational oversight committee to help resolve user conflict and take some of the burden off of the GGNRA - this was rejected. We asked for a tag program to educate visitors and provide some way of controlling dog owners who can't/ don't obey the rules - rejected. Without education, oversight, and some way to separate out people who cause the problems, how can any plan be successful? And, if these are important for success, why aren't they tried BEFORE the more drastic punishment of eliminating so much off-leash space?

Re the Fort Funston proposed alternative:

The upper meadow proposed for off-leash use is called "the tundra" by regulars. It is the coldest, windiest part of the Fort and on many days we move past it as quickly as possible. The eastern trail ("horse trail") is designated as "no dog", yet this provides us with a really lovely loop and is well-protected from the elements on windy, rainy days. There is no evidence of impact with the current use, except possibly for the graffiti, beer cans and homeless encampments - none of which are related to off-leash activity.

As with all the other sites, any change at Fort Funston should be based on evidence, not conjecture. I found nothing in the references that justifies such significant closure or change.

Re Baker Beach proposed alternative:

This proposal is a complete mystery. On most days, Baker Beach is completely empty. With the

exception of the restoration areas (which are well-marked and fenced already), it is impossible to understand how off-leash dogs could have an impact here. There may be a few sunny week-end days where there are sufficient visitors that some might be uncomfortable with off-leash dogs, but these days are few and far-between. This was a PERFECT site to consider timed-use for week-ends and holidays. That would have been a win-win. As it is, the proposed alternative begs for non-compliance - when people see an enormous beach with no one on it, it is going to be very difficult to persuade anyone that walking off-leash is going to harm anything or anyone.

At the end of the day, the only workable off-leash plan is one that people will support. Given the public and political outcry over this proposal, this is clearly not that plan.

Regards  
Linda McKay

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6511	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Mill Valley, CA 94941 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:48:38				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

In conclusion, I would like to add that, like for many others in the Marin, our move here was dictated by a lifestyle choice more than geographic expedience. The experience of living in close proximity to nature is something we all treasure and do not take for granted. However, this mindset naturally echoes that of a dog owner, and one of the most profound manifestations of this experience entails being able to take in the natural beauty alongside our four-legged companions. This is not just our view, but that of a great majority of the dog owners in our area and, of the several hundred families living in our association, almost everyone has a dog. Imposing limits on our ability to responsibly enjoy the nature with our dogs runs counter to the very fabric of our experience as Marin residents and we, therefore, hope that you take these decisions very seriously and only promote what is absolutely necessary for nature preservation and what cannot be achieved through any other means. We strongly believe that the current situation does not warrant such harsh measures and our opinion echoes that of a much wider community of Marin residents.

Please consider our position in finalizing your decision.

Kind regards,

Sergei Lubensky  
Shelter Bay resident, Mill Valley, CA

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6512	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94116 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:48:39				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean				

I am submitting a public comment OPPOSING the GGNRA Dog Management plan's Preferred Alternative

I have lived in San Francisco for over 40 years and have walked my dogs for decades at Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and Crissy Field

The NPS, using "junk science", has turned dogs and their humans who walk them, into scapegoats for just about every environmental problem they can come up with.

Just one example I personally witnessed:

Many years ago, the GGNRA decided that dogs and people walking on the sand dunes in the area above where the bank swallows nest, were most likely negatively impacting the swallows, especially when nesting and raising their young. To that end, they fenced off a large area above the cliffs where the swallows nest.

It wasn't long until several of us noticed that the swallows were no longer seen in the now "protected area". Instead they were regularly flying in areas where we really hadn't seen them that often before. It became clear they were following us, flying above as we walked. You could see that they were feeding on insects that flew up as a result.

We also saw something we had rarely witnessed before. Large numbers of sea gulls and ravens sitting on the dunes, by the edge of the cliff, above the bank swallow nests. They would fly down, pluck baby swallows right out of their nests, flying back up to the dunes where they sat and ate the baby birds. It was very hard to watch.

When we used to walk along the dunes in that area, the predator birds were kept at bay. But by fencing off the sand dunes above the bank swallow nesting area to keep people and their dogs from walking there, the GGNRA created a safe haven for the sea gulls and ravens. They could feed on baby bank swallows at will. It was heartbreaking.

.

Sincerely,  
Jean Kind

---



**Correspondence ID:** 6513    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:49:15

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** Hello, I would like NPS to consider the current usage of Fort Funston and Crissy Field in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area while considering changing the dog rules. Almost all of the people at Funston and many at Crissy field are in those parks with dogs and those dogs are off leash. About one of every 3 San Francisco households has a dog and limiting dog off-leash options will force dogs to cram into only a handful of other San Francisco parks that allow off-leash exercise. We love taking our dog out to Ft Funston and are out there twice a week while our dog also goes with a dog walker 3 more times a week. We would have never got a dog if Funston didn't allow dogs off leash. The park is a great place, full of great dogs and I fail to see how this usage is a problem, especially since Funston is such a small percentage of the acreage included in the GGNRA that does not allow dogs. Please do not change the off leash rules at Funston and Crissy field.

Thank you,

Brandon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6514    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:49:22

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I love playing fetch with my canine friends. Sometimes I like to visit places without my canine friends because they are rambunctious and scare off the wildlife. Some places are appropriate for off-leash dogs and other places are not. There needs to be a clear distinction of where off-leash dogs are allowed to frolic freely and where they need to be on-leash. At Ocean Beach, I have seen off-leash dogs steal sandwiches from the hands of children, I have seen off-leash dogs run up to people that clearly have a fear of dogs, I have seen off-leash dogs chase birds. The saddest day was when I saw an off-leash dog run into traffic and get hit by a car. All of these dogs seemed to be very sweet, but these incidents could have been prevented had there been an enclosed area for off-leash dogs. Enclosed off-leash dog areas remove all confusion of where dogs can roam. Enclosed off-leash areas make enforcement of leash regulations much easier.

Without enclosed off-leash dog areas and well enforced leash regulations the GGNRA will cease to be a place for the many, it will become a place for the few. I want the GGNRA to be a place that I can visit with my canine friends, but I also want it to be a place where I can observe the wonders of nature without the threat of an excited off-leash dog galloping through. There are so many fantastic examples of off-leash dog areas with double gates and benches in San Francisco. All the dogs I know get great exercise playing in enclosed-off leash areas. They don't care if there is a fence as long as I as continue to throw the ball.

The best dog management plan for the GGNRA will enclose all off-leash dog areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6515    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:49:27

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** In the Draft Dog Management Plan, the authors cite the confusion about policy that arises because dog-walking rules in the GGNRA are different than the rules in other national parks. The report makes the argument that there will be less confusion on this topic if the policy in the GGNRA is consistent with the policy in other national parks.

This perspective ignores a many-year history of these policies in the GGNRA, and the significant local confusion that will be caused by a sudden and dramatic policy change.

The plan also points to costs associated with this confusion, and the need for park staff to spend time and energy explaining this unique local policy. However, this argument ignores the significant cost that will be associated with implementation of a policy change, and the need for the staff to deal with the local confusion that will be caused by the policy change. I noticed that the report indicates that the implementation of a policy change will require somewhere between \$2M and \$3M in staffing expenses, which is significantly more than the \$430,000 presently spend on staff in these parks.

So, a change in policy will probably lead to increased confusion about policy, and even the draft report indicates that the increased confusion associated with the new policy will require a significant increase in staffing and costs.

If one goal of the authors of this report is to reduce confusion and reduce costs, why does the report advocate a policy change that will increase confusion and increase costs?

I think the best conclusion from all of the information in this report is that the present policy should not change, because any change will increase confusion and increase costs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6516    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Fairfax, CA 94930  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:49:43

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:** I am very much against the proposed Dog Management Plan which would nearly completely destroy the access dogs and their owners have to the GGNRA. This severe reduction in both the number and quality of their activities and interactions. These banned behaviors are in fact precisely what the citizens of our great country need in order to restore their equilibrium and sense of peace, love, and respect for nature and all of creatures who live in and visit these places. The best way to preserve the ideals upon which this nation was built is to do exactly the opposite of what this plan proposes. I propose that those who draft the final legislation take the time to read about and experience the wonderful joy, loving energy, and peace that these dogs bring to countless people every day in these locations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6517    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who has regularly participated in coastal cleanups, has spent hundreds of hours doing native plant restoration work, and who often walks with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. It is way too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dog's health the way I have on GGNRA properties for close to 30 years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. We can all get along, and criminalizing/losing responsible dog and nature loving citizens is NOT the answer!

Sincerely,

Mary Gerber

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6518    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:50:22**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I support the 1979 Pet Policy. In addition, as the GGNRA expands, they should add new off-leash areas. The proposal for visitors to have " a back country visitor experience" is unrealistic in a dense urban area. "Controlling access" and using "aggressive administering" to do so is contrary to the reason the park was established. "To expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region."

The SEIS has few scientific peer reviewed studies to show that dogs have a significant impact. They rely on the "best professional judgement of NPS staff." Anecdotal observations are not a scientific way to compile evidence. NPS staff have demonstrated a bias against dog walking, so their opinions cannot be trusted.

During negotiated rule making NPS staff were adamant that fencing of dog areas would not be considered. The SEIS preferred alternative now proposes fencing. The fencing allows for the movement of wildlife and so will not keep small dogs in, therefore fencing makes no sense and is a waste of money. Families with dogs and small children will not be able to use the enclosed areas due to dogs running around and the possibility of a child getting knocked over accidentally.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy because it is no better than the DEIS Compliance-Based Management Strategy. The emphasis is still on compliance of leash laws. The GGNRA would still be able to change the status of off leash areas for non-compliance, even if there was no proven negative impacts to resources or visitors.

Safety issues concerning dogs: The data cited by the SEIS of dog incidents does not justify the need for off-leash restrictions. The number of dog bites or attacks (95) from 2008 -2011 is tiny compared to the millions of dog visits over the GGNRA 80,000 acres. The latest compilation of incidents for 2013: 6 dog bites, 5 dog fights, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints from people who were frightened, 1 wildlife killing and one horse bitten. So incidents have gone down in spite of the increase of human population and by inference dog population.

According to Parade Magazine 2012 Survey, 42% o households nationwide have a dog. The SEIS does not consider the continued growth of the population surrounding their lands. San Francisco asked the GGNRA to investigate the effect the reduction in off-leash areas would have on city parks and were ignored. How can a supposed EIS not study that?

SEIS misrepresents the comments made to the DEIS by promoting negative statements concerning dogs and adding few positive ones. In spite of the fact comments ran 3-1 against the DEIS. In addition, no significant changes were made and substantive comments were not responded to.

Social and Economic Impacts: The SEIS did not address the social and health benefits of dog walking. Cities are advertising how dog friendly they are, Mendocino and Carmel for example. How will these restrictions effect tourism?

People with their dogs who come from other parts of the Bay Area may not come as often and will not be spending money at local restaurants and shops.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6519	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	hillsborough, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,  
Eva

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6520	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:50:49  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a native San Franciscan who regularly walks her dog off leash on the various GGNRA lands, and have done so for forty five years now, I would like to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternatives as described in the SEIS. There is no justification for the drastic changes. Where are the site-specific, peer reviewed studies as required by Federal law? Where is the science in any of it? The document seems skewed very much against dog walking as a legitimate form of recreation. I've watched over the years as the areas we have traditionally walked in have been gradually taken away. This is my main form of recreation and there is a wonderfully diverse community attached to it. I doubt there is any other user group to rival the passion and diversity of the dog community.

Formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy that so many worked so hard on would be my choice. That has worked well for years and only needs enforcement to cite the people that are causing problems. Don't punish the majority of respectful park users for the actions of a few "bad apples".

We, the people of San Francisco, gave our lands to you with the understanding that traditional recreational uses , including off leash dog walking, would continue.

It now seems the GGNRA is more concerned with creating habitats that never existed in certain areas of the GGNRA and then using those habitats as an excuse to keep people out. We do not need wilderness on the edge of a city of 800,000, we need recreational areas! There should be more off leash areas in Marin and definitely some in San Mateo county where there are none. How is that fair and balanced to have no off leash area in an entire county?

Sincerely,

Georgette Musante

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6521    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:50:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Save off leash dog parks!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6522    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sunnyvale, CA 94087  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:51:17  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

Please do not restrict the off-leash areas.

Sincerely,

David Spalding

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6523    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:51:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Thomas D. Sabin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6524    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Big Dogs Inc Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:52:16  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Save off leash parks!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6525    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:52:33  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

---

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6526    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:53:03  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Please allow the dogs to run free on SF!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6527    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sna Francisco , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:53:14  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** We need off leash dog parks in sf! We cannot afford to lose 80,000 acres! Dogs are family and are beneficial to the community. Don't make the community suffer!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6528    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:53:24  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Re: Support of Preferred Alternative F and any Management Plans that includes some voice-command dog walking (including Preferred Alternative A)

I am writing to express my support of Preferred Alternative F and any Alternative Plan that includes some voice-command dog walking (including Preferred Alternative A).

My credentials include&

- President of the North Coast Hockey League, a unit of the Coastsides Youth Association
- 7-year stint as a board member of the Boys and Girls Club of the Coastsides
- ongoing participation in the MidCoast Parks Task force
- long-time contributor to Moss Beach Park efforts

&and my reasons for support of continuing existing policies that include voice-command dog walking include:

- The GGNRA's goals include a diversity of visitor use, and some of the most heavily used areas by locals would be the areas that include voice-command dog walking.
- Local Montara and Moss Beach residents have committed to a self-policing effort regarding dog walking, and are good custodians of the land. They will volunteer to lessen any possible disturbance to wildlife and other park visitors, and remove pet waste as necessary.
- There are site-specific considerations that need to be included in the evaluation, and part of that is the pre-existing tradition of voice-command dog walking on the Rancho Corral de Tierra parcel.
- The GGNRA's goal of preserving and restoring the Rancho Corral de Tierra parcel CAN be accomplished even while permitting off-leash dog walking. Allowing off-leash dog walking would actually still be consistent with the fundamental values for which GGNRA was established.
- Selecting the alternative that includes voice-command dog walking IS possible, due to the very nature that it's one of the alternatives that merits consideration.
- Voice-command dog walking is most consistent with long-held policies within the neighboring community.
- With a parcel the large size of Rancho Corral de Tierra, certainly the GGNRA can find SOME small area - even 0.01% of the size of the parcel - that could be used for off-leash dog walking.
- Half Moon Bay is the urban center of the coast, and is woefully short on active recreational areas. It has closer to .06 acres per 1,000 residents than the national standard of 6 acres per 1,000. The HMB dog park that allows off-leash dog walking is 8 miles away, and does not provide the active dog walking experience that exists on the hilly terrain of Rancho Corral de Tierra.
- Choosing any Preferred Alternative other than F would be a more balanced approach, enabling many types of visitors to enjoy the Rancho Corral de Tierra parcel.
- The research that argues against off-leash dog walking in parks has been subjectively chosen to support the GGNRA's previously stated position against off-leash dog walking.
- With minimal work by the GGNRA, the no-action alternative would have little long-term impact on vegetation and negligible impact on special-status species.

Like many Coastsiders, I am a huge advocate for parks, and active recreation, and for outdoor family activities that include dog walking. When GGNRA officials met several times with the public, they heard overwhelming support for dog walking, plus support for horses and other uses of the park. To address the public's concerns, GGNRA should find a way to implement a plan that allows off-leash dog walking in at least part of the large Rancho Corral de Tierra property.

I encourage you to respect the wishes of the community of the northern Midcoast, which has been known for years to be dog-friendly. Please continue that tradition, and continue the existing management policies that would enable voice-command dog walking on Rancho Corral de Tierra.

Respectfully submitted, -Joel Farbstein, 412 6th St, PO Box 371064, Montara, CA 94037-1064  
jfarbstein@yahoo.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6529	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				

---



**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:53:53  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Hello,

With limited living space in San Francisco, the parks are all we have to exercise our dogs. Playing fetch, going for a run on leash/or off is vital to so majority of dog owners.

The proposed changes will greatly impact the quality of life not only my dog but also myself and family.

Thank you,  
M. McCright

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6530    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** san francisco , CA 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

Brandon Reim

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6531    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94122  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:55:28  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** Don't ban off leash fed parks!! They only benefit the community, don't hurt the community!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6532    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:56:34**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6533 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:56:48**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Dean,

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Berger

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6534 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:56:52

**Correspondence Type:** Web Form

**Correspondence:**

Ocean Beach SPPA

Background

My spouse and I are retired senior citizens. We live a half mile from the Ocean Beach SPPA, two blocks north of Sloat Boulevard. We have a five pound terrier mix dog, Izzy (short for Isadora-ble, but just lost our elderly cocker spaniel, Riley. We are very responsible dog owners; we always walk our dogs on a leash, even when it is permissible to do otherwise.

While I'm originally a second generation San Franciscan, I lived in the Santa Cruz Mountain for 40 years, until moving back to San Francisco 2 years ago. I lived on over three acres on the side near the top of a hill with a distant 220 degree view of almost nothing but trees. We had all kinds of birds: Red Tailed Hawks, Wood Peckers, Stellar and Scrub Jays, Owls, Humming Birds, Wild Turkeys, Turkey Vultures, Great Blue Herons, and we lived in harmony with them. I love nature, I'm also a member of the Sierra Club, and I was a Volunteer Fireman for over 14 years, protecting the woodland and wildland.

A number of people have asked me, "How, could you move from such a beautiful natural setting?" And I say, "Have you ever heard of the Pacific Ocean?" This is one of the primary reasons we moved back here, and now our access to the beach is being threatened.

"The Beach"

Ocean Beach SPPA spans the western boundary of the entire Sunset District, which is one of the most densely populated districts in the city. Therefore one of the advantages of living in the Sunset is having access to this beach; it is mostly a local's beach, because unlike most other beaches there is a lack of dedicated parking. The locals value the fact that is big and not very crowded, this as "our beach," and therefore we are willing to take care of it. Including doing what we can do to help protect the Snowy Plover, if also reasonably access.

Getting our exercise is critical to our wellbeing, and that of our dogs. So we look forward to taking a daily walk to the beach, and can't imagine not taking our leashed dog(s). We walk with other elderly friends who do not have dogs and we are able to socialize and meet new people who live in in the Sunset, and many of those are also senior citizens. For many people this is large part of their only social life.

Poor Alternative

While I understand and support the protection of the Snowy Plover, I do not believe that the preferred Alternative F is reasonable or fair solution:

- It is one sided, and does not consider the needs of responsible dog owners, who may value dogs and birds.

- It penalizes responsible dog owners because of irresponsible dog owners. "It throws the baby out with the bath water." I don't like irresponsible dog owners either, and it is offensive to me to be lumped together with them.

- It does not consider that most of the visitors to this beach are actually locals who live within reasonable walking distance and that to deny them access to the beach would mean, as in our case we would have to drive our car 2.5 miles if we wish to walk on the beach with our leashed dog.

- It also does not consider the beach cannot even be seen from many parts along the Great highway without actually standing on the dunes or bluffs, so responsible dog walkers will have to walk even further just to see the beach.

- It does not consider that more dog walkers, joining bicyclist, and strollers on already crowded paths and or trails creates an unintended consequence which does not appear to be addressed

- It does not consider that most people are not even aware of what you are planning (we have asked a lot

of people about, especially local dog owners and no one else seems to have a clue about what you're doing). You have not really gotten the word out. With this in mind, if this action is taken, you'll need to be prepared for a lot of pushback.

#### Best Alternative

The only fair approach is the moderate solution, which is why my spouse and I support Ocean Beach SPPA Alternative E. On-Leash Dog Walking Only

- It allows on-leash access to responsible dog owners with minor impact to Snowy Plover. And, yes on-leash all- the-time would be less confusing and easier to manage.
- In time, it will eliminate irresponsible dog-owners, through easy to understand signs, with phone numbers to report offenders through use of social media, with stiff progressive fines for repeat offenders (i.e. first warning, then \$250, then \$500, then \$1,000, etc.
- It allows the sense of community that already exists at the beach to continue.
- It will promote more good will than bad. It will make people feel that government agency is really able considers a variety of opinions and moderate their decisions to serve more people.

Best Regards,  
John

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6535	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Alameda, CA 94501				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:57:03				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Dean,				

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer McHugh

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6536	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:57:56  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I've read this report carefully. My conclusions, based on the data provided :

The policy changes will require a significant increase in cost and staff  
The policy changes will not reduce the number of dog attack incidents in the GGNRA.  
The policy changes will significantly reduce public use and enjoyment of the GGNRA spaces.  
The policy changes will be very difficult to enforce. Some civil disobedience is likely.  
The policy changes will have almost no impact on habitats or wildlife in Ft. Mason, Crissy Field, Ft. Point (as there are really no wildlife or habitats in these areas).  
These policy changes will produce some significant unhappiness with the NPS in a city that is normally likely to be filled with strong supporters.  
There are many negatives and very few positives.

I think this is a mistake. Surely, the NPS has better places to focus its efforts, where real good can be done.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6537    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:58:23  
**Correspondence Type:** Web Form  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose Alternative F, your preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGNRA. Instead, I support Alternative A.

The #1 reason I moved to Marin was in order to have space and accessibility to enjoy life with a dog. For the past three years, I have regularly enjoyed time with my dog in a small number of GGNRA areas where they are allowed. I have witnessed behavior of dogs and dog owners hundreds of times at Muir Beach, the Oakwood Valley Trail, the Miwok trail and others, and have seen responsible behavior the vast majority of the time. Your proposed plan is overly restrictive and not grounded in the realities of the southern Marin community. There are tens of thousands of dogs in the area that will need to be exercised. It is not a responsible action to so severely limit dog access in the GGNRA lands, amidst an urban and suburban area, putting undue pressure on a small number of Marin County trails and lands.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely-populated area. Marin residents rely upon this open space. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6538    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 9411  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:58:37**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** ok

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6539 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco , CA 94110  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6540 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,18,2014 23:59:22**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:** I object to the dog management plan, and I feel that the process to develop the plan was not appropriate for this national recreation area.

I have lived in San Francisco for over 35 years. I have had dogs for 20 years and have carefully used all of the areas in both the city and the GGNRA where dogs can be off leash. I follow dog policies in the city so that I can express my views as an informed citizen.

The GGNRA is fundamentally different from a national park. While each share many similarities, the GGNRA is part of an urban area and it has a historical emphasis on recreation uses. Recreation has not been given enough weight in the dog management plan. The proper balance of interests and uses for the GGNRA is not the same as for a national park, where preservation of pristine areas and conservation and protection of the natural environment was the reason for creation of the national park.

The dog management plan fails to adequately acknowledge the GGNRA's location within San Francisco; it lacks integration with other parks and public spaces in the city that are not part of the GGNRA, but are also used by city residents. The too-severe restrictions on off-leash dogs will result in displacement of those dog uses to other city parks. That environmental impact needs to be studied equally with the GGNRA impacts.

When one uses the various places where dogs can be off-leash [and I'm taking it as a given that off-leash activities with dogs cannot at all be replaced by on-leash activities or caged dog runs], it seems obvious that there could be many creative ways in which competing interests could be compromised. The approach to date has been too geared toward picking one advocacy group over another. I have personal experience with the mediation of disputes. A mediator would take a wholly different approach, that I think would be more creative and would result in a plan more responsive to all of the groups advocating on the GGNRA plan.

Related to this, the data collected was too limited. It did not take into account the broader urban area and what would happen in San Francisco, as a whole, if the GGNRA plan is adopted. An approach more similar to mediation of competing interests would lead to data collection that would support compromise. The present approach has been data collection in an attempt by one side to win an argument over another side. This leads to data being used only for argument and not for the practical use of fashioning compromise, whether that compromise is allowing for restricted hours of various uses or uses of various locations on some days or not others. Data collection with the goal of compromise and mediation would improve the end result of the process.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6541	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:59:45				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support the continuation of adequate GGNRA areas that permit walking dogs off leash. This is an important part of our community that is embraced by a large number of our citizens. The ability to exercise one's dog off leash is a cherished activity that must be accommodated in the planning for land use in the GGNRA.				

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6542	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 23:59:53				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Web Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly oppose the proposed 'Regulated Off Leash Area' (ROLA) in the area between Le Conte St. and Tamarind St., Montara in the Rancho Corral de Tierra area of the GGNRA. Reference Alternative 'C' and 'E' of the GGNRA draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS).				

---

A 'dog park' in this location is a very inappropriate use of this land and would significantly degrade the quality of the open space in this area adjacent to the community.

Since it provides direct and easy access this portion of Rancho should be conserved and preserved for the community to enjoy.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6543	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Cerrito, CA 94530 United States of America				

---

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** January 28, 2014

Frank Dean, Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGRA)

Fort Mason, Building 201

San Francisco, CA 92123

Dear Superintendent Dean:

Unable to attend Thursday's meeting, I am writing to convey my views on dog access to the GGNRA. I respect the life of all living creatures.

I am a dog lover who urges that dogs be required at the very least to be on leash when visiting the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Dogs have many places to roam and enjoy being out of doors. They live in peace in the comfort of our homes, where they are

allowed to eat, rest, sleep, and mate, bear and raise their young.

Wild beings do not have those privileges. Indeed, their habitat grows smaller by the minute. They cannot eat, rest, sleep, mate or

bear or raise their young in peace. These wild beings need a voice among us to speak on their behalf.

This dog lover wishes dogs were barred from entering the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. We have many doggie-parks and

other places for our pets.

On the other hand, wild creatures- -Snowy Plovers, Great Blue Heron, and other wild beings- -are limited to habitat that is getting

smaller and smaller.

I urge the reasonable course: do what we need to do to allow wild creatures the safety and comfort of their homes in the GGNRA

while we and our pets let the live in peace in our homes and designated parks.

I'm unable to attend the January 30th meeting, but I thank you for considering my perspective. I very much hope you share it.

Respectfully,

Judith M. Frank

62 Glen Mawr Avenue

El Cerrito, CA 94530

cc: Congresswoman Jackie Speier

SF Supervisor Scott Wiener

Howard Levitt, National Park Service

Marlene Finley, Director of San Mateo County Parks

Phil Ginsburg, General Manager of San Francisco Recreation and Parks

Neal Desai, Field Director of National Parks Conservation Association

Mike Lynes, Golden Gate Audubon Society

Bob Planthold, Disability Access Advocate

Martha Walters, Crissy Field Dog Group

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6544    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---



**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:** MARY-LYNN GARRETT

50 Southwood Drive

San Francisco, CA 94112

marylynngarrett@yahoo.com

January 24, 2014

General Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Building 201, Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Re: Draft Dog Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Esteemed Superintendent,

My name is Mary-Lynn. I am a San Francisco resident for over 20 years now living in the Ingleside district. I am a mom to Delilah, my first dog and daughter. We make use of Fort Funston and Ocean Beach every week as a crucial part of our health and wellbeing regimen. I am a member of the National Park Foundation and a social worker devoted to working with people with disabilities. I am very concerned about preserving the areas that my family and I as well as my clients have to enjoy with their entire families including their dog family-members.

In regards to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, I am primarily concerned about the lack of specificity and documentation of the negative impacts dogs have on the areas. I am often impressed with how well within the areas are organized by the GGNRA to limit the negative human and pet impact on the areas. I keep myself and my dog out of designated protected areas and observe that other visitors do the same out of respect, enjoyment and desire to preserve the GGNRA and what it offers us every time we visit. If the negative environmental impact can be better measured and specified, I am confident that dog-owners can better participate in reducing or eliminating that impact while preserving off-leash privileges.

Additionally, I believe the plan can become more focused in proposing more feasible alternatives in terms of preserving the natural resources in conjunction with our recreational enjoyment of the areas for ALL visitors- those with dogs and without. I understand some visitors have been having excessive, unacceptable and lasting effects to some of the sites; improved education and signage are two ways to significantly impact their impact.

It is so crucial to me and my family that we utilize the GGNRA sites with the regularity and freedom we currently do. There are so many benefits to us as a whole that are at our doorstep despite living in an urban area. It improves my mental health, physical health, commitment to my community and motivation to think forward of our shared responsibility to make it as available and pristine as it is for us now. I really seek ways that my disabled clients can better reap those benefits with improved access and outreach efforts. It is immeasurable how the GGNRA sites aid and support me, my family, and the city as a whole. I look forward to an improved plan that preserves the privileges we currently have, expands access to more visitors and perfects environmental preservation. Please considerable the no action alternative.

Sincerely,

Mary-Lynn Garrett

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6545 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Dear Superintendent Dean,

I, Mary Gregory, have been a resident of San Francisco for 57 years and Stinson Beach in Marin County for 51 (first as a child and now as a homeowner.) For 54 of my 59 years of age, my family and/or I have owned dogs: dachshunds, a basset hound, and labradors.

I have walked often at Crissy Field with my dogs precisely because it is located in an urban environment and is used by so many for casual and formal recreation. I also walk my dog frequently at Stinson Beach, and in both places, I am acutely aware of protecting wildlife while giving my dogs the exercise that they and I need.

I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dog in the near future. Additionally, the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years for come. I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy.

This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo counties. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released.

Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I really think that this shows that the GGNRA has an on-going, knee-jerk, indefensible bias against dogs and once again has not even bothered to properly research this issue. Or, realizing that it has very little evidence to stand on, the GGNRA is just trotting out the same old unconvincing arguments.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

Sincerely,  
Mary L. Gregory

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6546    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94121  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,03,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** GGNRA Superintendent

Bldg. 201

Fort Mason, San Francisco, CA 94123

Attn: SEIS

Dear Sir/Madam,

My wife is 72 years old and weighs 110 pounds. Recently she got charged by a 50-60 pound dog in the Sutro Heights Park. The owners tried to call it back but it ignored them. I had to fend it off with my walking stick until the owners could get it on a leash. Dogs are supposed to be on-leash in this park, but most dog owners let them run free.

Also in the Sutro Heights Park, I once got surrounded by three little dogs, the kind that yap at you insanely. The owner did not even try to call them off until I started to phone the police.

In the Marin Headlands out above Rodeo beach, my friends and I-all old people-got charged by four aggressive dogs. One of my friends, aged 78, lifted his coat above his head to make himself look bigger, and charged back. The dogs scattered.

Once I was walking near the Octagon just below the VA hospital when I was charged at by five or six little yapping dogs. The owner was not able to get them under control for a long time.

All this has happened in the last five or six years. I think that as I get older, dogs sense my frailty and attack. Now I have to carry a walking stick for fear of being bitten. You will see a lot of old people carrying walking sticks, and in some cases, golf clubs. Having to go armed takes a lot of the joy out of walking. More often old people simply stop walking in the parks. This is a shame because when you get old, walking is about the only exercise you have left.

Not one of the owners of the dogs which attacked me apologized. To a dog owner who loves his or her pet, the fact that a dog attacks someone is hard to understand. An example of this is Marjorie Knoller, a highly educated San Francisco woman who watched her dog tear Diane Whipple, a neighbor, to shreds. Nonetheless, Ms. Knoller continued to believe that her dog was "gentle and loving and affectionate." She said so in court(1) and the judge said that this was the only time during her trial when he

believed she was being sincere.

Not all dog owners are like this, but enough are to make walking in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area dangerous and unpleasant for old people. So I would like to ask you to try to separate the dogs and their owners from the rest of us, so we can walk in peace.

Very truly yours,

Robert Hanenberg

1 Supreme Court of California, People vs. Knoller, SI 34543, Filed 5/31/07.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6547    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Jan,28,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Jennifer Harden

210 Royal Palm Ave

Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

---

82soiljen@gmail.com

Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Fort Mason, Bldg 201

San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Attn: SEIS

Dear Superintendent Dean,

Thank you for extending the comment period regarding dog walking in GGNRA. I live next to part of the new Rancho Tierra and have done so for 32 years.

As this is a recreation area and not a preservational park setting, I believe that the community would be well served by perpetuating on-leash dog walking throughout the GGNRA and that selected sites should be

recognized for voice-control dog walking as well. A few other points and suggestions:

1. I bring to your attention this phrase regarding Rancho:

"Historically, although off-leash dog walking was not officially sanctioned by the previous private owner, off-leash use occurred frequently." This statement is weak in its portrayal of historic use because 1) POST (Peninsula Open Space Trust) was the landowner for only about 13 of the past 32 years; their policies of dog walking were not clearly posted throughout that period. For the preceding 20 years, there have been NO OBJECTIONS posted or otherwise by landowners to dog walking by voice control. This was not just negligence on the part of the previous landowners - I was in touch with each of them because of my sustained lease of pasture for horses.

My point: your premise of "Historically" is biased to a minor portion of our history, rather the majority of time supported voice-control dog walking. A more accurate portrayal of our historic use would be "Historically, off-leash dog walking was highly used and valued in two concentrated areas"

2. Being a good neighbor is important for government agencies now buying up so much land for future generations. Presenting an agency to a local community on behalf of a federal agency is particularly problematic. My personal experience of your moving in LITERALLY next door is that the burden of newcomers has so far outweighed any privileges. Conceptually it would be great to use US regulations to protect local citizen's interests and values rather than to marginalize them with the logic that they represent

such a small part of the federal constituency. This COULD be done with the use of buffer zones or buffer times\* that accommodate privacy and the local, historic values of your neighbors.

My point: seek methods, places, and ways to accommodate the dog-walking community in ways that are expansive and protective of their interests. Ask them to embrace your plan and partner with you in regulating it. This would require your reconsidering your current "preferred alternative" - give us some room, opportunity, circumstance to allow voice-control walking. As a minimum, do this in places that operate voice-control historically (where you have indicated leash-only on your maps)

3. A workable concept might be \*buffer times, in which you allow voice-control dog walking within an hour or two of sunrise and sunset, thereby allowing a controlled opportunity for locals. I suggest this because it recognizes a basic respect for neighbors' burden and opportunity.

Respectfully,

Jennifer Harden

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6548	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

---

**Correspondence:** February 7, 2014

Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Fort Mason

Building 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent,

My name is Pamela Aden and I am a physical therapist living and working in San Francisco. I am writing to you because GGNRA must mandate that all off leash dogs be kept in very limited (and fenced in) areas of the National Parks here in the Bay Area.

I've written to you in the past detailing 2 injuries I sustained due to off leash dogs. One injury left me w / a labral tear of my hip, fractured hand and torn abdominal muscles and I was unable to work for 5 months. The second injury happened when a "friendly" high spirited dog lunged at me and it's claw drew blood all the way down my leg. Over the past several years, I've watched as dog owners took over Crissy Field with little intervention by the Park Police to enforce existing leash laws because they are scared of confrontation w / dog owners. Active people like myself fear being hit by a pack of dogs running off leash at high rates of speed; I can't imagine what would happen to the elderly or the very young should they be caught in the path of such unrestrained force. The worst are the dog walkers who bring down 8-10 dogs at a time to run and somehow believe they are in control.

If GGNRA would construct fenced in parks for large and small dogs it would protect the public, environment and the dogs from harm. Also, let the dog owners contribute some additional cash for the damage their animals cause to the landscape by paying a small fee to use the off leash areas ~~at Crissy Field~~ this would be designated exclusively for upkeep of the area. How many times do I see dogs defecating on the Crissy Field beach without their owners cleaning up after them?

Owning a dog in the city requires dog owners to give up their idea that dogs should just "run free. If that is their priority move to the country, but don't put the rest of us at risk just so they can be lazy and not exercise their leashed animals properly.

Once again I believe that owning a dog is a RESPONSIBILITY, not a right.

Thank you for your consideration.

Pamela Aden

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6549    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA NA  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** February 14, 2014

to: ggNra

I am writing because Dogs and Dog Walkers Keep parks safe and all dogs need to get exercise if they

---

don't the dogs might misbehave. there's no proof that dogs are causing damage. people want to have fun with there dogs. not all dog owners are iressponsible and dogs need to run around and have fun with other dogs. the new law is unfair. the new law should be aldogs should were leash and go every were.  
From: Maurice Ali

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6550    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Grass Valley, CA 95949  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Park Form

**Correspondence:** Dear Frank Dean, General Superintendent Golden Gate National Recreation Area

It is a travesty to wildlife and their shrinking habitat that dogs are allowed to roam at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Dogs on leash areas are a farce. A large proportion of dog owners let their canines run free no matter what the rules are. Leash compliance on Ocean Beach is less than 30%! secure fenced area is where dogs should go to play so that dogs do not have the chance kill, maim, chase, or otherwise harass birds, wildlife and unsuspecting humans. The hard-wired canine instinct is to seek, chase, and kill prey. There are other users of GGNRA besides dog owners and dogs, many of whom want to enjoy our National Park without the disturbance of somebodys barking dog running down birds. Many people visit GGNRA to picnic, hike, walk view wildlife, and simply enjoy nature and the beauty of the ocean. GGNRA is the only national park with off-leash zones. Un-leashed dogs and wildlife are not compatible and should be kept physically separated In our national parks. The following excerpts are quoted directly from the NPS strategic plan: (NPS wording is in bold lettering, my comment is in parentheses.)

Since our 1916 creation, the National Park Service has preserved many of Americas finest treasures and made them accessible to millions of visitors. (Dogs are not the visitors the NPS is referring to, by any stretch of the rules. - my comment)  
Parks show us wonders, both natural and historical, that grace our lives and provide us cherished experiences.

Category I goals - Preserve Park Resources - reflect the NPS 1918 Organic Act  
SC conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein.

Category II goals - Provide for the Public Enjoyment and Visitor Experience of Parks - reflect the NPS Organic Act mandate to provide for the enjoyment of the [resources] In such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

#### MISSION STATEMENT

The National Park Service preserves unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. The Park Service cooperates with partners to extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation throughout this country and the world.

GGNRA has gone too far accommodating dogs and their humans. Please use diligence and common sense to protect our wildlife and peaceful beaches. Please use the NPS goals and mission statement to safeguard our natural resources, not trample and abuse them.

Sincerely,

A concerned Californian

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6551    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Attn: SEIS Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area,  
Fort Mason, Building 201, San Francisco, CA 94123

â€ I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors. Additionally, please include the following comments regarding Commercial Dog Walkers using the GGNRA for commercial business:

â€ Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

â€ Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Please help to regulate this fast growing industry. As a resident of San Francisco, I am concerned about the aggressive nature of commercial dogwalkers and their sense of entitlement over resources which should be shared and enjoyed by everyone. People who go to enjoy the wonderful natural areas which are the gems of our modern society don't necessarily want to be bombarded by a gaggle of dogs. Often, these groups are led by a single person, who is motivated by profit and not the safety and comfort of those around them. I

urge you to regulate this and I

applaud you for considering this measure. It's a relief to know that I

might be able to enjoy the natural areas with protection for myself and the wildlife who call this region their home. They need your support. I was very

distressed to see the photo of an unrestrained dog aggressively pursuing a great grey heron. This is

unacceptable! The Dog Management Plan is exactly what we need.

Thanks for your support,  
Sharon Arnold (native San Franciscan)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6552    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Attn: SEIS Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area,  
Fort Mason, Building 201, San Francisco, CA 94123

â€ I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

Additionally, please include the following comments regarding Commercial Dog Walkers using the GGNRA for commercial business:

â€ Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

â€ Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Please help to regulate this fast growing industry. As a resident of San Francisco, I am concerned about the aggressive nature of commercial dogwalkers and their sense of entitlement over resources which should be shared and enjoyed by everyone. People who go to enjoy the wonderful natural areas which are the gems of our modern society don't necessarily want to be bombarded by a gaggle of dogs. Often, these groups are led by a single person, who is motivated by profit and not the safety and comfort of those around them. I urge you to regulate this and I applaud you for considering this measure. It's a relief to know that I might be able to enjoy the natural areas with protection for myself and the wildlife who call this region their home. They need your support. I was very distressed to see the photo of an unrestrained dog aggressively pursuing a great grey heron. This is unacceptable! The Dog Management Plan is exactly what

---



we need.

Thanks for your support,

Karen Arnold (native San Franciscan)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6553    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Attn: SEIS Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area,

Fort Mason, Building 201, San Francisco, CA 94123

Part one: General info from Jake Sigg Newsletter:

â€ I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

â€ I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

Additionally, please include the following comments regarding Commercial Dog Walkers using the GGNRA for commercial business:

â€ Commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

â€ Commercial dog walking will provide no service or benefit to any park users, will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the American public.

Part : Below are my personal comments:

Please help to regulate this fast growing industry. As a resident of San Francisco, I'ts not fair that we can't enjoy the parks with this many dogs running around unsupervised. I want to be able to enjoy myself when I go out in nature and not have so many dogs at once. There are too many dogs per person and they are off the leash. There are a lot of people who don't have dogs and they deserve to enjoy the park too. The wild animals in the Nati. Rec area are getting a raw deal too. I was upset to see the photo of an unrestrained dog aggressively pursuing a great grey heron. This is unacceptable! The Dog Management Plan is exactly what we need.

Why should their business get free land to operate while others have to pay and get licences, etc? Who suffers because of this? The wildlife and other parkgoers who want to have a peaceful day in nature.

Thanks for your support,  
Ian Arnold-Eitz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6554    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 15,2014  
Michael Austin  
151 Lucas Park Drive  
San Rafael, California 94903  
Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason  
Building 201  
San Francisco, California 94123  
Dog Policy

Dear Superintendent,

I am distressed to again see efforts to reduce recreational areas for dogs - a reduction that, in fact, means reduced recreational experience for our family as we have a dog and a child that are bound together. My nine year old daughter likes going places with her dog. We already encounter a near impossibility to go camping because of leash restrictions - how can a dog and a child run together when one of them is on a six foot leash? The simple fact is kids and dogs were meant to run - the entire purpose of the land set aside we are talking about is captured in the name "Recreation". In the Golden Gate Recreation Area we are restricted to a relatively small portion of it if we wish to include the dog: it is not too surprising that we express a strong position to any further restrictions.

I do support areas where no dogs are permitted - there are people who are not comfortable around dogs and should have spaces free of them. East Beach comes to mind ' it seems to me there should be a section where dogs are banned.

While GGRA has a responsibility to save local species, the GGRA is not a wild preserve. In the first place its location next to one of the most densely populated areas in the country would make this impractical and I think would be at direct odds with its purpose as a recreation area. You need to think how crazy it is that families with dogs - and dogs are family members that play an important role in the family dynamic - to be forced with a decision between leaving the dog at home or watching a dog suffer at the end of a leash when it wants to run and listening to a child asking why she cannot play with her intimate pal or simply writing off the largest open space in the vicinity as 'forbidden'.

Finally - just where do you expect the dogs can go to run. Anyone that has been around them knows they play and that means running and exploring without a leash.

Respectfully,  
Michael Austin  
415 730-7207

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6555    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 5, 2014  
Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94 123-0022  
Subject: Public Comments on the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS

Dear Mr. Dean:

I hereby submit the following additional concerns and comments on the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS regarding the proposed Preferred Alternative for the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System located in San Mateo County:

1) I am a Pacifica resident who has been using the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System for over 6 years. I typically hike and run the trails 4 days a week with my dog on-leash between the Mori Ridge Trail located at the base of Shelldance Nursery and Portola Discovery Site or SFPUC Portola Gate (Please Note: the Mori Ridge Trail is mistakenly labeled as the Sweeney Ridge Trail in the Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS Alternatives Maps). I am fully in support of continued multi-use of the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System for all uses including dog walking (leash only), hiking, trail running, mountain biking, horseback riding, wildlife watching, etc. I am opposed to GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan's revised Preferred Alternative (Alternative F), which would ban on-leash dog walking on portions of the Cattle Hill I Sweeney Ridge Trail System (including Mori Ridge Trail located at the base of Shelldance Nursery). Alternative F is still too restrictive and severely limits the community of Pacifica's use of the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System for on-leash dog walking purposes. My preference would be for Plan adoption of Alternative A (Map 19-A), which would allow continued multi-use (including on-leash dog walking) throughout the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System. I would also support Plan adoption of Alternative E (Map 19-E) since it includes Mori Ridge Trail for authorized on-leash dog walking. I would like to reiterate, based on my experiences using the Cattle Hill! Sweeney Ridge Trail System, that this trail system (including Mori Ridge Trail) is appropriate for continued multi-use purposes for the following reasons:

a) The trail system's existing ranch/paved roads are wide enough to support multi-use purposes and avoid user conflicts.

b) The trail system's existing ranch/paved roads are surrounded by extremely dense coastal scrub habitat, which serves to prevent and deter trail users (including dogs) from going off-trail and impacting sensitive habitat.

c) The GGNRA maintains the trail system's existing ranch/paved roads on an annual basis through re-grading of the roads and clearance of overgrown vegetation on either side of the roads. Currently, the GGNRA is in the process of clearing overgrown vegetation within the trail system. On Mori Ridge Trail, I have witnessed trimming of overgrown vegetation (including coastal scrub) up to 4

feet on either side of the trail. This annual maintenance surely causes more impacts to sensitive habitat along this trail system than trail users (including dogs).

d) The GGNRA makes no clear distinction between on-leash dog walking, mountain biking, horseback riding, or hiking regarding their intensity of use. Therefore, it would be unreasonable to limit or favor one type of use over another.

2) Based on my comments in item I above, can you explain why Alternative A (Map 19-A) or Alternative E (Map I 9-E) would not be suitable as the Preferred Alternative in order to avoid use conflicts and protect sensitive habitat from trail user degradation?

3) I previously submitted comments on the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan/EIS in a letter dated April 26, 2011. This letter focused on the Sweeney Ridge Trail System in San Mateo County and provided detailed comments regarding my trail use experience, problems with the very restrictive preferred alternative, and inaccuracies/discrepancies contained in the analysis of the EIS. My letter is documented in Appendix A of the Public Comment Summary Report for the GGNRA Dog Management Plan/EIS dated September 2011 as Correspondence 2295 (first letter within the Appendix). I was disheartened to find out that none of my comments were adequately addressed in the Supplemental EIS, and that it appears that none of my comments would be responded to on an individual basis. It was my understanding, per Appendix A of this document, that "this appendix contains letters coded differently than others due to the nature of the comments. These letters were not assigned codes as the majority of the letters contained detailed comments referring to specific text within the Draft EIS. Instead responses will be prepared for each letter individually." I

am requesting that the GGNRA explain why they did not follow through with responding to the correspondence contained in Appendix A on an individual basis. I

am also requesting that the GGNRA reconsider my previous comments as they are valid to the construct of the Dog Management Plan and Supplemental EIS as it pertains to the Cattle Hill / Sweeney Ridge Trail System in San Mateo County (attached is my previous comment letter for your reference).

Please feel free to contact me via email at bcbecker13gmail.com if you have any questions regarding my concerns and comments. I would also like to request that you continue to place me on your mailing list so that I may receive notifications of future public hearings and updates regarding the GGNRA Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS.

Sincerely,  
Brett Becker, AICP  
Pacifica Resident and Sweeney Ridge Trail User  
Cc: Congresswoman Jackie Speier  
155 Bovet Rd., Suite 780  
San Mateo, CA 94402

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6556	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Moss Beach, CA 94038 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Decesion Makers,				

---

I am writing in expressing my desires that as much of the park land bordering Moss Beac and Montata be left as they were before the park came into existence. This is very personel to me since I am a long time resident of this area, some 40 years, with a very good portion of those years spent walking my dogs. In that time frame there have been very few problems that I am aware of.

I would like to point out that in my point of view, and a very important point I think, is that there are Two types of National Parks. First of all there are urban-area parks and I believe these parks should be more relaxed when it comes to rules about dogs. Parks of the second kind, rural of wilderness, could be more restrictive about rules for dogs.

I would also like to point out an honest observation. First of all there are alot of dog owners that walk their dogs in the Moss Beach - Montara area. Secondly, believe it or not, you are more likely to encounter a dog walker on these trails than any other kind of recreational user. Also dog walking is a legitimate form of recreation. Walking is healthy for the dog as well as the owne

I am aware that the environment is fragile. I also would like to see as little damage in an environmental sense to this area in order to preserve its beauty. Why single out dogs a the enemy numero uno? Just look what cars and over crowding have done to Yosemite Valley here in California. Why single out dogs as damaging when horses and mountain bikers and excess use by hikers can also damage the terrain?

It is my hope that dog walkers and ordinary visitors can co-exist peacefully on the trails of the GGNRA area of Moss Beach and Montara  
Please give the dogs as much area as you possibly can here.

Best Regards,  
Roberta Kenneth Bergenson  
PO Box 534  
Moss Beach, Ca 94038  
email - Keb05@sbeglobal.net

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6557	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Superintendent Frank Dean -				

Enclosed please find my comments on the Draft Dog Management plan that I sent to Supervisor Farrell, Senator Dianne Feinstein and Representative Pelosi.  
Please consider these as comments to you on the plan from me-  
Thank you-  
Isabelle Beekman

Hello Mr. Farrell.  
My name is Isabelle Beekman.  
I live in Pacific Heights in San Francisco.  
I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative Plan for GGNRA lands..  
My husband and I take our dog to Crissy Field four days a week where we walk him off leash.  
We "work" our dog: sitting, staying, heeling, coming, are rewarded by a ball thrown into the water or along the beach. Over the 25 years we have been going to Crissy, we have seen people

with dogs, families with young children, and water sports enthusiasts happily recreating alongside each other.

As part of the GGNRA, Crissy Field was set up to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" in the City of San Francisco. The new plan seeks to change people recreating at places like Crissy Field, to their experiencing a national park. We do not need a national park in the City of San Francisco. We need to recreate.

Moreover, this new plan ignores comments from dog walkers on an earlier version with no justification. Furthermore, assumptions made by the new plan regarding the impacts of off leash dogs are not based on any scientific studies. There is no scientific evidence that off leash dog walking has had any negative effects on GGNRA lands.

In summary, I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative Plan. This plan is unresponsive to previous criticisms; it is not based on science; and most importantly, it seeks a "national park experience" on lands that were intended to be used for recreational purposes, including off leash dog walking.

Thank you so much for listening to my family's opinion on this plan. We hope you will oppose it too.

Most sincerely,  
Isabelle Beekman

Dear Ms. Pelosi,

My name is Isabelle Beekman, I live on Washington Street near the Presidio.

I strongly oppose the Park Service Preferred Alternative plan, in part because it seeks to limit off leash dog walking.

There are many benefits to off-leash dog walking. My husband and I have been walking our dogs at Crissy Field for twenty-seven years. We are usually there four days a week, working our dog: heeling, staying and coming exercises are rewarded by a throw of the ball along the beach, or into the water. Crissy Field is an ideal space for off-leash walks. It is large and away from roads. On any day you can see families with young children, wind surfers, and people with dogs happily mingling in the same space. As part of the GGNRA, Crissy Field was set up to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" in the city of San Francisco. "Recreational" is the operative word here. The new Preferred Alternative Plan seeks to change people recreating at places like Crissy Field, to their experiencing a national park. We do not need a national park in the city of San Francisco. We need to recreate.

Moreover, in the new plan, previous comments by dog walkers on an earlier version of the plan are completely ignored with no justification. Furthermore, assumptions made by the new plan regarding the impacts of off leash dogs are not based on any scientific studies. There is no scientific evidence that off leash dog walking has had any negative effects on GGNRA lands.

In summary, I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative Plan. This plan is irresponsible to previous criticisms, it is not based on science, but most importantly, it seeks a "national park experience" on lands that were intended to be used for recreational purposes, including off-leash dog walking.

Most Sincerely,  
Isabelle Beekman

Dear Senator Feinstein,

My name is Isabelle Beekman; I live on Washington Street near the Presidio in San Francisco.

I strongly oppose the Park Service Preferred Alternative plan, in part because it seeks to limit off leash dog walking.

There are many benefits to off-leash dog walking. My husband and I have been walking our dogs at Crissy Field for twenty-seven years. We are usually there four days a week, working our dog: heeling, staying and coming exercises are rewarded by a throw of the ball along the beach, or into the water. Crissy Field is an ideal space for off-leash walks. It is large and away from roads. On any day you can see families with young children, wind surfers, and people with dogs happily mingling in the same space.

As part of the GGNRA, Crissy Field was set up to "provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space" in the city of San Francisco. "Recreational" is the operative word here. The new Preferred Alternative Plan seeks to change people recreating at places like Crissy Field, to their experiencing a national park. We do not need a national park in the city of San Francisco. We need to recreate. Moreover, in the new plan, previous comments by dog walkers on an earlier version of the plan are completely ignored with no justification. Furthermore, assumptions made by the new plan regarding the impacts of off leash dogs are not based on any scientific studies. There is no scientific evidence that off leash dog walking has had any negative effects on GGNRA lands. In summary, I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative Plan. This plan is irresponsible to previous criticisms, it is not based on science, but most importantly, it seeks a "national park experience" on lands that were intended to be used for recreational purposes, including off-leash dog walking. Most Sincerely,  
Isabelle Beekman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6558    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA NA  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To: GGNRA

I'm writing this letter about Dogs need exercise I think bog need to exercise because the owners need to exercise to and the dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe. Also not all dogwalkers are irresponsible And you could change the policy for the dogs and owners.  
With Love  
a stubent,  
Eaiyn Benitez.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6559    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rarael, CA 94901  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Attn: SEIS

Re: The GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

Dear Mr. Dean:

I am writing to oppose the Preferred Alternative. I reside in San Rafael and regularly take my two dogs to Crissy Field, Fort Fusion, Ocean Beach and other parts of the GGNRA. The Preferred Alternative is overly restrictive. The draft plan/SEIS fails to factually justify the necessity of a major overhaul of existing policies.

The Bay Area has a huge need for off-leash dog areas, without fences. Such areas should be increased, not decreased. Moreover, the erection of fences around off-leash areas will make them feel like pens and will those who use them feel unwelcome. Dog walkers and their animals need large open areas to recreate in the increasingly urbanized Bay Area.

The draft plan/SEIS is fundamentally flawed because it is not supported by empirical evidence. It relies on pure conjecture in speculating that dogs "could" or "might" cause environmental or other harm to specific areas of the GGNRA.

It also fails to acknowledge the self-evident fact that by restricting off-leash activity in the GGNRA, the draft plan/SEIS will force dog owners and their pets into smaller and less available city dog parks, which will become more congested and increase potential conflicts.

I urge you to reject the Preferred Alternative and, instead, expand the number and square footage of off-leash spaces in the GGNRA.

Sincerely yours,

Joel Yodowitz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6560    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA NA  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To: GGNRA

I'm writing  
I want dogs to be free.  
Dogs need exercise (so do I)  
50% of homes in SF have dogs  
Dogs and dogwalkers keeps parks safe  
Not all dog owners are irresponsible  
A dog that does not exercise will become misbehaved  
Dogs need places to go  
Dogs want life they want to live  
They always want freedom  
We need people to respect dogs and clean their messes  
We all love dogs.  
Why do dogs never get to go to places?  
Are dogs dangerous for people?  
Thank you for your time,  
Arwen Benitez

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6561    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Piedmont, CA 94611  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

---



**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean  
General Superintendent, GGNRA  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
RE: Dog Management Plan/Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Dean:

I am writing regarding the draft Dog Management Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I frequently use and enjoy the GGNRA lands and am concerned about impacts from dog-related recreation on wildlife, habitats and other park users.

The GGNRA has more federally-listed endangered and threatened species than any other National Park in the United States! Biologists have documented how dog-related recreation is harming wildlife and their habitats. On Ocean Beach and in other parts of the GGNRA, dog walkers follow leash requirements less than 30% of the time-meaning the vast majority of dogs in the park are off-leash and are not kept on voice-control. Every year, there are hundreds of incidents of dog attacks on wildlife, people and other dogs in the GGNRA.

The National Park Services mission is to manage its lands to protect them for users for all time and to allow recreation only to the extent that it does not harm the park resources. Management of dogs in the GGNRA is essential to ensure that the park remains healthy, sustainable, and enjoyable by all visitors.

I strongly encourage you to improve the plan by implementing the following:

1. Require all Regulated Off-leash Areas to be fenced, at least in areas where fences do not pose risks to wildlife and habitats. Fences provide more security for all park users and create clearer boundaries so that dog owners are aware of how to comply with park rules.
2. Close some GGNRA trails in San Francisco entirely to dogs. Under the current plan, nearly every trail in San Francisco-more than 21 miles-is open to dogs (on- or off-leash), meaning no trails are available for people who want to enjoy the outdoors without interacting with dogs. We also know that where on-leash dogs are allowed, it is common to see many off-leash dogs.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Dog Management Plan. I encourage you to adopt the best measures to protect the National Parks valuable resources for everyone and for future generations.

Sincerely,  
Marjorie Blackwell

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6562	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Larkspur, CA 94977 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a longtime hiker in the Golden Gate Recreational Parks and in other open spaces, I have noticed more and more the presence of dogs				

---

on and off leash in areas where it is marked NO PETS or NO DOGS.

Frequently dogs run after wild animals and horses without being called by their owners. Several times barking dogs have jumped on me with dirty paws and the owner responding to my request to hold their animal was, "It is a friendly dog". surprisingly frequently dog owners do not pickup waste left by their dog.

It is reasonable and wise that a small number of trails should accomodate dogs, but more trails should be free of pets and dogs, and enforcement applied.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6563    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Larkspur, CA 94977-0066

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dogs and dog owners are increasingly polluting the hiking and walking and running landscape. Stepping on dog poop is an every week, and sometimes every day occurrence. Exercising, yoga, circuit training, playing catch, kicking the soccer ball, playing frisbee, are mightily constrained by the presence of dogs and dog poop. Dog owners and walkers do forget to clean up after their animals.

Cryptosporidiosis proliferates.. dog barking has an unpleasant ring...dogs frighten away deer...let's eliminate dogs in public spaces.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6564    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Belvedere, CA 94920

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Edgar Peters Bowron and I live in Belvedere, California. I have been visiting GGNRA lands, specifically Crissy Field, Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Trail, Muir Beach, and Stinson Beach, for the past

thirteen years. I exercise there with my dog off leash and under voice control both for my own health as well as the health of my pet.

I oppose the preferred alternative for these areas because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the 2013 SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a recreation area for a densely populated, urban area, not a national park. The GGNRA was built and designed for dog walking from its inception, to better the quality of life of San Francisco metropolitan residents by making dog walking a well-established

priority. In fact, Congressional reports at the time referred to dog walking specifically as one of the uses for the space when the GGNRA was created.

Moreover, in my experience, many of these areas are utilized primarily by dog walkers and not by visitors without dogs. Take Oakwood Valley Fire Road and Trail, for example. I often make note of the people I meet on the trail and irrespective of day of the week or time of day, approximately only two of

every ten visitors are accompanied by a dog. When I count the visitors with and without dogs on the actual beach at Crissy Field, as opposed to the bike and walking path, a similar ratio prevails. After 2-1/2 years in review, the 2013 SEIS was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the DEIS released in 2011, opposing the proposals in that plan by a margin of 3:1. Moreover, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The SEIS document admits there are few scientific, peer-reviewed studies that show how these areas are affected by the presence of dogs (e.g., on vegetation and soils, p. 375), and instead cites anecdotal observations made by National Park Service staff. However, such anecdotal claims have no validity and cannot be used to set policy. I would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site-specific peer-reviewed studies (as required by law) before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land.

The SEIS does not provide the results of public comment on the DEIS (neither does the "Response to DEIS Comments by the GGNRA" document on the GGNRA website). You say you received over 4,700 comments, but do not specify how many respondents opposed restrictions on dog walking and how many supported them. The SEIS reads: "NPS received many public comments complaining that dog use precluded their enjoyment of areas (p. 100)." But there's no indication of how many negative comments were actually made. Are they from a small minority or are they widespread? An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that the vast majority (at least 3: 1) supported dog walking. This is not reflected in the SEIS. Rather, a community forum or roundtable should be set up to evaluate management going forward, including dog walkers and other GGNRA users.

Instead of curtailing off-leash privileges, the GGNRA could institute a dog "green tag" system ' which certifies dogs and their owners to use the area. Irresponsible dog owners should have their privileges suspended, instead of all people losing access to a particular dog walking area.

In conclusion, I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive- -there is no justification in the SEIS for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy as well as off-leash access on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. And, I urge the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Edgar Peters Bowron  
318 Bella Vista Avenue  
Belvedere, CA 94920

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6565	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94901 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,05,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, General SUperintendent Golden Gate National Reacreation Area Fort Mason, Building 201 San Francisco, CA 94123 Attn: SEIS				

Re: The GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

Dear Mr. Dean:

I am writing to oppose the Preferred Alternative. I live in San Rafael and have for years regularly taken my two dogs to Crissy Field and other parts of the GGNRA. The Preferred Alternative is overly restrictive. The draft plan/ SEIS fails to factually justify the necessity of a major overhaul of existing policies, let alone the draconian restrictions suggested.

The draft plan/SEIS does not present any site-specific evidence that dogs cause problems or environmental damage. The Supplemental Plan, like the prior Draft Plan, lists purely hypothetical impacts and damage that "could", "may", or "might" happen, but does not provide any credible scientific evidence that any of those impacts ever actually occurred in the GGNRA, or are occurring now. Mere conjecture does not provide a legal basis for valid rulemaking.

The draft plan/SEIS also overlooks the commonsense fact that by severely limiting the off-leash space in the GGNRA, dog owners and their pets will be squeezed into much smaller municipal park areas of local communities, which will increase potential conflicts and negative impacts. This is also true of forcing people with dogs into much smaller areas within the GGNRA itself.

The Bay Area has a huge need for off-leash dog areas, without fences. Such areas should be increased, not decreased. Moreover, the erection of fences around off-leash areas would make them feel like pens and will make those who use them feel unwelcome. Dog walkers and their animals need large open areas to recreate in the increasingly urbanized Bay Area.

I urge you to reject the Preferred Alternative and, instead, expand the number and square footage of off-leash space in the GGNRA.

Sincerely yours,

Shannon S. Yodowitz

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6566	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94107 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To: Frank Dean:				

I attended Congrw J. Spier's meeting at Stern Grove and am dismayed at both the lack of factual analysis and disregard for the needs of Californians by the GGNRA regarding recreation with our dogs.

Please stop this most exclusive plan & at minimum do the work, outlined below.

San Franciscans do have the right to reclaim GGNRA land if you restrict or deny access to us.

Susannah Bruder

\*Keep all off leash access reinstated off leash at Rancho Corral de Tierra.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6567	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94112 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

---

**Correspondence:** Superintendent, GGRNA  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Attn: Dog Management

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing to express my support for the GGNRA Dog Management proposals. I support Preferred Alternative F in the categories listed in the SEIS.

In the years that this debate has been going on, I have never been persuaded that we need a different set of rules for "urban" parks than we have for "wilderness" parks. It seems to me that the heavy use of urban parks by surrounding populations requires more safeguarding not less. That said - the compromise that I am willing to make is that dogs off-leash be allowed in some areas but not all areas. Balance doesn't mean that 50% of GGNRA should be off-leash dog areas.

The fact that Marin County Board of Supervisors has labeled this a "defacto dog ban" policy and that Congresswoman Speier considers the plan "unacceptable" makes it clear that no amount of discussion will change the minds of those who want to be able to walk their dogs where they want. So I hope whatever plan is eventually approved will include the enforcement procedures that will ensure compliance.

I was 12 years old when my parents took my sister, a cousin, and me on a two month camping trip from Pennsylvania, where we lived, to the 1962 Seattle World's Fair. We visited many magnificent sites that were administered by the National Park Service. It is an experience that planted in my heart an appreciation for the diversity of the natural beauty of our country. It is why I believe the the GGNRA needs to be protected so that 100 years from now a 12 year old visiting them will experience the same sense of awe and wonder I did when first viewing these incredible areas.

I have faith you will do the right thing.

Sincerely,

Bill Wilson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6568    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94126  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To the GGNRA General Superintendent  
Re: comments on Supplemental Draft GGNRA Dog Management Plan/EIS (SDEIS)  
Date: February 18, 2014

I am a 68 year old resident of San Francisco for whom walking with my dogs on and off leash in the GGNRA, especially Ft. Funston and Crissy Field, has been an important part of my life since about the mid-1970's. I have been a Sierra Club hike leader as well as being involved in birding and nature oriented trips nationally and internationally, and I have been a supporter of nature conservation groups for many

years. As I have gotten older it has become more important for me to have outdoor recreational access for myself and my dogs near my home. I need to keep myself and my dogs fit in order to pursue dog agility and hiking with dogs, which activities help keep me physically healthy, mentally stimulated, and in good emotional health. And the local dog walks also keep me part of an important community of other active people with dogs.

I have been disturbed in recent years by what I perceive as efforts to make the GGNRA into a park more fit for a wilderness area than as a park founded as a recreation area to serve the needs of a dense urban area as well as visitors who come to enjoy the natural beauty as well as the culture of this San Francisco Bay Area. I believe this problem may have come about because of the phenomenon of popular areas being loved to death. The park administration has to contend with the demands of many different users, but I don't think kicking users out of the park is the solution, and I do think that better ways need to be found to keep heavily used areas planted for maintenance and not turned into sand dunes again. Therefore I support revising Alternative A or Alternative F to provide more access to GGNRA by people with their dogs.

The current preferred alternative does not adhere to the enabling legislation to provide for needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning. Off leash dog walking was described as one of the recreational activities to take place on GGNRA lands when Ft. Funston was given by the city of San Francisco to the GGNRA. There are ways to mitigate the toll of heavy usage on the most accessible areas of the GGNRA that haven't been fully explored in the current preferred plan. For example, permits could be required for commercial dog walkers and the fees could go toward rotating renovation of heavily used areas. There could be timed usage so that people who don't like dogs can have access to areas without dogs at times, for example an easy to remember policy could be no dogs on Sundays (or at least Sunday afternoons ' many families who like to have outings to Ft. Funston or Crissy Fields like to do including their dogs).

The current preferred plan also doesn't make good sense for the ecology of the whole Bay Area, which includes the humans as well as plants and animals, and which should take a look at use patterns in city, regional and state parks. There have been declining areas for recreation with dogs through the years, as county beaches became state beaches, and there need to be more areas for such recreation not less. Dogs contribute to physical and emotional health of people, who are under stress just being in an urban environment, so dog walking should be prioritized as an activity. The GGNRA should not be cutting off leash dog walking areas to next to nothing at a time when there are fewer city parks available due to the expanding coyote population. The beaches of the GGNRA remain one of the safest places for people to seek recreation with dogs. Too much area has been set aside for the snowy plovers to feed. Perhaps there could be some fenced areas where no people or dogs are allowed up and down the coast, and then the plovers could find food without disturbance and people and dogs could still have lots of space for recreation.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Wilford

435 Dewey Blvd.  
San Francisco, CA 94126-142 6  
tamdiablo@att.net

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6569    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416    **Private:** Y  
**Address:** private, Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Subject: 'Comment on GGNRA draft Dog Management Plan I SEIS'

RE: ROLA Location In Montara (Alternative 'C' and 'E' of the GGNRA draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)

Dear Mr. Dean,  
I'm writing to you to express my deep concern about the alternative to create a Regulated Off-Leash Area for dogs between Le Conte and Tamarind streets in Montara, CA. I am STRONGLY OPPOSED to this.

Both Le Conte and Tamarind streets are very narrow, and will not accommodate parking for dog owners' cars. In addition, the surface on these streets, especially Tamarind, is marginal and is patched continually. Additional traffic on this normally quiet street will cause more rapid deterioration and increased cost for maintenance, which San Mateo County can ill afford.

This is a quiet, peaceful neighborhood and numerous barking dogs and shouting owners in a concentrated area will be disruptive to everyone in the area, including those in the adjacent Farallon School. I don't believe it is right to construct fences and change the nature of an entire neighborhood for the sake of only the dog owners. This is supposed to be OPEN space for everyone, not fenced-in space for dog owners created artificially in a quiet residential area.

Rancho Corral de Tierra is a large space. Please find a more suitable location with adequate access and parking for this. Or better yet, simply require that dog owners leash their dogs as is required by the County.

Please keep my personal identification information from public view.

Sincerely,

Ronald Welf

PO Box 371063  
Montara, CA 94037

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6570    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416    **Private:** Y  
**Address:** private, San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Keep my contact information private

Dear General Superintendent Dean:

The National Park Service has a rich resource in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. This resource needs stronger, more effective dog management policies in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to protect the resource for our future.

We need more trails and areas within the San Francisco part of the GGNRA that are off limits to dogs. Today you can encounter dogs everywhere in the park and it is not enjoyable for people that seek a quiet walk or want to enjoy birds and other wildlife. As a birdwatcher I no longer visit some parts within the GGNRA for example Fort Funston, because it is disturbing to see the dogs flushing birds along the trails and shoreline. Designated off-leash areas should be extremely clear to the public with obvious fencing and educational signage.

The National Park Service needs funding to support the staff required to enforce the dog rules. The GGNRA proudly boasts that there are 25 federally listed as endangered and threatened species that can be found within the park.

The National Park Service should protect these and other native species for future generations. One example of a federally listed species found within the park is the Snowy Plover. The US Fish and Wildlife Service Recovery Plan for the Snowy Plover states Pets should be prohibited on beaches and other western snowy plover habitats if, based on observations and experience, pet owners fail to keep pets leashed and under full control. The sensitive habitat for the Snowy Plover today is clearly ignored by some irresponsible dog owners. The compliance with the leash rules is weak. In 2008-2009 compliance was 34% and about 40% since that time. See [http://www.goldengateaudubon.org/wp-content/uploads/10819-GGA-Crissy-Field-WPA-SNPL-Report-2009-2010-finalRep\\_2f0Q\\_20\\_10-final11.pdf](http://www.goldengateaudubon.org/wp-content/uploads/10819-GGA-Crissy-Field-WPA-SNPL-Report-2009-2010-finalRep_2f0Q_20_10-final11.pdf)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6571    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** El Granada, CA 94018  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Feb 9, 2014  
Sherron Bullens  
643 Ferdinand Ave  
El Granada CA 94018  
Mr. Frank Dean,

---



General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco CA 94123-00 22

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing to comment on the proposed plan for usage of the Rancho Corral de Tierra area handed over to Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) by Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST) in 2011.

I have lived in San Mateo county since 1975 and El Granada since 1999. I bought my home in El Granada (and tolerate a lengthy commute every weekday) specifically and solely for the proximity to areas where I could hike with my dogs. I have enjoyed hiking with dogs in the area behind El Granada regularly since I moved in, continuing in the traditional use of that land that has gone on for decades, and likely since the time of human inhabitation of the area. Like most of my neighbors, I am a responsible dog owner. I pick up and carry out feces. I do not allow my dogs to disturb habitat, chase animals. Dogs have no greater impact on the environment than, for instance, a child would, and certainly less impact than a bicycle would.

Because I love the land behind our town, I have taken it upon myself to help protect and maintain the area. I never hike without a large garbage bag, and I pick up all garbage I see - which, at times, has been a whole lot and necessitated several trips for removal. Several of my dog-walking neighbors do the same thing. There are others who hike with pruners and shovels and work to maintain the patency of the trails. The people of this area greatly value the Rancho land and take care of it voluntarily. I am an environmentalist. I contribute time and money to many national and international associations dedicated to preserving wildlife and the environment, such as the Cornell Laboratory of Ornithology, Sierra Club, Audubon Society, World Wildlife Fund, National Wildlife Association, Nature Conservancy, and Zero Population Growth. I contributed regularly to POST to specifically aide in the preservation of our little area of Rancho. Hiking with dogs is not antithetical to caring about the environment. Clearly, many very avid and contributory environmentalists are dog owners.

I am dumbfounded that the preferred plan (Alternative B) that GGNRA proposes for Rancho is to completely prevent off-leash dog walking and severely limit access even for leashed dogs. This is so out of alignment with my experience of the current and historical usage of this land, as well as with my observations of lack of environmental impact of dogs, that I wonder if there is some unknown, malevolent motivation behind the proposal. What could possibly cause the GGNRA, part of our government - which is supposed to be by and for the people - to wish to completely change the way the local people enjoy public land? Why would a governmental body move to reduce the property value of citizens who have lived here for decades? Why would GGNRA risk alienating all the volunteers who have worked for years to keep Rancho clean and safe, providing this rare bit of natural habitat for the native wildlife? Why would GGNRA discriminate against citizens who wish to hike in this beautiful territory with their families, when their family members, in part or in whole, are composed of dogs? This is not responsible government. This is oppression, discrimination, and thoughtlessness. Proceeding with Alternative B will bring you ill will, passive resistance, legal action, and trouble and heartache for years to come.

Mr. Dean, I urge you to consider Alternative A - the usage plan which would continue to allow responsible dog owners to hike with their dogs on leash in all parts of Rancho, and even off-leash in specific areas behind Montara and El Granada. This is exactly how people are currently using this land. This will not cause the loss of goodwill and cooperation of the locals. You will retain your volunteer garbage collectors, trail custodians, and stewards of the environment. You will ensure that the people and dogs of San Mateo County have someplace to go to get fresh air and exercise and contribute to the

general health of the populace. You will be maintaining the wonderful aura that permeates this wild territory. As a government employee, you will be accurately representing the local peoples' will - truly governing by and for the people.

Thank you for allowing me to comment on GGNRA proposals for Rancho Corral de Tierra. If you have questions, or would wish to more fully understand my position, I provide my telephone numbers and email address below and invite you to contact me.

Sherron Bullens  
650-712-8927 home  
415-827-6908 cell  
plateletgirl@me.com

cc: Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, Congresswoman Jackie Speier, Honorable Sally Jewell, Supervisor Don Horsley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6572	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Rafael, CA 94912 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 17, 2014				
Frank Dean Superintendent GGNRA Building 102, Ft. Mason San Francisco, CA 91423					

Dear Mr. Dean,

I am writing to you regarding the DSEIS for dog management in the GGNRA.

As you are aware, I have been personally involved in the dog management issue for over twelve years as the chair of the Crissy Field Dog Group. I participated as a member of the Negotiated Rulemaking for Dog Management in the GGNRA and have been one of the few people who have visited all 22 areas under consideration for dog walking in the GGNRA. I am writing to you as a very concerned citizen who has lived in the San Francisco Bay Area for over thirty years.

Just remind you again, this is a recreation area. This is NOT a national park. It was established in 1972 to improve the quality of life in a major urban area, namely the city of San Francisco and its two neighboring counties, Marin to the north and San Mateo, to the south.

The issue of dog management in the GGNRA is not a contest to see what party will outlast the other party but rather should be about a thorough land use process that objectively evaluates the impact of dogs in the GGNRA and creates a viable and workable plan that creates a balance that will accommodate dog walking as originally intended by the GGNRA enabling legislation.

Unfortunately, this newest version of the GGNRA's DSEIS is far from adequate and is unduly restrictive about where dogs and their owners may continue to walk in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo counties. There is no justification to warrant such draconian measures other than to force out dogs and their owners in the long term. It seems like that is what the GGNRA wants to accomplish here. We will never let that happen.

So far, Congresswoman Jackie Speier, San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, the Marin County Board of Supervisors, the President of the San Mateo Board of Supervisors, the San Francisco SPCA, and the Marin Humane Society have expressed concerns opposing the restrictive nature of the GGNRA's preferred alternative and highlighting the GGNRA/NPS need to acknowledge or incorporate many of the public comments that were submitted in the DEIS in 2011.

Around 4700 public comments were submitted for the DEIS in 2011. A forensic accountant took the time to do a count of these comments and found that the people who were in support to retain the status quo of the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy (dogs under voice control in certain areas of Marin and SF counties) plus including the new San Mateo county lands was a clear 3 to 1 majority. We are tired of the GGNRA spin of saying that the dog supporters had a little over fifty per cent support for this issue. That is simply incorrect.

#### The DSEIS - - General Comments

I have read the DSEIS document several times and I will let our NEPA experts convey their specific NEPA concerns on behalf of the Crissy Field Dog Group, and from our present and former attorneys, as articulated in Ashley Miller and Ken Weiners letters. I concur with everything that they have written in their letters. I wish the GGNRA would take NEPA more seriously and produce an objective environmental analysis and follow the letter of the law. To date, that has not happened. In addition, I encourage the NPS/GGNRA to actively engage with relevant stakeholders to create a dog management plan that is workable and reasonable. NEPA encourages this type of dialogue and the NPS/GGNRA has flatly refused to collaborate with relevant stakeholders.

The DSEIS proposes too many restrictions with too little analysis and factual basis. There isn't any reliable scientific data to form a foundation for this plan. These proposed restrictions (only 7 of the 22 areas proposed would allow dog walking access on GGNRA lands in all three counties), in turn, will likely increase user conflict because of the limited remaining space for dog recreation. For example, the proposal to have dogs on leashes at places like Baker Beach or Muir Beach will simply not work and is unrealistic. And there is no factual or scientific basis in closing off leash dog walking at East Beach or the Grassy Airfield at Crissy Field nor at any of the areas under consideration. What dog can you take to the beach and not have them romp and have fun? Dogs and people need socialization for a healthy and happy lifestyle.

This DSEIS is clearly biased against dog walking. According to the 1972 GGNRA enabling legislation, the GGNRA should be protecting one of its core values, recreation. Both the House and Senate reports identify dog walking as a popular recreational activity but the benefits for dog walking are not properly recognized in this document.

When Crissy Field was restored in 2000, one of the purposes was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with

dogs. The proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in a smaller area (Central Beach and a small portion of the Grassy Airfield). This makes no sense and is setting up the dog management plan for failure.

Concerns identified from Chapter 2 (Alternatives):

" The GGNRA makes the assumption that there needs to be a no dog experience at all of the 22 areas under consideration for dog walking access. Where and how did the GGNRA make a unilateral rule that mandates such an action?

" The GGNRA manages around 80,000 acres and already less than one per cent of GGNRA lands in all three counties are being considered for dog walking access. People who do not want a dog experience can go to the other areas of GGNRA lands to have a dog free experience.

" Many visitors (including families and seniors) to the GGNRA who do not own dogs actually go to places like Crissy Field so they can enjoy watching dogs having fun. For a variety of reasons, some people cannot afford dog care, are allergic to dogs, or are simply too busy and understand that they do not have the time to take care of a dog but enjoy the opportunity to watch the playful doggies.

" The notion that dogs and their owners and other visitors to the GGNRA are incompatible is erroneous. The GGNRA uses the phrase multiple user groups with a negative connotation as if co-existence does not already occur. It occurs successfully everyday in these specific areas and has for years. A fact to consider: in the year 2012 to 2013, (data I received from a GGNRA staffer) out of the hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs; there have only been reported 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. While I am troubled that these dog-related incidents occurred and want to prevent any type of further dog incidents, I believe that expanding the San Francisco SPCA's Off Leash Open Space dog-training class would help to reduce such dog related incidents in the future. Also, it is my understanding the human incidents rate in the GGNRA for the same time period is much, much higher. This data does not support a need for change to further restrict off leash dog walking.

" The descriptions of places like Upper Fort Mason, Baker Beach, Ft. Miley, and Lands End are identified as low to moderate use but there is absolutely no factual or scientific basis to restrict voice control or off leash in these areas. There are a large percentage of people who use and have used Upper Fort Mason, Baker Beach, Ft. Miley, and Lands End for generations. These are people who live in San Francisco and consider the GGNRA to be their backyard, naturally. The same concept holds true for areas under consideration in Marin and San Mateo counties. Literally, the GGNRA is near or adjacent to peoples backyards.

" Two plant species (Marin dwarf flax and the SF Lessinga) have been

identified at Baker Beach and the adjacent high bluffs as an endangered species. Yes, we want to protect them and this could include implementing mitigation measures like appropriate post and cable fencing and appropriate signage. However, the DSEIS omits analysis of the design of the built environment altogether. Again, there is no factual or scientific basis to restrict dogs under voice control at Upper Fort Mason, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Ft. Miley, Lands End, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston or the other areas under consideration in Marin and San Mateo counties.

Real and Significant impacts not addressed in the DSEIS:

The year round special events at Crissy Field present the most significant environmental impact as many as several million people impact this area. It is not the dogs that have a significant impact here; it is the people and the heavily attended events such as Fleet Week, Americas Cup, corporate fundraisers, etc. that have a deeper and lasting impact on the environment. Additionally, the biggest safety concern at Crissy Field is the bicyclists, primarily tourists who blindly run into people along the promenade. The dogs and their owners are not a safety issue- -there isnt any empirical data in the DSEIS that supports that. I am not saying that there arent any situations that need attention, but the DSEIS is so biased against off leash dog walking you would think dogs present a daily hazard, which they do not.

And unfortunately, there were thousands and thousands of fireworks casings (made of cardboard, metal and plastic) that washed up on Baker Beach and Crissy Field as the result of the celebration of the Golden Gate Bridges t7h5 anniversary. It was the dog walkers who cleaned up this mess at Baker Beach and Crissy Field for several days running.

It would be helpful if the GGNRA would place signs about where people can walk their dogs under the 1979 Pet Policy now so everyone can understand the boundaries. This would also give the US Park Police and NPS Park Rangers an idea about where to enforce or not on GGNRA lands. These immediate possible mitigation measures should be given a chance to work before the GGNRA implements any significant restrictions as are proposed in the DSEIS.

The SDEIS states that dogs harass marine mammals at the beaches. However, the Marine Mammal Center has relied on dog walkers for years to inform them about stranded marine mammals on beaches - - these beneficial aspects of dog walkers should be taken into account in all fairness. The TMMC wrote an email letter to Jane Woodman in 2006 stating this information and is attached for your information. The dog walkers are the first responders when these marine mammals wash up on beaches because of illness or injury and TMMC depends on these sightings so if possible, they can help the distressed marine mammal in a timely manner.

Misrepresentation in the DSEIS

Boulder Green Tag Program: The DSEIS reported that the Boulder Green Tag Program wasnt successful and therefore the GGNRA dropped any consideration in pursuing the program as a viable enforcement tool for the GGNRA. Clearly the GGNRA did not do its homework. I personally spoke with the Green Tag Program Director and in fact, the Green Tag Program is highly successful with a compliance rate in the high 80% to low

90%. have made some recent enhancements to the program to make it more effective - but in short, it works. This program model would be an excellent model as a clear enforcement program.

Consider Urban Design to accommodate changes for Fort Funston:

The GGNRA should consider innovative structural solutions that were dismissed from the DSEIS entirely for Fort Funston (e.g., vegetative barrier, post and cable fencing). These are concrete ways to manage the protection of natural resources and dog walking at Fort Funston.

#### Workable Solutions

I believe that a workable and reasonable dog management plan would include:

- 1) Maintain the status quo of recreational dog walking areas: the 1979 Pet Policy plus designated off leash areas in San Mateo lands, with additional enforcement and mitigation measures identified here.
- 2) Implement variation of the Boulder Green Tag Program for clear enforcement
- 3) Educational Outreach: partnering with the SF SPCA and Marin Humane Society in developing and expanding an Off Leash Open Space Training Program.
- 4) Mitigation Measures: Vegetative barriers, post and cable fencing to protect plant species, clear signage
- 5) Recreational Roundtable: Community stakeholders who are committed to resolving on-going issues within the GGNRA (public private partnership)

#### Creating a Workable, Representative Plan Based on Public Comment

This is not simply a paper trail process but an opportunity to create a workable plan for the future. You are affecting ordinary citizens whose lives will be greatly affected about their ability to walk their dogs off leash in a responsible manner. This issue was highlighted for me recently when I looked at some older documents relating to this issue and found a resolution from 2006 from some members of the Negotiated Rulemaking committee sent to the Committee facilitators and it struck me that the same issues that we were concerned with in 2006 are still relevant today. Clearly, this failure to incorporate substantive comments into the preferred alternative indicates that NPS/GGNRA is focused on what outcome it wants, not what the public at large is saying. I hope that the GGNRA/NPS really listens to the people who use the GGNRA on a daily basis and incorporates and takes the public's comments seriously.

Crissy Field Dog Group has been collaborating on constructive solutions for many years in the GGNRA. For example, working with SFSPCA and GGNRA, Crissy Field Dog Group helped develop the Off Leash Open Space Training Program. Working with the San Francisco Board Sailing Association and the GGNRA we were part of the building of the dog rinse station at Crissy Field. CFDG has purchased and distributed dog waste bags on a daily basis throughout Crissy Field for many years.

We wish to take this spirit of collaboration into the next phase of this process, so that we may truly work together to develop a workable solution to dog management. I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation and protection of important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this critical document.

Martha Walters  
P0 Box 10726  
San Rafael, CA 94912

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6573    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
My name (as you can see above) is Eleanor Burke, and I am a 75-year-old grandmother, a native San Franciscan, a retired high school English teacher, and an author.  
I love to walk along Crissy Field and watch people and their dogs, enjoying the fact that families still find life worthwhile in this city. The dogs are an important part of that - the fact that within the city limits a dog owner can let his dog run free along the sandy beach, romp in the water, play with other dogs, is a source of delight to me, to their owners - and to the doggies themselves. Quality of life is so important to people who have decided to stay in the city, not flee to the suburbs, a decision my husband I made long ago for our children - and dogs. We had dogs for many years, loved taking them to Baker Beach and Crissy Field, where the exercise joy they got from running free made them great pets and companions. Please do not ban off leash dogs from the proposed areas along Crissy Field. Please do not disregard the positive value of letting dog owners let their dogs play run.  
Sincerely,  
Eleanor Burke  
1156 Vallejo St. #101  
San Francisco 94109

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6574    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Louis S. Wall  
P.O Box 370634  
Montara, California 94037

14 February 2014

Mr. Frank Dean

General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123

RE: Dog Management Plan

Dear Mr. Dean:

I have reviewed the subject Plan and attended many of the National Park Service's public meetings at which the Plan was explained and discussed. I have lived in Montara, California a little over three decades and therefore will limit my comments to that part of the Plan, Rancho Corral de Tierra (Rancho), that affects me directly and with which I am most familiar. When I moved here with my wife and daughter in the fall of 1983 we had three dogs and since that time our pack has varied from as few as a single dog to as many as five, most rescued animals. Since that time we exercised the dogs on Rancho property, usually only on week-ends but when I retired in 2004 almost daily on and off leash without incident.

Our walks generally were confined to that portion of Rancho located north and west of Farallone View School. This parcel of Rancho is crossed by many trails and has been greatly altered by agricultural uses, construction of the Ocean Shore Railroad, San Pedro Mountain Road, and Highway 1, and most recently by CalTrans' construction of the "Montara Mosquito Ponds" as mitigation for its construction of the northern approach to the Lantos Tunnel. Within this area the terrain varies greatly from flat to fairly steep hills. The vegetation also varies from grassland and shrub to impenetrable thicket to stands of trees which tend force adherence to the trails. It is for these reasons I have recommended to you and your staff previously that this area be considered as one that dogs would be permitted off-leash. Within this area off-leash dogs can easily be contained from the suburban neighborhoods to the south and east, by fences and terrain from Highway I to the west, and by the trees and higher terrain to the north. There is enough variety of land and vegetation to allow bigger dogs to run and get the kind of exercise they require. The Plan's proposal to provide a bit of off-leash area north of the alpaca farm between Le Conte and Tamarind has to be a joke. That area would create a dog park too small to allow for proper exercise, create a nuisance in a residential neighborhood, the same one that fought you with regard to the location of trailheads. and create a major concern for the alpacas and their owner.

In making your final decisions with regard to the Plan within Rancho I encourage you to permit off-leash exercise for dogs in the area roughly bounded on the west by the former Farallone View cut-off and old San Pedro Mountain Road to the stables; then east across the hills and valleys to the formerly proposed CalTrans Devils Slide Bypass right-of-way; and then south along a line which approximates an extension of LeConte. Avenue. This will provide a meaningful off-leash area large enough to avoid congested use and further damage to the environment. In addition the final Plan should permit leashed walking of dogs on all existing trails leading to this area and throughout Rancho.

Your thoughtful consideration of the above recommendations in making your decisions on the Plan is appreciated.

Sincerely,



Louis S. Wall

Copies to:  
Congresswoman Jackie Speier  
Supervisor Don Horsley  
Bill Bechtell, Montara Dog Group

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6575    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Eleanor Burke. I am a 75 year old grandmother, lifelong San Francisco resident, former high school English teacher, author of a book on San Francisco sold in GGNRA stores, and former dog owner who loved walking our dogs along the beach at Crissy Field.

Because dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly-created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years to come. I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is NOT a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed according to different standards, with the understanding that it is part of an urban environment that draws thousands of families with dogs to Crissy Field every year.

Sincerely,  
Eleanor Burke  
1156 Vallejo St. #101  
S.F. 94109

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6576    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** n/a, UN na  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** To: GGNRA

I'm writing this letter because not all dog owners are irresponsible. It's a public place people nit to have fun with there dogs. Dogs need exercise for they could be a good dog becouse a dog that not exercise might misbehave. 50% homes in Sf have dogs. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe.

With Love

Kellyn Umanzor

Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6577    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Eleanor Burke, as indicated above, and I am a 75 year old grandmother, longtime dog owner, native San Franciscan, retired high school English teacher and author of a book on San Francisco Neighborhoods - Sketching SF's Neighborhoods.

Please consider the thousands of dog owners who enjoy letting their dogs run on the beach at Crissy Field, and do not restrict their access by requiring that dogs be on leashes in most areas. I feel that doing so would only encourage dog owners to scatter into neighborhood parks or on streets, which would probably make an impact on them all in forms of dog poop and probably more dog fights between leashed dogs. I've noticed that off leash dogs quarrel with each other very rarely - when they are unleashed not restricted, they are much less likely to engage in turf battles that can escalate and end up in dog bites of anyone trying to break up the fight. This all was quite the case with our own dogs - Crissy Field was a godsend and definitely promoted much more civilized behavior on their part.

Given how many dogs there are in this city, I think the proposed restrictions would be terrible.

Sincerely-

Eleanor Burke

1156 Vallejo St. #101

San Francisco 94109

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6578    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Feb. 13,2014

To whom it may concern.

Re: Fort Funston:

Please do not reduce the size of the off leash areas. As a dog owner we have been using the "Fort" for our dogs and it has been a blessing to us and our dogs. We always adopt shelter dogs who are older and often in need of socialization with other dogs and very often with people. We first got acquainted with Fort Funston after adopting a dog who was 3 yrs old and had been locked in someones back yard all her life and was very fearful. Our vet suggested taking her there because it is non territorial so she could get adjusted to people and other dogs. Fort Funston was a God send! She adjusted and lived a long, happy life. I have other stories about our other rescued dogs. Fort Funston has been a place of socialization for my family and our dogs that has made our lives better. The only real damage I have seen over the years is erosion due to the removal of the Ice Plant that was stabilizing the sand now with out the Ice Plant the sand has blown and made the walkways impossible. The ability to walk around Fort Funston for us and to run for our dogs has made for healthy dogs and people. Please do not make it more difficult. We have been going to Fort Funston for 25 years.

Thank you,

Mrs. Loretta Teiber

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6579    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 17 2014

Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201 Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Dear Superintendent Green,

My is Bernard Burke, a 77 year old native San Franciscan. I am writing to express my dismay over the GGNRA preferred alternative that so severely restricts dog walking areas. The conclusions in the supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS seem flawed and not based upon fact. It seems to overstate a problem.

The GGNRA is not a National Park, it is a "Recreation area" in an urban environment. I support the 1979 Pet Policy being maintained.

Crissy Field especially should undergo only minimum changes, if any. Please be reminded that all 3 county boards of supervisors of the impacted counties oppose the plan.

I urge you to take measured changes to the current dog walking rules.

Thank you for your attention.

Bernard Burke  
1156 Vallejo St. #101  
San Francisco, CA 94109

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6580    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent

Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

February 14, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Gina Symczak, and I have lived in San Francisco for over fifty years. Most of that time, Ive lived across the street from the Presidio in Cow Hollow. Over these years, I have always walked my dogs at Crissy Field -both when it was an army base and a national park. Its been an important part of my experience of city life - - - actually, a wonderful blend of city and nature, unique and important to San Franciscos history.

One of the primary reasons my husband and I adopted our current dog, Lucy, was to help us overcome a tragic loss. We got her, expecting that walking her everyday in such a beautiful place would help us to find some joy and heal. And, in fact, it has. We have walked off leash every morning at Crissy Field for the past seven years- -basically since the day we adopted her. Nothing makes us happier than to see her confidently walking down the paths, wagging her tail, and turning around every once in a while to make sure we're catching up. And the tourists and little kids love watching her, too-it makes everyone smile. She adores the freedom, and we think she is a better-behaved dog because of the exercise and trust that off-leash walking provides. Anyone who has a dog knows of the special joy in seeing them want to engage and walk with you- - when they aren't made to with a leash. It's a sign of love and trust that is very gratifying.

I can tell you that after the 2500 walks that I have taken at Crissy over the past seven years, and countless others before then, I can count on one hand the number of issues I have seen involving dogs. Has anyone from the GGNRA making these proposed alternatives had that much first-hand experience walking there?

Dogs need a lot of exercise from running and socializing in order to behave, and the best way for them to get this is by being off-leash. A good, respectful dog is a tired dog, and one that is treated well; pet parents can't provide that if their options are limited. There are far more issues - and more important issues - - arising from humans degrading the area, such as during the Fourth of July fireworks at Crissy, than there are from dogs degrading the area. At least the dogs have responsible humans picking up after them; sadly, the humans don't often pick up after themselves.

I want you and our representatives to know that my husband and I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy and we oppose the GGNRA's preferred policy. This is a unique national recreational area in an urban environment - - not a pristine wilderness. It needs to take into consideration the needs, habits and expectations of the residents of the wonderful city in which it has the privilege to be. With almost twice as many dogs in San Francisco as there are children, dog owners need to have easy access to recreate with their best friends (whom they often treat like their children), and the 1979 policy respects that. Dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use when the GGNRA was created in 1972, and we believe this specific recreational use should continue for years to come. After all, it is called the Golden Gate National RECREATION Area for a reason, right?

The GGNRA's "preferred alternative" is definitely not our preferred alternative. It would greatly limit where Lucy and I could walk freely, together. I have walked so much on the sand, that I have actually injured my hip. It would be terrible if I could no longer walk freely with Lucy on the paths at Crissy, and had to be limited to the sand. I can't take her all the way to Ft. Funston and, even if I could, it's too dangerous for her because she's had two surgeries on her legs and the cliffs are difficult for her to navigate. I don't know what we'd do.

Additionally, my husband and I are concerned because the conclusions reached

in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are unfair and flawed:

- This SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but wont allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).
- The studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasnt updated the enforcement data since the last draft ETS was released.
- A significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRAs Draft ETS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRAs Supplemental EIS -is this process only for show or are you taking things seriously?
- The SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

We want the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that 1) considers the unique needs of this urban recreation area and its residents, and 2) will result in the preservation of offleash dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Gina Symczak

CC: Supervisor Mark Farrell  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Secretary of the Interior, Sally Jewell  
Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6581    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 6, 2014  
Sally Cancelmo  
2247 Sutter Street  
San Francisco CA 94115  
Superintendent Frank Dean  
GGNRA  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco CA 94123  
RE: Dog Management Plan  
Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I live and work in San Francisco and have been walking my dogs at Crissy Field for almost 24 years. I use the park on a daily basis and walk my well-trained dogs off-leash and under voice control. My dogs and I value the social, physical and mental benefits of walking and playing on the beaches each

---

day. Crissy Field is my front yard, my escape from frenetic life, my prescription for good health.

Preferred Alternative not workable

Since 2001 I

have written numerous letters to three different superintendents regarding continuation of off-leash in the GGNRA. The 1972 enabling legislation provides for the maintenance of needed recreational space and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreational opportunities available to the region. (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972). Your preferred alternative removes huge areas at Crissy Field (most of the airfield and the East and West beaches for dog walking).

Under your alternative Baker Beach has no off-leash. Ocean Beach and Ft Funston are restricted. Areas in Mann and San Mateo that have historically allowed off leash have been eliminated.

After the overwhelming response to the DEIS, three to one in favor of continuation of off-leash, the SEIS seems to ignore those responses and has created more restrictions. Your preferred alternative so greatly reduces or eliminates off-leash areas that your plan does not seem workable. By reducing offleash and other areas for dogs by 90%, our alternative, I fear,

will result in people and dogs venturing into areas that are currently not open for dog walking.

What you do not seem to understand is that law-abiding people with dogs have to and are going to walk their dogs at least twice a day. By restricting or eliminating areas for walking, these people will seek out other places to walk in the GGNRA, places you really do not want them to go. To protect the resources on your 80,000 acres, you need to allow more off leash areas to absorb the thousands who flock to the beaches and wooded areas each day. You need to provide adequate space for recreation and play. Good people have to walk; you need to provide enough space for them to do so.

Airfield at Crissy Field

Your preferred alternative as regards the airfield is counter productive. The area is very large and can absorb a huge number of people with dogs without interferring with walkers and joggers on the path or people walking on the beach. By restricting the use to a small middle section, you miss an opportunity to keep dogs away from the people and resources you want to protect.

In addition, there is no easy access to parking if people with dogs want to access this section of the field. I

fear that people

will park alongside the low buildings opposite the field and will not be able to safely unload their dogs and will have to dart across a section of Mason Street where cars drive too fast and there is no crosswalk to protect pedestrians. This is

dangerous! In addition, both areas are now permitted paid parking which is expensive and prohibitive for many who want to use the park.

The rest of the airfield is rarely in use by anyone but people with dogs and should be open to use. There is no sensible reason for it to be restricted. Many people park in the lot behind Sports Basement which allows free and safe unloading of dogs and well as safe crossing of Mason Street for access to the field.

It makes sense to limit the section of the airfield west of the sidewalk opposite Stillwell Hall as many families using the facilities in the hangars play and picnic in this area.

#### East Beach

By eliminating all dogs on East Beach you prevent many elderly, disabled or infirm dog owners as well as families with small children access to the beach. These groups may find it difficult or impossible to walk from the parking lot to the Middle Beach. It is imperative that all citizens have access in the park. A weekend restriction at one end of East Beach could accommodate these groups.

#### West Beach

I full endorse protection of the snowy plover when they are at West beach. But it makes no sense at all to eliminate this beach for walking when the birds are at Pt Reyes from April to September or October. Closing off the beach to dogs year round is nonsense. As explained above, removing areas that are safe for wildlife and other resources when there is no risk and the need is great is bad management.

Enough space for dogwalking will protect the park

There is a long history of off leash dog walking on our beaches and in our woods, plus an expectation that we will continue have this access in the park. Reducing access for dog walking by 90% in the few areas we have is not acceptable. In addition, the SEIS does not allow any off-leash dog walking on new areas and lands acquired by the GGNRA in the future, even if dog walking occurs has traditionally occurred there.

I believe that the 1979 Pet Policy, which you signed off on, is the only acceptable choice. Keep the status quo.

Sincerely,

Sally Cancelmo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6582	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Daly City, CA 94015 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Erik Christianson 375 Mandarin Drive, Apt. 308 Daly City, CA 94015				

---

echristianson @ccsf.edu

February 2, 2014

Dear GGNRA,

Fort Funston is by far my favorite place to go in all of San Francisco. My name is Erik Christianson; I live

in Daly City and work in San Francisco. I am a lecturer at San Francisco State University and an instructor

at City College of San Francisco. Six to seven days a week I visit Fort Funston with my two year old dog, Whitney. It provides great exercise and socialization for both of us. As a responsible dog owner, it is important to me that I can go somewhere safe with my dog. There is no place I feel safer than Fort Funston. The dog owners that go there are responsible and caring people, who have created a community. This community is important to Whitney and me. I have made many friends there with people from all different backgrounds. She has regular playmates who she loves to see and frolic with. When we walk on the city streets we are much more vigilant than Fort Funston. We have been chased numerous times by dogs that are off leash and not under their owner's control, while trying to enjoy our neighborhood. We have never had any issue like that at Funston.

Not only that, since going to Fort Funston I have gone from having borderline high blood pressure my entire adult life to normal blood pressure. With that said, I eat well and exercise regularly, it seems that time spent with Whitney at Fort Funston was the catalyst. As an avid environmentalist and naturalist, I credit that to the time I am able spend hiking around Fort Funston with Whitney. I feel safe there, for her and myself.

We have met so many wonderful people at Fort Funston. Some people who go out there do not have dogs of their own, but are grateful for the opportunity to be around other's dogs and enjoy nature with us. Some of these people have disabilities, some are elderly, and some are even my students. So many in our community enjoy and benefit from the beauty and joy that Fort Funston provides both humans and animals. Almost daily, I make the drive to Fort Funston with Whitney; we walk on the sands, I feel centered, she is free to roam while under my voice control, and we both have better lives because of it. I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative that the GGNRA is proposing. It does not support the current use of the land, or the 1979 law regarding off-leash. I oppose putting fences or delineating off-leash areas. Fences will take away the feeling of freedom the land provides and be restrictive to wildlife in the area. The current land use and policies have been effective for many years, and my hope is that without any changes we can continue enjoying the full use of the land for the dogs and our community for many years to come.

Sincerely,

Erik Christianson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6583	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Angelino, CA 94960 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Regarding Pets in the GGNRA:				

I'm 66 years old; have lived in S.F. county, San Mateo, and now Marinlo for the last 36 yrs.

I'm an avid outdoors person who has never seen a dog trained well enough to be allowed off-leash in areas designated voice control area.

I've seen dogs running and chasing water foul, snowy Plow other shorebirds and clapper Rail in where



they must be on leash and in some areas where they are not allowed at all.

I love dogs, and have frustrated many of my friends when we are hiking and I stop to greet almost every dog we pass by. But there is fast growing anarchy among lots of dog owners. When reminded of the rules they often say I am not a Ranger and until they get caught they will continue to do as they wish.

I have been told by some employers at Sonoma County Park that the reason for many owners to obey the leash law is there is a mandatory court appearance for a citation.

I am sure any animal shelter or SPCA would say that there are many more pets now than in decades past.

We must have rules; and restrictions for some places in GGNRA.

Please call for any Questions

Michael Stevenson

(415)457-6443

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6584    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Emily Church

9 Parkwood Avenue

Mill Valley, CA 94941

Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Attn: SEIS

Fort Mason, Bldg. 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

Attn: Dog Management Plan

January 21, 2014

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: GGNRA Dog Management Plan

I lived in the Marina in San Francisco for nine years and I now live in Mill Valley in Marin County. I am the owner of two Vizslas. I walk my dogs three times a day and send them out with a dog walker twice a day while I am at work. Every day after work I take my dogs on a walk on GGNRA land for 30-45 minutes. On Saturday and Sunday I usually walk them at Chrissy Field in the morning and in the Presidio or Marin in the afternoon. In addition, my dog walker takes the dogs to GGNRA trails in Marin daily Monday through Friday.

I am from the East Coast and have lived in the Bay area for 15 years. I consider myself fortunate to live in such a beautiful and historical city. Some of the areas I treasure are Chrissy Field and the Presidio, and the GGNRA hiking trails in Marin. There are few cities anywhere in the world where one can walk with their dog in a National Park or along a beach. Chrissy Field and the Presidio are two special places in that they are bursting with natural beauty and yet are also grounded in rich history. The trails in Marin are gorgeous and allow one to get out into nature on multi-use trails with hikers and other dog owners.

Chrissy Field, the Presidio and Mann are perfect places to walk your dog off leash. At Chrissy Field the dogs can run on the beach and romp in the field. Few other places provide such diverse terrain and excellent play areas. The Presidio is also an excellent place for dogs to walk off-leash as there are few people, no cars and ample trails. Other excellent off-leash dog walking areas are the Mann Headlands, Fort Funston and Baker Beach. These are all ideal spots for us dog owners to walk and exercise our dogs safely away from traffic and other hazards.

As I am sure you are aware, it is very important for a dog's mental and physical health that they get plenty of exercise. Some dog breeds require more exercise than others and it would be difficult for those breeds, such as the Vizsla, to get the proper exercise they require if they cannot run and play off leash. My dogs are very high energy and need to exercise at least two hours a day. Exercise and socializing is critical to a dog's health and well-being. I make taking my dogs out for exercise my number one priority.

I am strongly in favor of allowing dogs off-leash in as many GGNRA areas as possible. The more places that one can walk their dog(s) off-leash, the better. I hope you will consider the impact on San Francisco and Mann if off leash dog walking is banned in the GGNRA. Banning or further limiting off leash dogs will have a significant negative impact on San Francisco and Mann parks. And recreation areas At least 10,000 dogs visit the GGNRA every day. San Francisco city parks are much, much smaller than the GGNRA and will be unable to absorb the impact of all those dogs if they are forced out of the GGNRA. The negative impact on parks and other recreation areas in San Francisco and Mann far outweighs any potential negative impacts in the GGNRA.

Given that I walk my dogs several times a day, I am able to get out and meet many locals in both San Francisco and Mann as well as tourists on my daily walks. Given my passion for the Bay area, one of the things I am able to do is share stories and history with people who are visiting from out of town. One of the things that makes it easy for them to approach me is my dogs as they form a common bond between people. Every day I am out with my dogs I meet and socialize with people young and old; people gay and straight, people from the city or Mann or out of town folks who are just visiting.

One of the nice things about Chrissy Field, the Presido and GGNRA trails in Mann is that they are multi-use areas. So on any given day one is apt to encounter joggers, walkers, hikers, school children, botanists, photographers, people picnicking, etc. One of the charms of the area is that it attracts and supports such as diverse group of people and wide range of activities. The community of people recreating with off leash dogs represents a tremendous cultural resource in San Francisco, Mann and the GGNRA. Where else can you see people from nearly every ethnic background and race, all socio-economic levels, seniors, families with kids, etc. all getting together every day and every week to socialize together while their dogs play off leash. Walking and playing with off leash dogs brings together people who otherwise would rarely see or interact with one another.

I oppose the Preferred Alternative plan because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel

unwelcome.

I oppose the Monitoring-Based Management Strategy that replaced the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the earlier version of the dog management plan. The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I am alarmed that the new dog management plan did not adequately consider comments to the earlier version of the plan from people who support dog walking and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no explanation why these comments from 2011 about issues such as negative impacts on the community and human health from off-leash restrictions were not considered in the development of the preferred alternative. I have written numerous letters over the years and feel my voice and comments, and those of others, have not been heard!!

The plan will not allow off-leash dog walking on any trail anywhere in the GGNRA. There is no evidence presented that off-leash dog walking on GGNRA trails has had any negative impacts. Despite this, the GGNRA decided not even to consider the possibility of off-leash dog walking on any trails at all. This results in a major restriction of off-leash dog walking in Mann County in areas where it had been practiced for decades. This will impact hundreds of dog owners such as myself! I am extremely alarmed about the possible restriction. It will be a nightmare for myself and all other dog owners!!

San Francisco and Mann residents have been walking dogs off leash in the GGNRA for decades and this is yet another valid consideration for maintaining off leash areas. Off leash dog walking is the status quo. Banning or further limiting where off leash dogs are allowed constitutes a change to the current and historical use of the park. Continuing to allow significant off leash recreation opportunities constitutes a "continuity of use" of park land. I implore you to maintain continuity of use. I am strongly in favor of allowing dogs off-leash in as many GGNRA areas as possible. The more places that one can walk their dog(s) off-leash, the better.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Emily Church

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6585    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Newcastle, CA 95658  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Protecting Earth & Animals with Compassion and Education  
Conservation/Preservation  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 15, 2014  
ATTN: Dog Management  
Superintendent, GGNRA  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Ladies and Gentlemen:  
RE: Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

---

Please accept and consider these comments with regard to the GGNRA Dog Management EIS.

We are devoted owners, caregivers, rescuers, and fosterers of rescued dogs with over 100 collective years of intense, dog advocacy. We love dogs very much and want what is best for them. However, we firmly believe that the only places where dogs should be allowed off leash are in designated dog parks or on private property. Any public areas where sensitive natural resources may be disturbed should either not allow dogs at all, or should allow dogs on leash only. Just as in the Bodega Bay area, there are natural areas where neither dogs or people are allowed.

Many people may believe that their dog is the "special" one, that the leash laws do not apply to their "baby," or that their dog will behave and cause no problems. Thus enforcement, altercations, and negative reactions from non-dog aficionados are created.

In a public place, people without dogs or those with their dog(s) on leash can never trust that unleashed dog owners (1) are responsible (behavior, disease, vaccinations, etc.) or (2) actually know the dog's temperament in stressful situations. Thus, defacto "Russian Roulette" is being played any time strange dogs are allowed in public areas off leash.

One stated GGNRA purpose is to offer national park experiences to large and diverse urban populations. This in no way obligates the NPS to accommodate either dogs or dogs off leash. In fact, some people have dogs who are not socialized with other dogs. Those people must stay away from public areas where dogs are off leash. Thus, an off leash or voice/command control area denies these very responsible people the opportunity to walk/recreate in the GGNRA. If all dogs were on leash, they could enjoy the GGNRA with their dog(s) on leash.

GGNRA lands are not, and should not be considered, the "backyards" of urban or any other citizens to do whatever they want. There should be no expectation, and is none for the most part, that public lands are or must be made available for dog walking and other recreational activities. If citizens want to exercise their dogs, and walking on leash is not an option, then it is their responsibility to create a dog park/public or private. The responsibility for dog exercise is not the purview of NPS or the GGNRA. Off-leash, voice and sight controlled dogs are an oxymoron. We have seen award winning dog obedience trainers have their dogs bolt, completely ignoring a command, when squirrels or other wildlife appears. The dog may be duly scolded, but usually the damage has been done either to wildlife, vegetation, and/or another dog or person. National Park Service (NPS) must set the regulations and enforce them accordingly; its first concern should be to protect natural resources and wildlife, which are known to be especially stressed due to dog presence. Disease is another negative impact that dogs can introduce to wildlife.

Since there appears to be "confusion" generated due to changing laws, regulations, and policies which need to be flexible to respond responsibly to issues, then only a blanket, strict, conservative position should be taken by NPS. "Confusion" is not a legitimate, valid reason to loosen NPS rules. Certain sites must be permanently closed (to people and/or dogs), and other sites may allow dogs but on leash only. Proper licensing and vaccinations should be required in any area where dogs are allowed in the GGNRA.

Please do not allow "dog walkers" demands and flagrant noncompliance of regulations to dictate GGNRA's policies. There are bully dogs just as there are bully people. We urge the NPS to increase patrols for enforcement purposes and to cite and fine scofflaws to the fullest extent allowed to help pay for the additional expenses incurred. We appreciate greatly GGNRA staff's work and hope they know that there are plenty of

citizens who support their efforts to protect our natural resources.

Sincerely,

Randall Cleveland for the PEACE Team

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6586    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Daly City, CA 94015-3053

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I have been walking my dog(s) at San Francisco parks from 1989 to the present. They include Christopher Park, Douglas Park, Stern Grove and Fort Funston. In 1993 I bought a house in Westlake, Daly City minutes from Fort Funston and the fort became my go to place for physical exercise for both my dog and me. It also gave me an amazing social life. I have made some wonderful relationships over the years due to friendships my dogs made playing and running with dogs off leash.

I retired in 2002 after 34 years of teaching and 5 years of substitute teaching in the SFUSD and now walk at the fort twice a day 7 days a week.

As a 71 year old single woman with a hefty mortgage and relying on only my pension restrictions on off leash walking at Fort Funston would affect me economically, physically and emotionally.

I disagree with the GGNRA's current preferred alternative. The recreational needs of the people of the Bay area must be preserved.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Barbara Cohen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6587    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Moss Beach, CA 94038

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Christine C. Cowdery 1020 Etheldore Street Moss Beach, CA 94038  
Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent Building 201, Fort Mason( San Francisco, CA 94123-0022 Attn SEIS(

Dear Superintendent Dean,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas (GGNRA) Dog Management Plan SEIS. My name is Christine Corwin

---

Cowdery, and I am a resident of Moss Beach and a long-time parks advocate, environmentalist, and hiker.

Before delve into my substantive comments on the SEIS. just wanted to share some general thoughts and feelings about what is happening with GGNRA and our local communities. At a time when the National Park Service is struggling with how to make parks more relevant to its constituents, especially in urban areas, the poorly thought out and executed GGNRA Dog Management planning process has created a hostile environment that for the most part has pitted local communities and elected officials against the National Park Service.

When the lands that are now GGNRA were handed over to NPS in 1973, it was with the understanding that the lands would be managed for the recreational needs of our urban population which includes dog walking. The fact is that GGNRA is not a destination national park such as Yellowstone, Yosemite, or the Grant Canyon-it is an urban national recreation area that needs to be managed for both recreation and natural values.

In October 2013. I attended a meeting on the issue in San Francisco held by San Franciscos Board of Supervisors. It was incredibly eye opening and a shame that NPS refused to attend. Dozens and dozens of citizens of different backgrounds and ages took time off from work to share the reasons why they are opposed to GGNRA's Dog Management Plan. Speakers included an urban planner talking and others who rely on these open space areas to properly exercise their dogs, senior citizens who are healthier because they have been hiking with their dogs in GGNRA, to mothers who raised their children going to places such as Fort Funston with their dog, to those who do not own dogs, but value the experience of diverse uses and community in our urban parks. The fact is that park leadership has dismissed the dog walking needs of the city of San Francisco and local communities such as where I live on the San Mateo Coast claiming that GGNRA is federal land and that local governments have no jurisdiction. While this may be legally true, this goes against the true spirit in which GGNRA was created and is extremely short-sighted given that GGNRA benefits from a wealth of city and county services from police, medical, and fire services to animal control and wildlife rehabilitation services provided by the SPCA.

As long as this insular mentality prevails among park leadership, GGNRA will not be able to fulfill its potential for making national parks more relevant to diverse urban constituencies-constituencies that we need in the environmental and parks movement. I hope that you rethink the current dog management planning process a process that so far seems to be unfairly discriminating against a diverse user group without the peer-reviewed science to justify GGNRA's significant policy changes around dog walking.

SEIS Comments As mentioned earlier. I am a resident of Moss Beach, which borders Rancho Co rai d Tien, the newest addition to GGNRA. My husband and I moved to Moss Beach just over three years ago We, like so many other local residents, were drawn here because of the areas small town feel, the amazing hiking areas, and the fact that it is a community of dog lovers. We have a sevenyear-old black lab mix named Gus. I have always been a hiker. Being able to hike with our dog in the areas of GGNRA that are dog friendly has been one of my greatest joys in life. He is a part of our family. If I coLild not bring him on trails in GGNRA, I would not visit the park.

After reviewing the SEIS (all 1,500 pages!), I am advocating for Alternative A in the SEIS with the addition of the two historical off-leash areas in Montara and El Granada lthe true baseline-please see the enclosed map). Local communities are

the primary users of Rancho and have a long history of responsible dog walking, including off leash dog walking in the lower portions of Rancho Corral de Tierra in Montara and El Granada The Montara Dog Group, which has more than 400 members from Half Moon Bay to Pacifica, has provided dog waste bins and bags, as well as promoted responsible dog guardianship.

Despite this history of responsibility, GGNRA's preferred alternative does not provide any off-leash opportunities for dog walking in Rancho. Why is San Mateo County the only county where GGNRA is proposing to completely ban off-leash dog walking?

In addition, the SEIS fails to link off-leash and on-leash dog walking with documented resource impacts. GGNRA's SEIS has failed to provide actual scientific data about dog walking's impact on natural resources in Rancho, such as wildlife and vegetation. Not only does GGNRA not have any peer-reviewed scientific data about resource impacts, all of the resource impact statements in the SEIS are purely speculative. Off-leash and on-leash dog walking has occurred in Rancho Corral de Tierra for decades, including during the past two years while it has been under the management of GGNRA (as acknowledged in the SEIS). Despite this history, Rancho continues to provide valuable habitat for wildlife. As reported by Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA President, Ken White, in his February 8, 2011 letter to GGNRA: Our professional wildlife rehabilitation staff completed a review/analysis of the site (Rancho) and the proposal (GGNRA's Dog Management Plan) and we believe that there is no observable reason related to the protection of native wildlife which would justify denying access to off-leash dogs in the area. (\*Please see attached a copy of Ken White's February 8, 2011 letter.)

In general, characterization of dog-related issues in the SEIS is misleading. The SEIS document has failed to provide evidence that dog walking is resulting in conflicts and resource degradation. From 2008 through 2011, a total of 1537 dog-related incidents associated with natural resources occurred at GGNRA according to Table 6 in the SEIS. However, out of a total of 1,537 dog-related incidents, there were only three incidents of dogs destroying vegetation. Meanwhile, there were only 15 dog-related incidents of dogs disturbing wildlife; 1,519 incidents were related to dogs being off-leash in on-leash areas or dogs being in closed areas/incidents that could be attributed to lack of public education and signage by GGNRA.

Because Rancho Corral de Tierra was just transferred to NPS in December 2011, law enforcement data and statistics are not yet available for this site. I will say that with the exception of the January 2011 incident when an NPS ranger tased a dog walker, that I have never experienced or heard of any negative dog-related incidents in Rancho—just happy people with dogs, bikers, and equestrians who all peacefully coexist and recreate in this part of GGNRA. The Peninsula Humane Society & SPCA also says in their February 8, 2011 letter that they cannot recall ever receiving complaints about off-leash dogs or dogs acting aggressively in the area.

In addition, GGNRA's preferred alternative is proposing to dramatically cut the number of dog-friendly trails in Rancho. Given the fact that Rancho's primary user group is local residents and their dogs, why isn't there an alternative in the SEIS that considers increasing the number of dog-friendly recreational trails?

Also, the area of Rancho Corral de Tierra in Moss Beach—the area where GGNRA is proposing to completely ban dogs—is not even mentioned in the SEIS. This area has been used by equestrians with dogs and by hikers with dogs for decades without any conflict or resource degradation. The SEIS fails to give any rationale

for banning all dog walking from this section of the park. This major policy change should require some sort of justification.

Another impact which the SEIS fails to consider is the impact on the local community culture. Sari Mateo Countys coastal communities are communities of dog lovers. Pancho is more than just an open space area. It is a community space where people go with their dogs to walk and to catch up with their neighbors and friends. In many ways, Rancho is the heart of our community If dogs are banned except for on a few trails. GGNRA will be gutting the very thing that makes it enjoyable to live here

Thrs negative community impact is not unique to Rancho This community impact is something that is common among all of the 22 areas targeted in GGNRA's dog management plan. Where does GGNRA propose that we all go? Approximately 50% of households in San Francisco have dogs. I would estimate that at least that many households on the coast have dogs. Dogs are a part of our culture, just as they were in 1973 when the park was founded and in 1979 when the 1979 Pet Policy was crafted.

I am whole-heartedly in favor of protecting the environment and wildlife. There are already a number of areas in GGNRA where I am not allowed to go with my dog and I accept that. With that said, GGNRA's current Dog Management Plan/SEIS goes too far, it is a highly restrictive plan that is being proposed without any hard evidence that these restrictions are warranted. The plan's language and Alternatives B-F are highly biased against people who recreate in GGNRA with their dogs. We need a common sense, balanced approach to park management that takes into account the recreational needs of Bay Area residents-as intended by GGNRA's enabling legislation.

Again, I support Alternative A in the SEIS with the addition of the two historical offleash areas in Montara and El Granada (please see the enclosed map). Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Christine C. Cowdery Montara Dog Group Member

cc: Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi Congresswoman Jackie Speier The Honorable Sally Jewell, Secretary of the Interior San Mateo County Supervisor Don Horsley

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6588	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	San Francisco Dog Owners Group Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 17, 2014				

Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
GGNRA. Building 201  
Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

COMMENT: DRAFT DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN/SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL  
IMPACT STATEMENT



Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am writing this public comment on the GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) as Chair and on behalf of the San Francisco Dog Owners Group. SFDog is the largest citywide dog owners/guardians group in the City, with a thousand active members, and at least a thousand more that we reach regularly through our emailed newsletters and list serves. SFDog pushes for responsible dog guardianship, and advocates for off-leash recreation for dogs that are under voice control. We are a 501(c) (3) nonprofit, and work to educate dog guardians, non-dog people, and elected and appointed officials about responsible dog guardianship and the benefits of having a dog in our modern, often isolated, society. We have organized workshops on how to deal with the three most common dog behavior problems seen in parks (poor recall, jumping, and resource guarding), and publish a Park Petiquette flyer (how to behave in a park with your dog) that has been posted in city parks for years.

We conducted a Dog-Horse Socialization workshop to desensitize dogs to the presence of horses. This workshop was conducted in conjunction with the SF Police Departments Mounted Patrol unit, who provided the horses and riders for it. We organized workshops on understanding dog body language and behavior for gardeners and rec center staff of the SF Recreation and Park Department. We helped design and implement a pilot "Kids Read to Dogs" program (called Pawsitive Reading) with the SF Boys and Girls Clubs to foster literacy in at-risk populations of children. We work with members of the SF Board of Supervisors, along with SF Recreation and Park Department staff and other park advocates, on dog issues in parks and elsewhere in the city. SFDog had two representatives on the GGNRA's Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, and has been involved in off-leash and other dog-related issues in the GGNRA for over a decade.

The SEIS for a new Dog Management Plan is so extraordinarily poorly done, it, frankly, should be an embarrassment to the GGNRA and the National Park Service (NPS). It is fatally flawed and cannot be used to justify any management decision or policy.

Three years ago, I used those same words to describe the DEIS. I suggested the DEIS be thrown out and redone in an unbiased, science-based way. Unfortunately, nearly all the criticisms I leveled at the DEIS also apply to the SEIS. Faced with significant substantive criticisms of the DEIS, the GGNRA chose to make only minor changes in the SEIS. Clearly, they did not adequately respond to the substantive criticisms of the DEIS made in many public comments, including mine. The GGNRA has proven that it cannot produce an unbiased, science-based EIS. The SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports must, once again, be thrown out.

#### THE SEIS DOES NOT INCLUDE A SUMMARY OF THE DEIS COMMENTS

Both the SEIS and the DEIS Comment Response Report mention the total number of comments about the DEIS that they received (over 4,700 pieces of correspondence). Neither document gives an overall summary of the comments - how many comments opposed the GGNRA's Dog Management Plan? How many supported it? How many supported off-leash dog walking? How many opposed it? The DEIS Comment Response Report does include a list of sample comments to give a "flavor"

of the overall comments, but there is no "tally" of how common those comment were.

The description of public comments on the ANPR on p. 9 of the SEIS indicates that 71% of the respondents favored off-leash dog walking at selected sites in the GGNRA. This allows you to get an overall sense of the public comment and to put it in some kind of context. There is no similar overall summary of the public comment on the DEIS.

An independent analysis of the DEIS comments showed that they were overwhelmingly opposed to the GGNRA's proposed Dog Management Plan and overwhelmingly supportive of dog walking, including off-leash. You would never know that, however, from reading either the SEIS or the DEIS Comment Response Report. Every time there has been public comment (the ANPR, the DEIS), it favors dog walking, yet the GGNRA continues to push to restrict access for people with dogs against the will of the people.

#### THE GGNRA DID NOT ADEQUATELY RESPOND TO COMMENTS ON THE DEIS

Comments on the DEIS made by SFDOG and other dog owners and walkers raised many issues that the DEIS did not consider, e.g., human health benefits and community building aspects of dog walking, and negative impacts on nearby city parks. These comments are listed in the DEIS Comment Response Report as substantive. However, nowhere in the SEIS or in the DEIS Comment Response Report is there a clear explanation of how those substantive comments were considered, what role they played in the revised SEIS impact analysis, or even if they were considered at all or merely dismissed without reason.

For example, the DEIS Comment Response Report identifies Concern ID #30445 (p. 335): "If the proposed restrictions were implemented, it would result in the loss of a community of dog walkers. Many visitors felt this community was their main tie to the GGNRA, and for many, it is a main channel of social interaction. Visitors felt the loss of this community would have a negative impact on their quality of life." The Response to this Comment given on p. 336 is: "Comments were considered during revision of impact analysis. Please see Chapter 4, Visitor Use and Experience for details."

Yet when you read Chapter 4, Visitor Use and Experience, there is no detailed discussion about how these comments about community were included in the alternative evaluations or even if they were considered at all. There is what amounts to a simple list of comments made by visitors who like walking with dogs that includes "community". However, there is no way to tell, when reading the discussions of impacts of the various alternatives at each site, whether any consideration was given to the effects of each alternative on the social community of dog walkers. Chapter 4, Visitor Use and Experience does not give the details that the DEIS Comment Response Report said it would.

Similarly, concerns in the DEIS Comment Response Report about the human health benefits of dog walking and negative impacts on human health of restrictions on dog walking (e.g., p. 154) refer to Chapter 4, Human Health and Safety in the SEIS for

details as to how they were considered. Yet again, when you go to Chapter 4, Human Health and Safety, you find another list of comments that include the human health benefits of dog walking, while the analyses of the alternatives at each site focus entirely on dog bites and unruly dogs, with no mention of positive human health benefits from dog walking or of negative impacts on human health from restrictions on dog walking.

As I said in my DEIS comment, NEPA law requires the GGNRA to consider impacts on humans, including human health and social community in an EIS:

- Human environment shall be interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment. (see the definition of effects (1508.8).) 40 CFR 1508.14
- Effects and impacts as used in these regulations are synonymous. Effects include ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. 40 CFR 1508.8 (emphasis added)

It is not enough to merely provide a list of sample DEIS comments made in the SEIS. There is no way to tell from the DEIS Comment Response Report or the SEIS whether the GGNRA actually considered impacts on human health or social community. The GGNRA's failure to adequately address my DEIS comments indicates the SEIS is as flawed as the DEIS, and it and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE GGNRA IGNORED DEIS COMMENTS THAT SHOWED MISLEADING CITATIONS THAT BIASED THE ANALYSIS AGAINST DOGS

In a DEIS public comment dated May 17, 2011, Keith McAllister listed over 15 cases of incorrect or misleading citations of articles that the DEIS claimed showed negative impacts from dogs on vegetation and wildlife. He showed, by quoting from the source articles, how the way the DEIS referred to these articles was misleading or inaccurate, or that the articles cited did not include evidence to back claims made in statements. Sadly, these same misleading citations appear in the SEIS, word for word the same as in the DEIS. In particular, citations of Sime 1999 are repeated over and over in the SEIS (in particular from pp. 374 - 378), despite McAllister's proof in his DEIS comment that her quoted statements are not supported by evidence in the reference cited or refer to impacts on "sensitive alpine habitat" that are not found in the GGNRA. Similarly, McAllister showed in his DEIS comment that citations of Miller et al. 2001 that say the articles shows that dogs disturb wildlife more than people alone and that dogs increase a person's radius of disturbance are, in fact, incorrect. Miller et al 2001 actually showed the opposite - that dogs disturbed birds less than people with dogs or people alone. Yet the incorrect DEIS claim recurs in the SEIS on p. 376. The fact the SEIS repeated the same, misleading citations that McAllister debunked in his DEIS comment without change is further evidence the GGNRA did not adequately respond to the DEIS comments. All of the misleading citations push the analysis in one direction only - dog walking is bad. Not a single misleading citation would lead you to say dog walking is beneficial. This is not just sloppy work; it is outright bias in the analysis. That kind of bias has no place in an EIS. Therefore the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE SEIS OFFERS NO SITE-SPECIFIC EVIDENCE OF IMPACTS FROM

## DOGS

The SEIS, like the DEIS before it, offers no solid, site-specific evidence that dogs, and especially off-leash dogs, are causing major environmental or safety impacts. Instead, it lists impacts that dogs "could", "might", and "can" cause, while offering no evidence any are actually occurring now in the GGNRA or ever have.

For example, the SEIS says, on p. 373: "Site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have not been conducted at the GGNRA sites for the sole purpose of documenting impacts to vegetation or soils from dogs." And on p. 376: "Very few site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at GGNRA for the purpose of documenting impacts to wildlife as a result of dogs." Yet the SEIS claims, without supporting evidence, that the GGNRA must restrict access to people with dogs to protect vegetation and wildlife from dogs. An EIS is supposed to be a site-specific technical planning document, based on hard evidence of actual impacts and effects. This SEIS does not come close to that description.

The SEIS, on p. 373, goes on to say: "... during the past six years, park staff has amassed scientific and technical information that is available on dog management related topics." In other words, GGNRA staff spent the last six years doing literature searches for articles about impacts from dogs on vegetation and wildlife at sites that may or may not be relevant to conditions in the GGNRA. In those same six years, however, GGNRA staff could have done actual studies at the GGNRA sites that would show whether or not the impacts are actually occurring. Yet GGNRA staff chose not to do any site-specific studies.

The SEIS uses the results of the literature searches to describe impacts that "could", "might", or "may" occur in the GGNRA. But, of course, because they've not done any site-specific studies, they cannot say that any of these impacts are actually occurring in the GGNRA now or that they ever have.

As mentioned above, the literature citations in the SEIS, like those in the DEIS, are often misleading, inaccurate, or misrepresent what was said in the cited reference. Many misleading citations were mentioned in DEIS comments, but were still repeated in the SEIS.

The SEIS does contain additional references not cited in the DEIS. However, many of these are also misleading. For example, the SEIS on p. 1231 cites a 1998 Northern Virginia Planning District Commission report: "For example, in the 20-square-mile Four Mile Run watershed in Northern Virginia, a dog population of 11,400 has been identified as a major contributor of [fecal coliform] bacteria in the watershed." However, a later study that used DNA analysis of the bacteria detected found that dogs actually contributed less fecal bacteria to the watershed than waterfowl and humans. Don Wayne, in *Bacteria Source Investigation in an Urban Watershed: DNA Sleuthing in Four Mile Run* (Northern Virginia Regional Commission, December 14, 2000), found that waterfowl accounted for 37 percent of the coliform, humans 17 percent, raccoons 15 percent, deer 10 percent, and dogs 9 percent. Dogs were not a major contributor. The reference in the SEIS should be removed as it was proven by the later study (not referenced in the SEIS) to be wrong.

Frankly, given the problems with the literature citations in the SEIS, I do not think

they can be used to justify any restrictions on access for people with dogs.

Without evidence of actual, site-specific impacts, the GGNRA's insistence on changing recreational access for people with dogs can only be described as arbitrary, capricious, and an abuse of discretion. Government agencies cannot act without good cause and solid evidence backing up the decision. Because that is sorely lacking in this case, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE SEIS USES ANECDOTES TO PROVE IMPACTS FROM DOGS

Given the lack of site-specific, peer-reviewed evidence that dogs cause impacts, the SEIS cites anecdotal reports from GGNRA staff of "observed" impacts. For example, on p. 375, the SEIS says: "In conclusion, very little peer-reviewed literature exists documenting disturbance to vegetation and soils specifically as a result of domestic dogs in recreational/park settings. However, NPS rangers have observed dogs affecting soils and vegetation at GGNRA sites." No other information is given. How many dogs? Was it 10 dogs or 10,000? What were they doing? We don't know because the SEIS doesn't say. Because it doesn't say, there's no way to know whether these "observations" represent a significant impact or not. Frankly, I expected a rigorous scientific analysis of impacts in the SEIS, not anecdotal stories.

Similarly, the SEIS includes anecdotal stories of impacts from the DEIS comments to support its claims of impacts from dogs. For example, on p. 1231, the SEIS says: "Currently, adverse impacts on visitor human health and safety from dog-related pathogens exist at all park sites considered in this draft plan/SEIS." The only evidence to support this statement are anecdotes from DEIS commenters, e.g., "At San Francisco General Hospital, we have seen over the years innumerable dog bites and many of these parasitic and bacterial infections transmitted by dogs." Sounds bad. But, because it is an anecdote, rather than a peer-reviewed study or official statistic, there is no way to judge the comments veracity. Yet it is presented in the SEIS as "proof" of an impact. There's a reason public policy is based on science not anecdotes. Because the SEIS relies so heavily on anecdotal accounts of impacts, it and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE SEIS RELIES ON BIASED GGNRA STAFF JUDGMENTS TO DETERMINE IMPACTS FROM DOGS

The DEIS Comment Response Report says on p. 134: "In lieu of site-specific data, research methods generally accepted in the scientific community and best professional judgment have been used to draw conclusions regarding expected impacts to resources..." Indeed, throughout the SEIS, the phrase "best professional judgment of park staff" occurs frequently when discussing impacts. For example, the Assessment Methodology section for Vegetation and Soils (p. 386) says: "The information in this analysis was obtained through best professional judgment of park staff and experts in the field, as well as supporting literature..." A similar statement is made in the Assessments Methodology section for Wildlife impacts (p. 554). This assumes that the "best professional judgment of park staff" is science-based and unbiased.

However, we know that GGNRA staff have shown repeated, long-standing, deep-rooted

bias against dogs and people with dogs. Their "best professional judgment" is highly biased and should not be relied upon to determine whether impacts from dogs are or can occur in the GGNRA.

For example, at the November 8, 2006 meeting of the Technical Subcommittee during Negotiated Rulemaking, a GGNRA law enforcement officer, specifically asked to speak to the Subcommittee as an expert witness by the GGNRA, stated as fact that most dogs walked off-leash in the GGNRA do not even wear collars, and romp at least a quarter mile ahead of their owners, bothering wildlife all the time. The clear implication of this statement is that dog walkers are irresponsible (they don't even put collars on their dogs) and have no voice control of their dogs. When challenged by dog walkers on the Subcommittee, she acknowledged that she had no data to support her claims and was just giving her personal opinion. Yet she had been specifically asked to attend the meeting and give her "best professional judgment" to the Subcommittee.

In another example during Negotiated Rulemaking (NR), Daphne Hatch, GGNRA Chief Biologist, led a site visit for NR Committee Members to Ocean Beach. During the visit, Committee members observed a single dog walk past a plover without causing any disturbance of the bird. Then a horse and rider galloped through the plover protection area (and then circled around again), flushing snowy plovers. Yet at the end of the visit, Hatch reminded the Committee members that they had seen a dog flush plovers during their visit so they could see for themselves the need to restrict off-leash dog walking there. Committee members corrected her that it had been a horse, not a dog that had flushed the birds. Hatch remembered what she had wanted or expected to see, not what had actually happened.

In her 1996 report on dogs and snowy plovers at Ocean Beach, Hatch says (p. 13): "Disturbance [of plovers by dogs] results in lost energy intake due to reduced foraging and feeding efficiency, and increased energy expenditure as a result of fleeing from disturbance." The very next sentence is: "Little research has been conducted on the energetic expenditure as a result of fleeing from disturbance." The first sentence is stated as fact, as a reason to restrict off-leash dogs at Ocean Beach (the conclusion of the report), but the second sentence is proof that the first sentence is an untested assumption. Policy should not be based on untested assumptions.

Indeed, Hatch reports that the highest number of plovers observed at Ocean Beach was in 1994 (a maximum of 85 and a median of 40 plovers reported, p. 16) when dogs ran off-leash on Ocean Beach. She reports that (p. 10): "Factors other than the number of people or dogs, possibly beach slope and width, appear to exert greater influence over Snowy Plover numbers on Ocean Beach." Yet, Hatch's best professional judgment, given in the conclusion of her report, is that unleashed dogs should be restricted to protect the snowy plovers.

In her 2006 report on dogs and snowy plovers at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field after the court ruling reinstating the 1979 Pet Policy, Hatch recommends that dogs be leashed in those areas because of an increased number of dogs observed on the beach since the court ruling, and an increased number of dogs harassing snowy plovers (a total of 4 incidents were reported (p. 16), out of the tens of thousands of dogs on the beach during the study periods; not exactly a major problem). The

report says (p.8) that the maximum numbers of plovers observed from 2000 to 2005 ranged from a low of 23 in 2000 (when dogs were off-leash) to a high of 62 in 2003 (when the GGNRA had banned off-leash dogs), apparently making her case that off-leash dogs affect numbers of the bird. Of course, the purpose of the report is to study impacts on plovers after the 2005 court ruling that reinstated off-leash dog walking, but those numbers are not given in the report text. However, raw data from the 2006 Hatch report posted on the GGNRA website during Negotiated Rulemaking actually shows an increase in the median number of plovers at Ocean Beach after the court ruling reinstating off-leash dog walking, from a median of 28 in 2004 to a median of 33 for 2005. Yet this is not included in the report. The GGNRA's own data indicate there was no negative impact on plover populations after the court ruling allowed off-leash dogs back on Ocean Beach. Yet, Hatch's best professional judgment, as stated in the conclusion to the report, is that dogs should be leashed to protect the plovers.

Hatch was also quoted in the September 7, 2005 San Francisco Chronicle: "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard." This shows a high level of bias against recreation at Ocean Beach, and a misunderstanding of the purposes of the GGNRA in its enabling legislation.

This is all reminiscent of the controversy over an oyster farm in Drakes Bay at Point Reyes National Seashore. The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) conducted an independent evaluation of the work of National Park Service scientists that had claimed in reports that the oyster farm caused significant negative environmental impacts. The NAS found that NPS scientists "selectively presented, overinterpreted, or misrepresented the available scientific information" and "exaggerate[d] the negative and overlook[ed] potentially beneficial effects." The exact same criticism can be leveled at the work of GGNRA staff, including Hatch, and the way scientific information is presented in the SEIS.

That is why I suggested, in my DEIS public comment, that GGNRA staff had demonstrated such a bias against dog walking that they could not impartially and fairly analyze the public comments on the DEIS and therefore, I called for a independent analysis of the DEIS public comments. It is not clear in the SEIS, if that happened or not. However, if GGNRA staff are too biased to impartially and fairly evaluate public comments, they are also too biased for the SEIS to use their "best professional judgment" as part of an impartial and fair analysis of impacts, especially where no site-specific studies have shown an impact. Because the SEIS, in fact, does rely heavily on analysis from park staff who have demonstrated bias against dogs, it and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE SEIS DOES NOT ADEQUATELY CONSIDER HOW THE PRESENCE OF DOGS MAY BENEFIT SNOWY PLOVERS AND BANK SWALLOWS

The SEIS assumes dogs have only negative impacts on snowy plovers, primarily by chasing them or flushing the birds if a dog runs nearby. However, there may be benefits to having dogs around that the SEIS does not consider. In a January 31, 2014 letter to the editor in the San Francisco Chronicle, Tom Lurtz, from McKinleyville, writes: "Controlling crows and ravens that prey on the nests could be as important as monitoring people and dogs. The state has been working for years to help snowy plovers breed on Clam Beach in Humboldt County. Unfortunately, the

intelligent ravens and crows have learned to recognize areas that have been fenced to protect the nest sites from dogs and humans."

In the April 2011 edition of the West Portal Monthly, Dan Murphy, a local plover counter and expert from the Golden Gate Chapter of the Audubon Society, is quoted as saying: "Ocean Beach isn't really suitable for nesting [of plovers]. Not only is it overrun with people and dogs, it's loaded with predators." He continues, "There are typically between 15 and maybe 40 ravens in the plover protection area at any given time. There are additional birds that come and go during the day. Then there are the other predators that use the beach, mostly at night. In other words, there are way too many predators and disturbances to suggest Ocean Beach is a likely spot for successful plover nesting."

Finally in the December 2013 edition of the West Portal Monthly, Dan Murphy is quoted as saying: "Birds and birding are endlessly interesting. Watching ravens teach their young to hunt the rare Bank Swallows at Fort Funston was mind-blowing."

There is no evidence that dogs have ever injured or killed a snowy plover or bank swallow. Clearly natural predators, and in particular ravens and crows, present the real dangers to snowy plovers and bank swallows in the GGNRA. The presence of dogs may keep ravens and crows away from the plovers and bank swallows, protecting them from their 'real' enemies. This interaction should be studied and included in the SEIS. Because it was not, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE SEIS RELIES ON FLAWED SURVEYS TO DETERMINE VISITOR COUNTS AND EXPERIENCES WITH DOGS

To understand visitor use in the GGNRA, the SEIS refers to two on-site visitor count studies, both of which are significantly flawed. The first, a two-phase study was conducted in 2008 at Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, and the Presidio is described on p. 310 of the SEIS: "The first phase of the survey involved an intercept survey (personal contact with visitor) to provide a visitor population profile, including a more thorough understanding of who visits the parks, use patterns, their likes and dislikes, and a preliminary understanding of their visitor experience... The second phase of the survey included a follow-up telephone survey with the same visitors interviewed in the first phase to gather more detailed information on visitor experiences, satisfaction, and opinions of park management."

Whether this survey is valid or not depends primarily on how the interceptors chose the people to interview. If it was randomly chosen, there might be some validity in the results. However, at both Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, interceptors were observed actively avoiding talking to people walking with dogs and talking primarily with people walking without dogs. At Crissy Field, after watching an interceptor talk to many people without dogs and not talk to anyone with a dog, a dog walker asked the interceptor what he was doing. When he responded he was doing a survey of visitors, she asked if he wanted to interview her and he responded, "No." GGNRA staff were alerted to problems with this survey at the time it was done, yet it is cited here. The inherent bias shown by the interceptors means any results of this survey - e.g., that 9.6% of the respondents listed dog walking as their primary reason for visiting the site - are essentially meaningless.



A 2011 on-site visitor count study conducted at Fort Funston and Muir Beach is described on p. 307 of the SEIS: "Visitor counts were maintained on a tally sheet where field personnel recorded all visitors leaving the site. Visitors were placed in one, and only one, category, including dog walker, surfer, angler, etc. When visitors left the park in groups, each person in the group was categorized individually..., if two visitors were walking a single dog, only one would be classified as a dog walker."

I was at Fort Funston when the visitor count was done in 2011. I saw two men sitting, back to back, near the parking lot, one facing the Sunset Trail and the other facing the Chip Trail, tallying people. I was there to walk with my friend and her dog (my own dog died several years ago and I am currently dogless). By the study protocol, I was likely tallied as either someone walking without a dog or as "other." But I was there specifically to walk with my friend's dog. Had I wanted to walk with my friend without her dog, we would have gone somewhere else. What about people walking the family dog? Would mom be listed as a dog walker, while her children were listed as not there to walk with their dog? Clearly, the survey miscategorized me and others like me walking with more than one person to a dog. The survey clearly underestimated the number of people using the sites to walk dogs. The SEIS says (p. 307) that people in a group carrying a picnic basket were all classified as picnickers even though only one had the basket. Similarly, all people walking with a dog should have been listed as being dog walkers, even if there was only one dog walking with them. Because of the problems with this survey, its results are essentially meaningless.

Finally, the SEIS describes a GGNRA Dog Walking Satisfaction Visitor Study done in 2011 on p. 304 as: "designed to evaluate the perception of and satisfaction with the current on and off-leash dog walking policies by both dog walkers and non-dog walkers, and the potential for redistribution of use based on access changes." The survey was done online and was by invitation only. It was not a random sampling of dog walkers or park users. Invitations were sent to people who had given the GGNRA their email addresses at some point over the years and who expressed interest in dog walking in the GGNRA (both supporting and opposing it). The SEIS admits that only 897 people out of 7000 people contacted for the study actually completed the survey. Given such poor response rate, it's not clear that the survey has anything meaningful to say.

One stated purpose of the survey was to determine where people who now walk dogs in the GGNRA would go if dog walking was restricted as proposed in the DEIS Preferred Alternative, an attempt to quantify impacts on nearby city parks if DEIS restrictions were adopted. Then why were people who don't walk dogs or who oppose dogs in the GGNRA included in the survey?

The SEIS reports one result of the survey on p. 305: "Of the dog walkers who responded to the survey... 206 individuals were "not satisfied" or "slightly satisfied" with off-leash dog walking opportunities [at] their most frequently visited sites at the park." The SEIS says that 662 dog walkers responded, plus 20 professional dog walkers. This sentence seems to imply that roughly one-third of dog walkers are not satisfied with existing off-leash dog access.

I took the survey, as did many people that I know. The wording of the survey was confusing. Some people who took it thought the questions about how satisfied you are with off-leash access referred to existing access, while others thought it referred to the off-leash access contained in the DEIS Preferred Alternative. Personally, I was in the latter group, because the survey was described as trying to determine where people would go if the restrictions proposed in the DEIS Preferred Alternative were in effect. I responded that I was not satisfied with the restrictions proposed for Fort Funston, my most frequently visited site, in the DEIS. Yet the SEIS describes my response as being not satisfied with the existing off-leash conditions at Fort Funston. Many people I spoke with in 2011 who had taken the survey were confused as to what it was asking. Because of this confusion, in addition to the small numbers of non-randomly-determined responders, this surveys results are essentially meaningless.

An EIS requires baseline information on current usage, something all three studies were intended to answer but do not. All are so significantly flawed as to render them unable to contribute any meaningful information about current usage or the current visitor experience. Until such information is finally provided, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE SEIS DOES NOT ADEQUATELY ANALYZE IMPACTS ON NEARBY CITY PARKS

The GGNRA does not exist in a vacuum. It is located within and immediately adjacent to San Francisco, a city of some 800,000 people. Actions that it takes will impact neighboring cities. In 2011, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution opposing the DEIS Preferred Alternative, and urging the GGNRA to delay taking action on its proposal until a thorough study was conducted of the effect the proposal would have on San Francisco city parks. Unfortunately, the SEIS does not provide the thorough study requested by the City.

The SEIS says, on p. 354, that: "It is very likely than an increase in the level of recreational use by private and commercial dog walking will occur at nearby dog walking areas outside of GGNRA as a result of this draft plan/SEIS. However it is speculative to precisely identify all potential impacts from redistribution related to the implementation of this draft plan/SEIS..." This claim of speculative impacts is ironic since the SEIS discussion of impacts on vegetation and wildlife contain repeated references to speculative impacts for dogs that "might", "could", or "may" occur.

In discussing impacts on nearby parks, the SEIS primarily identifies (or tries to identify) which parks people will visit if forced out of the GGNRA. The SEIS does contain a list of parks in San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo Counties where people who want to walk their dogs off-leash might go if they could no longer walk in the GGNRA (pp. 343-349). The list describes basic physical conditions at these parks, e.g., vegetation present, parking, etc. But there is no mention of current usage at any of the parks. How many people currently walk in each park with their dog? The SEIS does not say. Without this information it is impossible to know whether the movement of tens or hundreds or thousands of people and their dogs from the GGNRA into each park would have a serious impact or not. A thorough analysis would have provided this information.

We know from Tsunami Friday, as reported in my DEIS comment, that when the GGNRA closed all of Fort Funston and Ocean Beach on March 11, 2011 after an earthquake in Japan, usage at Pine Lake/Stern Grove, the closest off-leash area in a nearby park to both GGNRA sites, increased tenfold. Parking was described as "chaotic." While the GGNRA's Preferred Alternative will not close all of Fort Funston and Ocean Beach to people with dogs, it will close approximately 75% of each area to all dogs, even those on-leash. The SEIS should have explored current usage at nearby parks, but it did not.

As shown in the section above, the GGNRA's attempts to establish visitor use at GGNRA sites were significantly flawed. The SEIS does not adequately address how many people who normally walk dogs in the GGNRA will be affected by the Preferred Alternative's proposed closures of off-leash space, a crucial point in any thorough study of impacts on nearby parks. For example, Table 10, p. 309 of the SEIS, lists the results of the two on-site visitor surveys about usage at six GGNRA sites. However the results are listed as percentages, e.g., what percent of visitors surveyed were there to walk dogs. There is no account of the total number of visitors, so there's no way to know how many people are actually walking dogs at each site. For example, Table 10 says 62.1% of visitors to Fort Funston were there to walk dogs. Setting aside the severe undercounting of this number as outlined in the section above, to understand impacts on nearby parks caused by the closure of large parts of Fort Funston, you need to know the actual number of people affected, not just a percentage. 62.1% of 1,000 people means closures will impact significantly fewer people than 62.1% of 10,000 people. Thus it is impossible to tell from the SEIS if the proposed closures of off-leash space at Fort Funston will move 62 people into nearby parks or 6,200.

Similarly, the question of whether or not the off-leash space that will remain at GGNRA sites like Fort Funston will be adequate to accommodate the number of people who walk there now cannot be answered from information provided in the SEIS. If it's 62 people, the severely reduced area likely would be okay, but if it's 6,200 people, then the remaining off-leash will not adequately serve the recreational needs of that many dog walkers. The issue of how many people will be affected at each site must be quantified before any analysis can be accepted, and the SEIS did not do that.

The SEIS also does not adequately address the fact that off-leash areas in nearby parks are significantly smaller than similar areas in the GGNRA now. The SEIS says that under the Preferred Alternative, off-leash areas at GGNRA sites would be reduced by approximately 107 acres (p. 373). This does not include the acreage included in the loss of 30.9 miles of off-leash access on trails, roads, and beaches. So the total acreage of off-leash areas closed by the Preferred Alternative will be much higher. Ironically, the acreage of off-leash areas closed by the Preferred Alternative is actually greater than the total legal off-leash acreage in San Francisco city parks. Table 5.1 of the Final Draft of the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (SNRAMP) of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (RPD) (p. 5-24) lists the total DPA (Dog Play Area, or legal off-leash area) acreage on RPD property as 117.5 acres. However, the Natural Areas Program, for which the SNRAMP is its management plan, proposes to close over 14 acres of DPA space to off-leash recreation. Therefore, the total acreage of off-leash space in San Francisco

city parks, after SN RAMP, is 103.24 acres, less than the non-beach-road-and-trails acreage lost because of restrictions in the GGNRA Preferred Alternative. This shows the scale of the loss of off-leash space in the GGNRA when compared to available off-leash space in San Francisco city parks. The SEIS should have included this information, but it did not.

The SEIS says, on p. 372, that: "Visitors who currently visit Fort Funston would likely continue to take their dogs to Fort Funston for off-leash dog walking, despite the decrease in the area available for off-leash dog walking, compared to Alternative A." Similar comments are made at every site under consideration - if there is any off-leash space still available at a site, no matter how small, people with dogs will continue to walk in the GGNRA, and not move to nearby parks. Similarly, the SEIS says (p. 373): "However, the movement of visitors under the preferred alternative is anticipated to be low, since five GGNRA sites would still provide off-leash dog walking in ROLAs, all the sites considered for dog walking would allow areas for on-leash dog walking, and none of the sites would prohibit dogs." Yet the SEIS offers no rationale for these statements.

Clearly, the GGNRA did not listen to comments from dog walkers in response to the DEIS. Dog walkers made it clear in their DEIS comments that there is a qualitative difference between walking with a dog on-leash and off-leash. To assume, as the SEIS does, that someone accustomed to walking off-leash at a site will continue to walk there because there is still on-leash access available is ridiculous. Dog walkers made it clear that they enjoy walking long distances with their dogs on trails in the GGNRA. To assume, as the SEIS does, that someone used to walking long distances with their dog will be content to walk much shorter distances in the significantly smaller off-leash areas at sites like Fort Funston is ridiculous. To assume, as the SEIS does, that people used to walking in one long loop, where they do not pass the same site twice, will be content to make repeated loops in much smaller off-leash areas, passing the same scenery over and over again, is ridiculous. Yet the SEIS makes those assumptions. Had they listened to the DEIS comments, the SEIS would not make statements that few visitors would move to nearby parks because there will still be small off-leash and/or on-leash areas available.

As flawed as the 2012 GGNRA Dog Walking Satisfaction Visitor Study was, it does say that nearly all dog walkers who responded (98%) would be only moderately or less than moderately satisfied if they were not able to walk their dogs off-leash at the sites they frequent now (p. 339 in the SEIS). It is reasonable to assume that people who are used to walking many miles throughout Fort Funston with their dog off-leash will not be satisfied to be restricted to the significantly smaller off-leash areas proposed in the Preferred Alternative. And people who are unsatisfied will go somewhere else. In other words they will move to nearby city parks.

Because the SEIS does not include an adequate analysis of impacts on nearby parks, as requested by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and in many DEIS public comments, including mine, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

**THE SEIS CREATES A NEW CLASS OF PARK VISITORS WITH  
GUARANTEED ACCESS TO ALL GGNRA SITES**

The SEIS and the proposed Dog Management Plan essentially sets up a new special class of park visitor - those who do not want to interact with a dog - and affords them the special privilege of guaranteed access at every single site in the GGNRA. In describing why the GGNRA cannot allow any off-leash at Muir Beach, for example, the SEIS says (p. 113): "Muir Beach is a small site and there is not sufficient space to allow multiple visitor use areas on the beach (i.e., a ROLA and a no-dog area)." There is no corresponding requirement that sites that do not now allow dogs, e.g., Stinson Beach, have an off-leash area in the future (or even an on-leash one). This double standard is blatantly unfair.

Similarly, at most sites, the SEIS analysis of Alternative A says that it will have "No impact for visitors who would prefer to walk dogs at the park" but "Long-term moderate to major adverse impacts for visitors who would prefer not to have dog walking at the park" (e.g., Ocean Beach Alternative A Conclusion Table for Visitor Use and Experience, p. 1160). However, if you look at the SEIS analysis of Alternative F, the Preferred Alternative, at most sites, it says that it will have "Long-term minor to moderate adverse impacts for visitors who would prefer to walk dogs at the park" but "Beneficial impacts for visitors who would prefer not to have dog walking at the park, assuming compliance" (e.g., Ocean Beach Alternative F Conclusion Table for Visitor Use and Experience, p. 1166).

Why was the Preferred Alternative F, considered to have a beneficial impact for people who do not want to walk with dogs, while the No Action Alternative A, was only rated as having "No impact" for people who want to walk with dogs. Why was Alternative A not rated as having a "Beneficial impact" for people who want to walk with dogs? Clearly, the DEIS public comments made clear that people enjoy being able to walk with their dogs in the GGNRA now, and would not enjoy it if the Preferred Alternative's proposed restrictions were put into place. Clearly it would be a benefit to be able to continue to walk in the GGNRA. The SEIS seems to be making a value judgment that negative impacts of Alternative A on people who don't want to walk with dogs are worse than the negative impacts of Alternative F on people who want to walk with dogs. The SEIS seems to be saying people who do not want to walk with dogs are somehow 'preferred.' That is not fair or balanced.

Because the SEIS insists that one class of people - those who do not want to interact with a dog - has the right to guaranteed access to every site in the GGNRA, and because the benefits on Visitor Use and Experience for people who want to walk with dogs are analyzed in an unfair manner, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan that it supports cannot be accepted

#### THE SEIS DOES NOT ADEQUATELY ANALYZE THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The SEIS, like the DEIS before it, does not adequately analyze the No Action Alternative. There is little discussion of management strategies that could mitigate existing problems or tensions. There is no discussion of improved signage, or working with dog groups to resolve problems through training or other programs. SFDOG has conducted successful dog-horse socialization workshops modeled after workshops in the East Bay hills that reduced conflicts on trails between dogs and horses by over 90% (these workshops were mentioned in my DEIS comment). Crissy Field DOG has organized dog training workshops with the SF/SPCA at Crissy

Field. Yet the SEIS includes no mention of these and other kinds of programs that can help mitigate on-going problems. When hang gliders at Fort Funston complained about stepping in dog poop in their takeoff area, Fort Funston Dog Walkers and SFDOG produced signs, with our organizations' logos prominently displayed, asking dog walkers to keep their dogs out of the takeoff area. The signs showed dog walkers' peers asking them to stay out of the area, not the GGNRA demanding that they do so, and, as a result, the problem significantly improved. Yet there is no mention of this kind of cooperative approach to resolving issues.

There is no acknowledgement in the SEIS that it is already illegal to let dogs chase birds or jump on people. If the GGNRA enforced those rules, rather than focusing on the mere presence or absence of a leash, conflicts could be lessened. The SEIS mentions that a dog bit a police horse at Crissy Field in 2012 (p. 1228), but does not mention that a mechanism already exists to deal with aggressive dogs, and it was used in this case. The dog was referred to the San Francisco Police Departments Vicious and Dangerous Dog Unit for a hearing. The hearing officer ordered the dog to be euthanized, and, after a period of negotiation with the City, the owner finally surrendered ownership of the dog, who was then moved out of San Francisco in the care of a trainer for intense training. That dog will not cause any more problems at Crissy Field or anywhere else in the GGNRA. There is already a way to deal with aggressive dogs, as this case showed. Yet the only solution offered in the SEIS to any of these problems is to either ban dogs entirely or require leashes. Note that I made the same criticism in my DEIS comment, but the SEIS did not respond to it.

The SEIS says, on p. 97: "This project is unique in that adverse impacts to park resources and values are currently occurring as a result of alternative A and are therefore described as "continued" because they are occurring and will continue to occur without action." Yet, as has been described earlier, the SEIS says the GGNRA does not have any site-specific, peer-reviewed studies providing evidence of impacts from dogs on vegetation and soils or on wildlife. Dogs have been walked off-leash at GGNRA sites for over 40 years (at least as long as the GGNRA has been in existence). Negative impacts should be clear by now. But the GGNRA has not done the site specific studies that would prove they are actually there. They produced six years of literature searches, but did not produce any site-specific, peer-reviewed studies. Yet they say adverse impacts to park resources are now "continued." An EIS must base statements like that on solid evidence, but that is lacking in this case. Therefore, the analysis of the No Action Alternative that assumes these continued impacts is flawed.

In a similar vein, the SEIS says, on p. 1339: "Under Alternative A, an undefined policy never promulgated as an enforceable regulation governing dog activities within certain areas of the park..." The 1979 Pet Policy was not "undefined." It was the result of extensive public hearings and comments. It was quite clear where dogs could walk off-leash and where they could not. Again, the SEIS paints a negative and biased picture of the No Action Alternative.

The SEIS says of Alternative A on p. 1340: "Additionally, the dog management policy that would continue as a result of the no-action alternative would be inconsistent with NPS regulations..." The ostensible point of this whole exercise was to create a Dog Management Plan for the GGNRA that would allow some off-leash dog walking, even though dogs are not allowed off-leash (except when hunting and killing

wildlife!) in other units of the National Park Service. How can this be held against the No Action Alternative? It is circular reasoning at best.

Because the SEIS so inadequately and incorrectly analyzes the No Action Alternative, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE SEIS DOES NOT ADEQUATELY ANALYZE HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES

The SEIS, like the DEIS, does not provide an honest evaluation of impacts of dogs on human health and safety. This is particularly true in the SEIS discussion of dog bites. On p. 35, the SEIS says: "Data collected by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention show that approximately 4.5 million Americans are bitten by dogs each year, and one in five dog bites results in injuries that require medical attention." This statement is repeated on p. 336, followed by additional information that: "Small children are typically the most common victims of dog-related injuries because of their natural behaviors, such as running, yelling, grabbing, and hitting, which may threaten a dog. ... Elderly people are also considered at a higher risk of complications from dog-related injuries due to their increased susceptibility to bruising, lacerations, or broken/dislocated bones." On p. 1228, the SEIS adds to this expanded description of dog injuries that: "In general, children are the most common victims of serious dog bites in the United States, with 70 percent of fatal dog attacks and more than half of serious bite wounds involving children..." This is followed by an anecdotal quote from a DEIS comment from a parent whose small children were frightened by off-leash dogs.

The perception created by these statistics, and in particular the way they are presented, is that dogs in the GGNRA present a significant health risk for people, especially children and seniors. Children are likely to be seriously bitten and even killed by off-leash dogs in the GGNRA. The problem is that the SEIS presents only part of the story.

The reality is that few dog bites happen in park settings like the GGNRA. In one of the most comprehensive analyses of injuries due to dog bites, Canadian researchers searched a national database of all reports of injuries throughout Canada in 1996 (Canadian Hospitals Injury Reporting and Prevention Program, or CHIRPP; the study can be found at: [http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/injury-bles/chirpp/injrep\\_rapables/dogbit-eng.php](http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/injury-bles/chirpp/injrep_rapables/dogbit-eng.php)). Dog bites represented 1% of all injuries in the CHTRPP database.

The CHIRPP study found that children between 2 and 14 years old sustained over 70% of all bites. Most of the dogs involved in the bite incidents (65.2%) are either the victim's dog or the dog of a friend, acquaintance, neighbor, or relative. Only 12.2% were stray or unfamiliar dogs. The majority of the dog bites (64.5%) happened in someone's home (either the victim's or another person's home). Only 3.1% of dog bites in the CHIRPP study (a total of 38 incidents) occurred in a public park, in conditions like those in the GGNRA. A majority (50.3%) of the victims had been interacting with the dog before the bite - petting, handling, feeding, walking or playing with, hurting or provoking the dog, or disciplining the dog.

The CHIRPP results are similar to those reported in the United States. The Centers for

Disease Controls MMWR weekly from July 4, 2003 reported that 42% of all dog bites occurred among children under 14 years of age, and cites research that indicated that in children under 18 years old, 80% of bites were inflicted by the family's own dog (30%) or a neighbor's dog (50%). This report can be found at:

<http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5226a1.htm>.

In other words, the chance of being bitten in a park like the GGNRA by a strange dog that you have not interacted with is pretty slim. Yet, that information is not included in the SEIS. Instead, the reports about dog bites are presented in a fairly alarming manner that gives the impression that dog bites are a significant safety issue in the GGNRA, when the reality is they are not.

I presented all of this information to the GGNRA as part of my comment at the final meeting of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee. Clearly, they did not read it.

In testimony before the San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare Commission on February 8, 2007, Jean Donaldson, the founder and then-director of the SF/SPCA Dog Training Academy said:

Off-leash play has not proven to be a factor in dog bites. According to both the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the American Veterinarian Medical Association, the majority of bites take place on the guardians' property. The remaining incidents involve dogs that are either restrained, i.e., leashed, or dogs that are at large, [that is,] unsupervised dogs that have escaped confinement.

Consider for example, the three highest profile serious dog attacks in the history of San Francisco. Those are Diane Whipple in 2001, Sean Jones in 2001, and Nicholas Faibish in 2005. In the first, the dogs were on-leash. In the second, the dogs had escaped confinement in the backyard and were at large. And in the third, the dog was confined in the guardian's home. I would add that in all these instances, the dogs were un-neutered.

Interestingly, it could very well be that the safest dogs are those that attend off-leash dog parks. Shyan and cohorts published a research paper in 2003 in the Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science which looked at the prevalence of interdog aggression in dog parks. Dog-dog problems turned out to be minimal and of a non-serious nature. While the paper did not consider the question of dog-to-human aggression, the obvious interpretation of this low incidence of aggression was interesting and I think very relevant. They suggested that self-selection operates strongly, i.e., people who take the time to get into their car or walk to a designated off-leash area to exercise their dog tend to not be the type who are derelict in other areas of dog guardianship, such as training, socialization or appropriate containment.

Note: The study she referred to is: "Bark Parks" - A Study on Interdog Aggression in a Limited-Control Environment, by Melissa R. Shyan, Kristina A. Fortune, and Christine King, Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science, vol. 6, no. 1, 2003

Again, I gave the GGNRA this information as part of a DEIS comment (submitted as Chair of the Animal Control and Welfare Commission), yet it was ignored. Instead the SEIS chose to present information on dog bites in a sensational manner designed to convince readers of the need for restricting off-leash access to prevent dog bites.



The GGNRA's own data in the SEIS show that dog bites or attacks are not a significant safety issue in the GGNRA. On P. 336, the SEIS says: "There were a total of 95 dog bites/attacks at GGNRA sites from 2008 through 2011." That works out to an average of about 24 bites/attacks per year. When compared to the millions of dog visits in the GGNRA each year, it is clear that only a tiny fraction of dogs cause problems. Of course, even one bite is one too many. The question is what is the best way to deal with them? There is already a mechanism in place to deal with aggressive or problem dogs - the San Francisco Police Departments Vicious and Dangerous Dog Unit. As we saw with the dog that attacked a police horse at Crissy Field in 2012, the unit deals with aggressive dogs and can order corrective measures be taken by dog owners to ensure a bite does not happen again. These measures range from requiring a dog be muzzled in public, or requiring owners to take training classes with the dog, all the way up to euthanasia of the dog in the most extreme cases. It is not necessary to require that dogs be leashed or banned entirely from large parts of the GGNRA to deal with the very few aggressive dogs. This mitigation for dog bites in the No Action Alternative was not considered in the SEIS and it should have been.

On p. 6, the SEIS gives the following reason for why the GGNRA needs to develop a new Dog Management Plan: "Since the 1990s, the San Francisco Bay Area population and overall use of the GGNRA park sites have increased, as have the number of private and commercial dog walkers. At the same time, the number of conflicts between park users with and without dogs began to rise, as did the fear of dogs and dog bites or attacks." The first sentence is disproved by the graph on p. 301 of the SEIS, "Figure 5. Recorded Annual Visitation to GGNRA, 1973 to 2011." The graph shows that since 1990, the annual visitation has remained fairly constant, hovering around 14 million visitors per year. There is no significant increase in yearly park visitors since 1990, unlike the claim made on p. 6.

So what about the second claim that conflicts between users have begun to rise? The SEIS offers no specific evidence to support this claim. However, it does discuss the total number of dog-related incidents, which is all we have available to consider. Table 5: Number and Types of Incident Reports Within GGNRA, 2001 -2011, on p. 253 of the SEIS shows a total of 4,932 dog-related incidents, out of total number of incidents reported of 45,700; that is, dog-related incidents make up 11 of the total number of incidents. The non-dog-related incidents range from Drug Offences, to Trespassing, with nearly one-third listed as "Other." "Other" clearly includes most violent crime in the GGNRA, from murder, to rape, to robbery, but the SEIS does not provide any information on how common such violent crime - the true safety risk for park visitors - is in the GGNRA. The first 11% throughout the ten year period (ranging from a low of 6% in 2006 to a high of 14% in 2004). This table does not show any significant increase in incidents, and by extension, in conflicts over the last ten years. There's no indication in this data that there have been increasing problems with dogs over at least the last ten years. This contradicts the SEIS' stated reason on p. 6 for a new Dog Management Plan.

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

On pp. 253 and 254, the SEIS says: "In addition to obtaining the annual law enforcement incident databases from 2001 through 2011, paper copies of the dog-related law enforcement incident reports for the years 2008 through 2011 were obtained from GGNRA to conduct a more detailed analysis for each GGNRA site. ... The number of dog-related incidents in the 2008 through 2011 analysis does not match the number of incidents in the analysis of the overall law enforcement data in table 5 (which includes incidents not related to dogs) because incident reports may contain more than one violation. ... there were often multiple incident violations per incident report. This was not done for the overall law enforcement data analysis because incident reports not related to dogs did not generally include multiple violations and there was insufficient staff time available to review the approximately 40,000 incident reports not related to dogs."

Essentially, the SEIS assumes that non-dog-related incident reports will not contain multiple violations as the dog-related ones do. They don't know for sure, because the paragraph makes clear that they did not actually study the paper reports for non-dog related incidents. If the total number of non-dog violations is higher because of multiple violations per incident, then the percentage of dog-related incidents, compared to the total number of incidents might be even smaller than the 11% figure reported above. That the SEIS did not perform this analysis of paper copies of reports for both the dog-related and non-dog-related incidents, and instead did it for just one of them, is just sloppy science. The point to keep in mind is that 89% of the incident reports in the GGNRA had nothing to do with dogs, including violent people-on-people crime. It is people who are the safety threat, not dogs.

The SEIS analysis of impacts on Human Health and Safety at each site focuses on negative impacts (bites, diseases, aggression) while seeming to ignore positive benefits to human health and social community from dog walking. Thus Alternative A for Fort Funston is determined to have long-term moderate to major adverse impacts on Human Health and Safety (p. 1312) while Alternative F is determined to have long-term minor to moderate adverse impacts (p. 1318). Similar analyses are given for Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. This is a biased analysis of impacts.

On p. 338, the SEIS reports that a survey of guide dog handlers found that: "... a total of 83 percent of respondents had experienced interface by an aggressive dog. The majority of the attacks or interface occurred on a public-right-of-way including sidewalk and roadways. Results showed that 76 percent of dog attacks were from an off-leash dog..." An off-leash dog on a sidewalk or roadway is likely to be a dog guarding its home and property or a dog that has gotten out with no owner around to control it. These circumstances are not found in the GGNRA. The more appropriate statistic would be to report the number of incidents that happened in parks like the GGNRA. The SEIS contains no information on this. Therefore, this study is not particularly useful for determining risks to guide dogs in the GGNRA.

Because the SEIS presents information on dog bites in a more inflammatory manner than is warranted by the facts, and its own data show that dog-related incidents are a small fraction of the incidents reported in the GGNRA, and most of those are leash law violations with no disturbance of wildlife or resource degradation, the SEIS does not prove that dogs are a major problem in the GGNRA. Because it does not prove that, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6589    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Richard Springwater  
3024 Clay Street  
San Francisco, CA 94115

February 16, 2014

Mr. Frank Dean,  
GGNRA Superintendent,  
Building 101, Fort Mason,  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Mr. Dean,

I recently became aware of the Park Service's plans to restrict off-leash dog walking on Crissy Field and I am writing to object to this proposed policy. I have reviewed the GGRNR Dog Management Plan and its accompanying EIS and find that the arguments presented in the Plan fail to make a persuasive case for the need for a change from the status quo. Furthermore, the analysis presented in the EIS fails to present actual adverse impacts from off-leash dog use of Crissy Field, relying entirely on speculation as to what "may" happen, or what "might" be the case. On the other hand, the EIS entirely ignores the very real adverse impacts that would occur if off-leash dog walking were further restricted at Crissy Field.

My dog and I visit Crissy Field several days a week to run the promenade between the Crissy Field Center and Fort Point, and we know Crissy Field intimately. The location and views, the quality of the landscape design and the diversity of visitors from the Bay Area and around the world all make Crissy Field a local and national treasure. Restricting off-leash areas would significantly degrade this environment by eliminating an activity enjoyed by thousands of visitors every year.

This letter presents three separate comments to the EIS:

- 1) Law enforcement issues related to the presence of off-leash dogs are very minor in relation to the heavy use by dog owners at Crissy Field;
- 2) Conflicts between dogs and wildlife at Crissy Field are non-existent given the extent of currently fenced areas; and
- 3) Crissy Field is a unique urban park and regulations that apply to National Parks and Wilderness Areas elsewhere should not be applied at Crissy Field without consideration of the differences.

Law enforcement issues are minor. As the Park Service well knows, the

---

number of dog-related incidents is extremely low, with reports showing a total of six

dog bites throughout the entire GGNRA during 2013, among hundreds of thousands of visitors. While a dog bite is a serious matter regardless of how few occur, the Park Service currently has the authority to restrict dogs that do not respond to voice command. Furthermore, a leash is no guarantee that a dangerous dog will not bite a stranger. Restricting the freedom of all dog owners because of the actions of a very small number of irresponsible dog owners is fundamentally unfair.

All uses of Crissy Field present potential undesirable consequences: bicycles collide with pedestrians and other bikes, picnics create litter and packaging endangers wildlife, auto access generates air pollution and pedestrian and cycling hazards, surfers and sail boarders create risks to self and others, yet these activities are encouraged because they serve the GGNP.A's recreational mandate and enhance the diversity of visitors to the site. Off-leash dog walking is indistinguishable from these other uses.

Conflicts between dogs and wildlife on Crissy Field are non-existent. I have read the letters from the birding community and respect their opinions. My family and I have in the past been members of the Golden Gate Raptor Observatory and watching the birds at Crissy Field is a big part of the joy of being there. In twenty years of running on Crissy Field, I once, and only once, saw a dog chase a bird on the meadow. The dog was a puppy who did not know any better, and the bird simply flew away. Dogs are not predators like feral cats. The assertion that the off-leash dogs at Crissy Field endanger wildlife is unsupported by evidence and absurd on its face. I fully support the extensive fencing of sensitive areas to protect landscape and wildlife, including the Snowy Plover nesting area from humans and dogs, but the current policy of allowing off-leash dog walking cannot be shown to have any impact on the well-being of the avian population of Crissy Field.

On this point, I would also add that I am very sympathetic toward the goals of birders at other sites within the GGNRA where landscape and wildlife may not be well protected by fencing. Preservation of bird habitat should be a high priority within the GGNRA. I support fencing and limiting off-leash pets in such sensitive areas. Crissy Field, however, is a model of how sensitive habitat can be protected by fencing in such a way as to eliminate conflicts between birds, sensitive habitat, people and dogs. It needs no additional restrictions.

Crissy Field is Unique. Aristotle wrote: "There is nothing so unequal as the equal treatment of unequals" and that certainly describes the proposed GGNRA Dog Management Plan. When I started running on Crissy Field twenty years ago, the site was derelict and resembled a superfund site more than a park. Thanks to the efforts of the non-profit Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy and the generosity of the Haas family and other private donors, Crissy Field has become an urban paradise, but it is a man-made paradise. Crissy Field is a simulation of a natural shoreline, designed by Hargreaves Associates, to replace the industrialized wasteland the Army left behind.

Quoting Michael Boland in "Crissy Field: A New Model for Managing Urban Parkland," in the Design Observer: ([http://places.designobserver.com/media/pdf/Crissy\\_Field:\\_925.pdf](http://places.designobserver.com/media/pdf/Crissy_Field:_925.pdf))

Until the mid-nineteenth century Crissy Field was occupied by sand dunes and salt marshes. Filling began in the 1870s and was completed in time for the area to become part of the grounds on which the Panama Pacific Exhibition was staged in 1915. Then, when the exhibition came down, the site was transformed into the first military airfield on the West Coast. Thus it was that when the National Parks Service inherited the site in 1974, 70 of its acres were covered in asphalt and hard packed dirt while rubble lined much of its 6,000-foot shoreline.

Treating Crissy Field as a pristine wilderness area just because it looks like one today misses the mark. There may be other areas within the GGNRA that qualify as preservation sites but Crissy Field is not one of them. Crissy Field is an urban recreation area designed for local community uses and paid for by a local community with the clear goal of encouraging a rich and diverse range of human recreational activities. I share the belief that the National Park System is "America's Best Idea," but it is important not to conflate the National Park System, including its mandate to preserve our natural resources, with this "new model" of an urban park. Crissy Field was conceived through ten years of intense local community participation, designed with artistic imagination and ecological research, and constructed on a brownfield site formerly owned by the U.S. Army. Superimposing wilderness preservation restrictions on a man-made park in contradiction to the priorities set by the community that created the park, disrespects the community and is unjust on its face.

Throughout its history, Crissy Field has permitted use by off-leash dogs under voice command as part of a happy mix of uses that reflects the needs and desires of its local community. The conflicts between dogs and people, and dogs and wildlife, which have been asserted by the Dog Management Plan and analyzed by its EIS, do not occur at Crissy Field except on very rare occasions. Restricting off-leash dog walking at Crissy Field ignores Crissy Field's community legacy and degrades the richness and diversity of its environment.

Very truly yours,

Richard Springwater

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6590	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94147-5372 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Crissy Field Dog Group Recreational Groups				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 18, 2014				
Mr. Frank Dean General Superintendent Golden Gate National Recreation Area Building 201, Fort Mason San Francisco, CA 94123					

Re: Crissy Field Dog Group on the Draft Dog Management Plan /  
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

---

Dear Superintendent Dean:

The Crissy Field Dog Group (CFDG) submits the follow comments on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), released in Fall, 2013. CFDG supports maintaining the existing status quo of dog recreational areas. In recognition that enforcement and/or compliance may always be improved, CFDG proposes additional solutions here which should be considered and incorporated into a modified preferred alternative that is based on Alternative A.

The detailed analysis of the SEIS completed by K&L Gates on behalf of CFDG is incorporated by this reference. Set forth below are additional comments of the CFDG. I have also enclosed my own detailed comments on SEIS which are also incorporated by this reference. Set forth below are additional comments of the CFDG.  
Monitoring-Based Management Strategy

The NPS in the SEIS modifies and renames the adaptive management program as a Monitoring-Based Management Strategy which is defined as:  
Monitoring-Based Management Strategy-A program designed to encourage compliance with sections of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) applicable to dog management, and ensure protection of park resources, visitors and staff. Tt provides the framework for monitoring and recording observed noncompliance with the applicable sections of the CFR, including the new 36 CFR Part 7 special regulation, and will guide use of park resources to address those violations. Noncompliance with federal regulations related to dog management will be met with a range of management responses. The program will also monitor for impacts to natural and cultural resources.

Despite these sensible goals, unfortunately, the SEIS does not provide clarity on exactly what and how the system will actually work. See SEIS p. 63-67. The entirety of the discussion of the Monitoring Based Management Strategy appears to take less than 7 pages of the SEIS. While understandably one size does not fit all, the monitoring-based management strategy is in essence a program that says the NPS will know when the program is not working when they see it and will do whatever they think makes sense without any public input so long as closures are for one year or less.

The SEIS fails to adequately analyze and take into account the recommendations contained in CFDG Appendix A to May 27, 2011 comments which is again incorporated as part of these comments as Ex. A. While the NPS says that the program will be peer reviewed and available for public comment, there is no description of how, when or under what circumstances those conditions will be met. See SEIS p. 66. The general description of If compliance rates or resource impacts are deemed unacceptable based on the previous 12 months monitoring data in one of the zones, in spite of the parks primary management actions, the park will evaluate secondary management responses, including short-term closures does not explain what is meant by deemed unacceptable by whom or by what standard. SEIS p. 66. Moreover, there is no description of how park users will be kept informed of the monitoring results at meaningful times to provide additional information to the NPS. Finally, the ultimate threat is that if the NPS decides that the administrative burden is too much, then the benefits in allowing the use is outweighed by the NPS administrative burden required to manage the use, draining

limited resources needed for other important park programs without any standards how that determination will be made. SEIS p. 67

NPS in the SEIS has failed to adequately analyze and respond to other comments of the CFDG.

Failure to Analyze Voice and Sight Control Results for Boulder, CO Tag Program

The NPS should consider a certification/tag program comparable to one implemented in Boulder, CO. Based on how much NPS is willing to spend on its preferred alternative, there appears to be funding available for a certification/tag program (the Green Tag Program). A Green Tag Program can also be developed through alternative funding mechanisms, including community-based models, use of the parks conservancy resources, and hybrid approaches (e.g., where some resources from the current proposed monitoring based management plan are reallocated to other strategies such as a Green Tag Program).

To promote public awareness within the dog walking community of the unique resources within the GGNRA where off leash dog recreation is permitted as well as to inform GGNRA visitors with dogs of their rights and responsibilities for voice and sight off leash dog recreation within the GGNRA, the National Park Service should implement a mandatory Green Tag Program. This proposal assumes that there is sufficient space for park visitors with dogs such that the program will be viable. CFDG, as noted, supports use of the status quo off leash dog walking areas.

All GGNRA visitors with dogs who wish to engage in off leash recreation with their dogs would be required to obtain a Green Tag that would have to be attached to the collar of each off leash dog. In order to obtain the Green Tag, each GGNRA visitor with a dog (including each member of their household who wishes to walk a dog off leash) would be required to participate in an instructional class given at a location determined by the GGNRA, and agree to abide by the Green Tag Program voice and sight rules and regulations.

The Green Tag is specific to the GGNRA visitor- not the dog. No off leash dog recreation would be possible in the GGNRA without a Green Tag. Violation of the Green Tag voice and sight rules and regulations will subject the GGNRA visitor with dogs off leash to fines which escalate. If a GGNRA Visitor with a dog off leash has 3 violations in 24 months, they lose their Green Tag rights. GGNRA visitors with dogs who lose their Green Tag rights must successfully complete a Green Tag Program approved certification course and agree to be bound by the Green Tag Program voice and sight rules and regulations in addition to paying a reinstatement fee before they can walk dogs off leash in the GGNRA again.

Advantages of a Green Tag Program are many, as it would allow enforcement to target problem users (the real cause of issues), not problem areas. A Green Tag Program is more fair and effective because responsible dog users are not punished and deprived of recreational resources as a result of a few problem users. Moreover, a Green Tag Program can provide a cross-cutting solution to address all impacts of concern including species of concern and other areas needing enforcement. Data from the Boulder program should be considered by NPS, given that that program obtained rates of tag carry compliance over 90% and in the initial year of implementation user conflict dropped by roughly 40%. Compliance rates for leash carry regulations were at almost 100% according to a Boulder representative, and there have been almost no incidents of wildlife harassment. Voice and sight control compliance is in the high 80% to low 90% range. This information did not receive analysis in the SEIS. The only reference to the Boulder program in the SEIS is in reference to waste removal - not voice and sight control performance. See SEIS p. 1231 and the list of references SEIS p. 1364. Relevant reports on the Boulder voice and sight control experience, including additional modifications to

the program being considered, are cited here and CFDG specifically requests that NPS review and strongly consider this information:

City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks, Voice and Sight Tag Program Evaluation (Jan. 2013), available at <https://www-static.bouldercolorado.gov/docs/voice-and-sight-tag-program-evaluation-I-201306071558.pdf>

City of Boulder Voice and Sight Tag Program Monitoring Report (2011) available at <https://www-static.bouldercolorado.gov/docs/voice-sight-tag-propram-monitoring-reort-1-201304101211.pdf>

Failure to Analyze the Impact of the Proposed Alternatives on Recreation

As detailed in the K&L Gates comments made on behalf of CFDG, the SEIS fails to take into account recreation as part of the environment in the GGNRA and the impact on human recreational uses from the proposed preferred alternative. The SEIS does not analyze or respond adequately to the recommendation made as Exhibit B to the original CFDG comments which are attached here as part of Exhibit A.

As counsel for CFDG has pointed out in the past:

Conservation of recreation is an essential GGNRA value that should not be impaired (see SDEIS inadequate discussion of impairment on pages 42-43). Certainly conservation of GGNRA's ecological integrity is a paramount mandate under the NPS organic act, but omitting urban recreation as an objective and as a park value that should be maintained improperly biases the planning and alternatives evaluation process.

Instead, the SDEIS treats GGNRA as victim of lack of recreational space in Bay Area (pages 21-22). As noted, the need for urban recreation area is one of the main reasons GGNRA was established in the first place (see GGNRA organic act quoted above and on page 43 of the SDEIS). This need for urban recreation is not an impact on GGNRA - it is one of GGNRA's fundamental purposes. This basic error permeates the SDEIS.

Comment of Ken Weiner to SEIS dated February 14, 2014. The SEIS bias against recreation impacts park users and the members of CFDG disproportionately. CFDG recommends that NPS perform the evaluation originally recommend in Exhibit B to CFDG's original comments.

The Lack of Site Specific Impact Data Leads to Unwarranted Assumptions

In response to CFDG's original comments noting the defects in the scientific data and basis for its assumptions, NPS's response can fairly be summarized as:

In lieu of site specific data, research methods generally accepted in the scientific community and best professional judgment have been used to draw conclusions regarding expected impacts to resources, consistent with CEQ and DOT requirements. The available data provides sufficient information to allow the decision maker to make a reasoned choice among alternatives.

What is described as reasoned choice among alternatives does not explain the assumptions about what could or might happen in the future. These are sites where there has been active recreation for decades. While the research methods may be appropriate for the locations where the research was done, the SEIS fails to adequately take into account the different and unique circumstances of these sites. Without that detail, the leaps from other data to the conclusion that an impact could happen is insufficient to support the need for the preferred alternative. CFDG urges that there be site-specific data and analysis before the conclusions reached about what could happen are meaningful.

Recent Data and Experience Demonstrates that the Status Quo is Working

Based upon the most recent enforcement data that has been released, CFDG understands that during the past year there have been reported 6 people bitten by dogs, 5



dogs that were fighting, 2 dogs that were rescued from cliffs, 2 scared person reports, 1 reported gosling death and a horse bitten by a dog. CFDG takes each of these incidents very seriously and is working with the SPCA and the GGNRA to support responsible dog ownership. The SPCA has been offering Off Leash Open Space dog-training classes that are very popular and successful at the Crissy Field Center and Grassy Airfield. But given the high number of visitors with dogs that are in the park each and every day, these statistics do not support the proposed alternative. CFDG recommends that NPS take the most recent enforcement statistics into account and change the preferred alternative to A. Crissy Field Specific Issues

The Preferred Alternative proposes to dramatically reduce off leash recreation at Crissy Field. This is a complete reversal of direction from the original Crissy Field Environmental assessment where the plan proposed to increase the acreage available for off leash recreation from 38 acres to 70 acres. Crissy Field EA p.10. The purpose was to allow for anticipated increases in the need for off leash recreational activity. Children with and without dogs, families, and other park users have all coexisted on East Beach successfully. The SEIS has not analyzed the impact on those park users who currently use East Beach for off leash recreation as they have for decades.

The SEIS has also failed to adequately take into account the impact of reducing the available off leash recreation area for responsible commercial dog walkers and other park visitors with dogs because of the increased concentration of dogs in smaller off leash recreation areas. As identified in the K&L Gates comments submitted on behalf of CFDG, the shrinkage of off leash recreation areas impacts all of the regional and city parks by increasing the number of visitors with dogs to those locations. The SEIS fails to adequately evaluate the impacts on these park users and neighbors. Each of the governing bodies of Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo have raised their objections to the preferred alternative for precisely these reasons as documented in the K&L Gates comments.

CFDG recommends that NPS implement continued education and outreach - such as the SPCA Off Leash Open Space dog training course already offered at Crissy Field and to change the preferred alternative to A.

Other areas under consideration for off leash dog walking in the GGNRA

The preferred alternative is unreasonably restrictive of off-leash dog walking in the other areas of the GGNRA. No off leash resources are proposed for San Mateo County. This is plainly unacceptable. Off leash areas in San Francisco would be reduced from 5 to 3, with two of the remaining areas being further restricted. In Marin County, only 2 off-leash areas would remain of the current 5. These restrictions have not been justified based on sound site specific science. Moreover, these restrictions create substantial risk of dispersion of existing off-leash use to the few remaining areas, where impacts may be concentrated. Finally, these restrictions are simply impractical - - they will not reduce the demand for off-leash dog walking.

The SEIS fails to adequately identify or measure specific impacts on recreational users under the proposed alternative for restrictions on dogs under voice control at Upper Fort Mason, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Ft. Miley, Lands End, Ocean Beach, and Fort Funston or the other areas under consideration in Marin and San Mateo counties. The SEIS assumes the possible impacts that dogs could have or might have are not supported by site-specific data. CFDG recommends that NPS change its preferred alternative to A for these areas.

Practical Solutions

In conclusion, we believe the following is a workable and reasonable solution for the dog management plan:

1) Maintain the status quo of recreational dog walking areas: the GGNRA 1979

Pet Policy plus designated off leash areas in San Mateo lands, with additional enforcement and mitigation measures identified here.

2) Implement a variation of the Boulder Green Tag Program for clear enforcement

3) Educational Outreach: partnering with the SF SPCA and Marin Humane Society in developing and expanding an Off Leash Open Space Training Program.

4) Mitigation Measures: Vegetative barriers, post and cable fencing to protect plant species, clear signage

5) Recreational Roundtable: Community stakeholders who are committed to resolving on-going issues within the GGNRA (public private partnership)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important document.

Sincerely,

Martha Walters, Chair

Crissy Field Dog Group

cc: House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-CA

Senator Diane Feinstein, D-CA

Senator Barbara Boxer, D-CA

Rep. Jackie Speier, D-San Mateo

Rep. Jared Huffman, D-Marin

Sally Jewel!, Secretary of the Interior

Gina McCarthy, US EPA

Horst Greczmiel, Council on Environmental Quality

Jon Jarvis, National Park Service Director

Christine Lehnertz, NPS Western Regional Director

Frank Dean, Superintendent, GGNRA

Jared Blumenfeld, US EPA Region 9

San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee

Supervisor Scott Wiener, City of San Francisco

Dr. Jennifer Scarlett, Co-President, SF SPCA

Rebecca Katz, Executive Director, Animal Care and Control

Nancy McKenny, Executive Director, Marin Humane Society

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6591	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 12, 2014				

Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Attn: SEIS

Re: Draft GGNRA Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS

Dear Superintendent Dean,

---

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important document, the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft DMP/SEIS).

I have lived with my dogs in Montara since 1999. We have always enjoyed walking in the area, particularly Rancho Corral de Tierra since it is not far from our home. Some of my dogs have been allowed off-leash (since they have a reliable recall) and some are only allowed on-leash, but all have gotten exercise, fresh air, and sensory stimulation with me by walking far and wide in Rancho. I am also a paraglider pilot, and enjoy spending time at Mon Point and areas of the GGNRA in San Francisco. Sometimes my dogs accompany me and sometimes I am there flying above. When POST purchased Rancho to protect it from development we were quite happy, and learning that the GGNRA would take over management seemed a good fit since weve enjoyed recreational activities on other GGNRA lands.

We were honestly a bit shocked to hear that the GGNRA was planning to dramatically restrict access to all lands for dog owners and their pets. These lands (in San Francisco and San Mateo County) have been a haven for our dogs for decades, and friends often join us on our walks - enjoying both the area and the joy of dogs romping alongside us. While there are always poorly behaved humans (who do not appropriately control their dogs), the vast majority we have encountered share our appreciation for the area and respect for others.

When our local paragliding club (Bay Area Paragliding Association) worked with the rangers at the GGNRA to establish permits to fly at the Stables (just south of Fort Funston) and Mon Point, we were treated with respect and consideration for our recreational use of the area, and established guidelines to support and respect other recreational uses (such as horseback riding). We would hope that similar respect and consideration would be afforded dogs and their humans, particularly in Rancho, where dogs and their humans are in the majority of users of this wonderful recreational area.

From Julie Spiegler (continued)

It is my understanding that aspects of the GGNRA Tsplan imply that the area should be treated like a national park, rather than a recreational area. As a frequent visitor to our federally managed and protected open spaces (US Forest Service lands, Bureau of Land Management lands, National Recreation Areas, and National Parks), there are definite differences in the management goals and therefore type of activities supported. Please consider all DMP/SEIS options in the light of our beloved National Recreation Area use - GGNRA land is not a National Park.

All actions to change, contrary to Congressional act, the GGNRA to a National Park (whether in name or in deed) with the associated restrictions are unlawful. The intention of a National Recreation Area clearly is to support recreation (to preserve for public use and enjoyment... areas... possessing outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values..., and to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment). Studies have shown that dog ownership increases recreational walking - supporting both recreational use of the area along with improved health benefits for the population. Another

study showed that 40% of those walking/hiking in at an urban site were dog walking. Use of GGNRA lands by dog walkers is clearly a primary recreational activity.

I am also a member of the Montara Dog Group, who I know have been very diligent in providing detailed feedback about the various plan options throughout this process. The preferred alternative for Rancho is Alternative A, the No Action alternative, with the addition of two off-leash dog walking areas: one near Montara and the other near El Granada (per Attachments provided by Bill Bechtell, President, Montara Dog Group, in his letter dated January 10, 2014). Dogs would be allowed on-leash throughout the remainder of Rancho as indicated in Alternative A in the SEIS. Note that part of my reasoning for modifications to this alternative is that the status quo for Rancho should be the historic use before the GGNRA took over management, since the original GGNRA rules were made without appropriate consideration and discussion. Further, the GGNRA covers Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo Counties, however the proposed plan has off-leash dog walking areas in San Mateo County - this does not create a visitor experience consistent throughout all areas.

Thank you for your consideration.

Julie Spiegler

Page 2 of 3

From Julie Spiegler (continued)

Cc:

U.S. Senator Diane Feinstein

U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer

Congresswoman Jackie Speier

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

State Senator Leland Yee

State Senator Jerry Hill

State Assembly Member Kevin Mullin

Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell

National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis

National Park Service, Pacific West Region Director John J. Reynolds

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

San Mateo County Supervisor Don Horsley

Crissy Field Dog Group Chair, Martha Walters

Montara Dog Group President, Bill Bechtell

Does getting a dog increase recreational dog walking? Cutt, H.E., Knuiman, M.W., and Giles Corti, B. - published in International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 2008. <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/1479-5868-5-17>

Additional studies cited in Psychology Today article: <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-teenage-mind/201311/dogs-are-good-your-health>

Physical Activity and the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum Stanis, S.A.W., Schneider, I.E., Shinew, K.J., Chavez, D.J., and Vogel, M.C. - published in the Journal of Park and Recreation

Administration., Winter 2009.

[http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/chavez/psw\\_2009\\_chavez\(wilhelm\\_stanis\)006.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/chavez/psw_2009_chavez(wilhelm_stanis)006.pdf)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6592	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	DRAFT DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN				

Superintendent

United States Department of the Interior OFFICE  
National Park Service Golden Gate Recreational Area  
Fort Mason, San Francisco, Ca 94123

Dear Sir,

The above address brings me to a point of contention long resounding in the dog owners hearts! The area of Crissy Field is part of the GGNRA but is not a National Park. I feel strongly that this should be considered in the off leash issue.

If 7% of the detritus from dogs is all that has been reported how does this compare to the detritus from humans? Most of us pick up or carry to trash cans or what groups leave when using the area and we also pick up what is washed ashore and harmful to anyone using the area. Most of us pick up after our dogs and others as well and we make a concerted effort to remind offenders, too.  
I am enclosing a piece of rusted metal found today (2/15) at Crissy Field. When the 75 Celebration for the bridge was held an enormous tent was put up on the grass. Afterwards the removal by workers pulling the canvas up and the hooks shot out all over the grass and the central path. I know this as I collected 150 or so of these on the path and in the grass, and told staff about them. Here today I find yet another. What is this doing to the environment? Hopefully this won't happen again.

Instead of fining people unless there is a gross situation involving a dog why not post signs saying that we walkers are willing to leash on weekends and holidays after 9:30 a.m.? We have suggested this many times and enforcement would be costly at first but would taper off. Your park service will suffer from the city residents when dogs have to leave areas and go to local parks-who pays for the extra maintaining for this?

Sadly, areas in San Mateo which allowed dogs on leash have terminated this practice.

The Crissy Field

Dog group has tried in many areas to help: With help from the Park service we have provided a dog shower. We supply poop bags a cost of \$2,000 a year and volunteers fill the containers. It appears to many that you have not effectively reviewed our suggestions and have closed your interest in listening to us! With the number of animals and the limited space surely something can be made to work! It is a fragile area but we all need to share it!

Thank you,

Nancy Solari  
2440 Union St  
San Francisco, CA 94123

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6593    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044

United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** E-mail

**Correspondence:** To: Golden Gate National Recreation Area

From: Dyer Crouch

Date: Feb 18th, 2014

Re: The input from the City Of Pacifica to the GGNRA

I was very distressed to see an article regarding the City of Pacifica and input to the GGNRA requesting more areas be available to on leash dogs. This does not represent my wishes or the wishes of many in Pacifica that I have discussed this with.

Let me point out that I am proud to say that I have 3 rescue dogs in my family. Unfortunately both my family and our dogs encounter off leash dogs all through the GGNRA, and at times problems with them. I, and I am sure many others agree with the current recommendations by the GGNRA, understanding the problems with enforcement and wildlife that the GGNRA has experienced to date.

While it would be great to have more access for dogs on leash, the owners who continue to take their dogs off leash in sensitive areas have caused and perpetuated the problems by making other dog owners feel that it is OK for them too. This is only common sense.

Some number of the owners who claim they have control do not, and others who claim their dogs are not a problem are. People deny chasing wildlife is a problem, when kids or even toddlers get knocked down by a rambunctious dog, the owners sometime cheerfully say "oh hey they are only playing!". I have experienced this and had many similar incidents recounted to me by many others.

I have no doubt the GGNRA rangers can report ridiculous first hand experiences as well.

The GGNRA is responsible for addressing a problem, protecting the wildlife and the public. The people that are the problem are what has necessitated this to be addressed with the dog management plan.

Reasonable people know and understand this.

I am disappointed that the city of Pacifica would take this position since the problem with off leash dogs is a well-known problem in "on leash areas" of Pacifica, with the city either unwilling to, or unable to address it.

\*I have included text which was "cut/paste" from just two letters to the editor of many similar one at the end of this letter. One from a few years ago, and another recently published that demonstrate the continuing frustration of people dealing with this issue.

In a well-publicized recent incident, a pregnant woman and her child/fetus were even killed by a dog here in the city. And yet the city continues to ignore the safety issue here.

This is why I am disappointed that the city asks the GGNRA to follow suit knowing the difficulties in "leash" enforcement, the problems with public safety and wildlife protections.

It is my belief that the request to the GGNRA from the city of Pacifica is at the behest of individuals and groups such as POOCH. The claim that bay area dog owners bring money to the vicinity for recreation is obviously a repeat of claims in an editorial in the Pacifica Tribune from POOCH president Beverly Kingsbury on March 18th, 2009. In that editorial she was also disputing wildlife management efforts.

The lack of understanding of wildlife management by the city is clearly demonstrated by 6 letters I have included that show how our city deals with wildlife management at Pacifica State Beach (PSB).

PSB is a CA State Park managed by the city of Pacifica, and was on the USFWS Western Snowy Plover recovery plan:

---

The first is a letter from the California Coastal Commission directing the city to CA State Parks for input/approval when the city applied for a permit for some "signage".

This was by the city in an effort to respond to the letters from residents and around 10 wildlife organizations/groups who asked the city to address the loose dogs and protections of the Western Snowy Plover at Pacifica State Beach (USFWS Plover site CA-48).

The second letter states (incorrectly) that the city wants to address Western Snowy Plover protections at Pacifica State Beach by following the general rules and regulations of State Parks.

\*I state "incorrectly" as when the general rules and regulations were provided to the city, the city challenged this and later tried to avoid/bury them along with other pertinent recommendations.

The third letter from the city claimed that CA State Parks was in error on points in the letter, and the city challenged State Parks on this.

The fourth letter was from State Parks re-iterating input regarding dogs (which happens to be the same measures that were listed on the USFWS recovery plan for that location, as well as other wildlife sources such as Point Reyes Bird Observatory for this location).

The fifth item here was a memo to create a "subcommittee to clear this up and provide recommendations including the dog owners group POOCH on the subcommittee. No biologists or experts were involved. Both myself and another bird observer were challenged and disputed when we presented studies, law, regulations etc... mostly by Beverly Kinsbury of POOCH.

Amusingly the bird counter/observer which was listed as a "resource" that the group used (Edwin Geer), was quite frustrated at the challenging of credible data and obvious weight POOCH was given by staff in the subcommittee. He did not feel that he was a resource, but that his name was used for credibility of the subcommittee..

The CA State Parks letter with unwanted recommendations was received on a Friday, it took 3 business days to come up with and announce this "subcommittee" the following Wednesday.

The resulting staff report and presentation had pertinent agencies and offices as "mentioned background and recommendations", with the "subcommittee" at the forefront.

At this point, the city council was approached by members of the public asking for USFWS input and an attorneys notification letting the city know in clear language with supporting documentation that they (the city of Pacifica) were in violation of federal law, the Endangered Species Act.

The city finally turned to get input from an appropriate resource that could not be dismissed by having the implication of a lawsuit.

Three years later, (USFWS response was in 2011) the city continues to negotiate down the recommendations with staff making claims of delays caused by "waiting for input/clarification from" USFWS after it has already been received.

This issue has been going on since 2008, and Pacifica's lack of ability to deal with wildlife management is another reason I would ask that the GGNRA to look at Pacifica's history and motivation when weighing the input from the City of Pacifica on the dog management plan.

I am also displeased that so many other municipalities and elected officials have responded in kind.

This is no doubt a response to the ridiculous number of emails I get from individuals and dog owners groups such as "San Francisco Dog Owners Group" that I get weekly.

I could understand how this massive mobilization by the vocal minority has convinced many that they are speaking for the silent majority. This is not the case.

Thank you for addressing these difficult issues with the dog management plan, and for all the GGNRA has done for our GGNRA lands.

Dyer Crouch

Pacifica, California.

Seven attachments with this document are:

6 PDF documents showing the exchanges of CCC, State Parks, City of Pacifica and resulting memo.

1 PDF document from B. Naficy notifying the city they are in violation of the ESA.

2 letters to the editor below are cut and paste from the web version of the Pacifica Tribune after they were in print. Note Linda mar is Pacifica State Beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6594    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent NPS  
Fort Mason Rm 201  
San Francisco, CA

Re: park planning Golden Gate re dogs

Dear Sir,

I love at the above address and go jogging to the Golden Gate Bridge and sometimes over the bridge. I am for prohibiting dogs from being in the area. Just today 3 dogs came towards me (within a foot), not on leashes. I had to go under a chain fence; hide behind the NPS dog notice to get away. The dogs take away from the beauty of enjoying the wonderful scenery. A prior time last month the owner failed to clean up poop her dog left.

Sincerely

Helen Bunt Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6595    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** na, UN na  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,27,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Attn: SEIS

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am a resident of southern Marin, and former longtime resident of San Francisco. I am a dog owner, and frequent visitor of the GGNRA together with my husband and two young children. We live adjacent to the Marin headlands, and a 12-mile drive to Muir Beach. We regularly walk out dog on Miwok Trail, Oakwood Trail, and at Muir Beach. We chose to live in this area in large part because of the access to the trails, the coast, and specifically to areas that provide dog access - both on and off-leash. We also visit Crissy Field and other areas of the GGNRA regularly. Having a dog providing him access to the outdoors is an important part of our family's quality of life.

I am an environmental planner by profession. I have a master's degree in marine policy and am passionate

---



about environmental protection. I have written, managed the writing of, and reviewed EIRs and EISs for more than 10 years.

My comments on the SEIS are as follows:

1. Comments provided on the DEIS have not been adequately responded to. The changes made to the DEIS were less than substantive considering the serious inadequacies noted.
2. The basis for the SEIS - the Purpose and Need for Action - needs to be completely revised to address two fundamental inadequacies"
  - i. The first part of the need statement asserts the resources/values could be impacted ("A draft plan/SEIS is needed because GGNRA resources and values, as defined by the park's enabling legislation with the NPS Organic Act, could be compromised to the extent that, without action, those resources and values in some areas of the park might not be available for enjoyment by future generations.") The document continues to describe possible impacts, biological and health-safety, that are not backed by credible studies, observations, or science in the GGNRA. The issues raised are conjecture rather than real issues based on solid data.
  - ii. The second part of the need statement implies that all NPS areas need to be regulated in a consistent manner ("Additionally, a dog management policy inconsistent with NPS regulations and increased public expectations for use of the park for dog recreation has resulted in controversy, litigation, and compromised visitor experience and resulting in resource degradation. The conflicts will likely escalate if not addressed in a comprehensive draft plan/SEIS." Parks have different values and resources and should be managed accordingly. Adaptive management is very much an accepted principle, and the Park Service should consider this in the management of its different resources. Recreation has long been an important value of the urban GGNRA. The "need" statement implies the NPS doesn't want the headache of inconsistent management - this is a woeful and un-compelling reason to remove dog access that so many people and dogs have come to depend on and enjoy for their quality of life. Sometimes our jobs are difficult, but worthwhile to uphold the values we set out for ourselves.
3. The SEIS lacks relevant scientific evidence to adequately substantiate claims of potential impacts. Where impacts cannot be appropriately substantiated, they should be removed from the document. This particularly pertains to assertions of biological and health/safety impacts.
4. The document still lacks appropriate analysis of recreational resources in the urban setting of the San Francisco Bay Area. NEPA requires that environmental impacts on the quality of the human environment be considered. They were not.
5. Based on my above points, I strongly support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. I strongly oppose Alternative F, the preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the Golden Gate Recreation Area. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. You haven't conducted peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. The Golden Gate Recreation Area was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely populated area. It requires a different management strategy than a National Park. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 Pet Policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. If specific issues/impacts do arise, substantiated by data, please, work with the community to find creative management solutions, rather than broad-brush, heavy-handed abolitions. Please honor the mission of the GGNRA, which is to promote not only natural but also recreational value of the park. My family, including my dog, and so many others depend on the continued enjoyment of our common resources for our quality of life.

Best,

Antonia Sivyver

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6596    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94107  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February, 10, 14  
Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Re; Draft Environmental Impact Statement / Draft Dog Management Plan

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Tim Sinclair and I am fortunate to be a resident of San Francisco where I have owned a home for over 20 years now. I live in Potrero Hill with my partner, David, and our Weimaraner, Hunter. As a family, we use the GGNRA on a weekly basis. In fact, rain or shine, we take advantage of the wonderful off leash area at Crissy Field at least twice a week, more if we are able. Going to Crissy Field is a part of our regular routine and have built a community there that adds greatly to our quality of life. Like many of the dog owners that use the area, we support and encourage use of Crissy Field in an environmentally responsible manner. In fact, I have noticed that, as a group, those who bring their dogs tend to have higher standards in this regard and are very mindful of taking care of this very special place. I keep my dog under voice and sight control, clean up after him, and always keep him out of the fenced dunes and vegetative areas. As a responsible dog guardian, It is important for my dog walking friends and me that the area of Crissy Field that currently allows dogs to be off-leash remain open for off leash dog walking access.

I do not agree with the GGNRA's current preferred alternative as it significantly restricts and eliminates off leash dog walking in many areas within the GGNRA. The proposed changes to the existing conditions (1979 Pet Policy) and to the new lands in San Mateo County are not based upon sound science or long-term monitoring of site-specific conditions.

As presented in the DEIS, the proposed dog management plan eliminates dogwalking (on and off leash) access for all new lands (additions to the GGNRA sometime in the future) within San Mateo county lands. The GGNRA's mission applies equally to new lands as existing lands and it is essential for the GGNRA to consider reasonable and balanced alternatives for dog walking on new lands.

I am concerned about the long-term preservation of the GGNRA's natural resources and want to protect these important natural areas, but other options (besides restricting dog- walking access) should be considered first. For example, it is not clear where dogs are allowed. (think the GGNRA should provide better signage and create environmental barriers, such as the vegetative barriers surrounding the tidal marsh at Crissy Field or the restored dunes at Fort Funston.

As a responsible dog guardian and advocate for animals, I know it is crucial that our dogs are well behaved and trained in order to peacefully co-exist in an urban environment and adequate exercise and socialization is essential for a well-behaved dog. Having places where I can take long walks with my dog allows me to get the exercise I need while also meeting my dog's needs. Without access to the small amount of land in the GGNRA we currently have, I am very concerned that many dog and dog guardians will not have sufficient opportunity to exercise and recreate.

Some areas within the GGNRA also serve as a place of solitude for me and provide me with a very important peace and safe outdoor space and experience within the San Francisco Bay Area, a large metropolitan area. Some specific problems with the DEIS include the following points. Please revise the DEIS to correct these errors.

This DEIS and Plan doesn't recognize that environmental values include both recreation and nature. In many places, the DEIS treats the environment and recreation as opposing values, i.e., that recreation only harms natural resources. The document doesn't acknowledge that people care about both and that people with dogs are often also good stewards of our environment. The draft plan has the effect of punishing many people because a very small number are uneducated, insensitive, or irresponsible and because the current signage of off leash areas is unclear. The reasonable response to this problem is to educate visitors, improve signage and help park visitors follow the rules and learn how to respect the environment, not to ban the rest of us with dogs from the GGNRA. I wish that the DEIS would include an alternative along these lines.

The proposed "compliance-based" approach should be modified to create a baseline of current conditions, and then measure impacts rather than compliance. It should include a robust public educational component and an objective, long-term monitoring program designed and carried out with the community. The GGNRA should develop partnerships with community, animal welfare, and conservation organizations to make this work. These partner groups could bring additional resources to limited federal resources. GGNRA should be a partner with the City of San Francisco and other communities, not an adversary.

The DEIS doesn't recognize that many areas of the GGNRA are located in or next to urban neighborhoods. The DEIS excludes the quality of the urban environment from its scope, saying it's not significant. The reality is that the GGNRA provides much needed open space in a major urban area. This omission is disconcerting because the fundamental purpose of creating the

GGNRA was to provide open space for recreation (including dog walking as a form of recreation) to serve the metropolitan Bay Area. The dynamic interrelationship between GGNRA and our neighborhoods is exactly the human environment that the EIS is required to study, but failed to do so. The DEIS notes some studies and general tendencies of dogs to harm natural resources, but with few exceptions, there is little documented site-specific impacts to support the restrictions of the preferred alternatives. Further, there is insufficient documentation that considers other impacts ' other park visitors that disturb and impair the natural resources, other wildlife, Mother Nature, boot camps, bicyclists, huge crowd attracting events such as Fleet Week, festivals and Walk-a-thons. The proposed broad limitations in the DEIS are without site-specific science that demonstrates that problems with the quality of GGNRA's natural resources are actually attributable to dogs and not to other factors.

The DEIS definitely needs to provide full disclosure to the public and decision makers. If dog- related disturbances are having a significant negative effect on wildlife, for example, the DEIS needs to provide site-specific scientific evidence as documentation and undertake a scientific evaluation as to whether people or other factors are also causing or contributing to the problem noted. [You could give examples where the DEIS says there are impacts in an area that you have not observed in that area or where the problem is does not seem to be caused by dog). If they are, GGNRA needs to provide an analysis that considers whether people should also be restricted from these areas. We need this documentation in order to comment meaningfully on the draft plan and DEIS. The science needs to be sound and the consequences need to be fully and fairly disclosed for everyone ' so that an informed decision can be made. And lastly, [this is where you state your own preferred alternative], after much consideration, I support Alternative A, the No Action alternative and would also include the "New Lands" areas (such as Cattle Hill, Sweeny Ridge, Mon Point, Pedro Point and Milagra Ridge and Rancho Corral de Tierra) in San Mateo county.

The DEIS is biased against and does not take a hard look at the No Action alternative or variations on that alternative. There are many areas in the GGNRA where the existing 1979 Pet Policy has been working, and where sensitive species are not present and visitor conflicts do not occur or are very infrequent. In addition, the DEIS does not provide site- specific information that these areas are inappropriate for continued dog walking.

Respectfully,

Timothy Sinclair MD  
344 Arkansas St.  
San Francisco, CA 94107

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6597	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco , CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 11, 2014  
Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Attention: SEIS

Dear Superintendent:

I have heard from a few people that the GGNRA will hear all of our comments during this time period and will basically toss out all opinions and go ahead and do whatever it wants to do. I am still an optimist and believe (hopefully not foolishly) that we live in a democratic society and that our voices are heard and that we will be listened to.

I know that a lot of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's land is secluded and away from large cities, but the areas in question (Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Crissy Field) are all part of a cosmopolitan area and need to be addressed as such. In San Francisco alone, it is estimated that there are nearly 200,000 dogs. My mother is a dog walker in San Francisco. During that time she has learned very much about training and working with animals. One of the conclusions that she has come to in all her years doing this is that the single most important thing you can do for your dog is to socialize them with other dogs, people, children, etc. But especially other dogs. Dogs are teachers. The elder dogs teach the young ones how to behave in a pack.

Currently less than 1 percent of the parkland is now available for off-leash activity, yet the proposal would not only reduce that space but could forbid even leashed dogs in some places people love to visit. Any new lands added to GGNRA, under this proposal, would prohibit dog walking (even leashed) by default, unless a specific exception was made.

Neighborliness works better than drawing up battle lines. It's not a question of pet owners vs. non-pet owners, hikers vs. walkers, or any other oversimplified interest group. Our shared space is exactly that: shared. There's room for everybody, within reason, and within balance.

Census data show that there are more dogs than children in San Francisco, but again, it's never either/or. This city has always recognized and embraced animal companionship. For many of our citizens, their pet companions are family. After all, this is the city of St. Francis.

The GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan is a major departure from the established, balanced use of parklands that prevailed here for forty years. Vastly reducing the off-leash areas in GGNRA would harm the quality of life of tens of thousands of dog guardians and, of course, the behavioral health of their dogs.

Dogs get the same benefits as people from playing outside. Companionship and exercise shape both dogs and owners into healthier, better urbanites.

One of the things that makes San Francisco so great is all of the off-leash dog walking areas. If anything, dogs need more off-leash areas, not less. They can out-run and out-walk us 100 times over. They definitely need areas that are conducive to running, playing and getting all of their energy out. It makes for a much more well-adjusted dog.

Please, please reconsider your management strategy, and leave the off-leash areas just as they are.

Sincerely,

Govinda Sherwood  
523 - 22 Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94121

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6598	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 11,2014				

Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Attention: SEIS

Dear Superintendent:

I have heard from a few people that the GGNRA will hear all of our comments during this time period and will basically toss out all opinions and go ahead do whatever it wants to do. I am still an optimist and believe (hopefully not foolishly) that we live in a democratic society and that our voices are heard and that we will be listened to.

I know that a lot of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's land is secluded and away from large cities, but the areas in question (Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Crissy Field) are all part of a cosmopolitan area and need to be addressed as such. In San Francisco alone, it is estimated that there are nearly 200,000 dogs. I have had the pleasure, for the last 16 years, of being able to care for dogs (and cats) in the city of San Francisco. During that time I have learned very much about training and working with animals. One of the conclusions that I have come to in all my years doing this is that the single most important thing you can do for your dog is to socialize them with other dogs, people, children, etc. But especially other dogs. Dogs are teachers. The elder dogs teach the young ones how to behave in a pack.

That's the problem with the preferred proposal by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), which wants to drastically limit the areas where people can bring their dogs. Currently less than 1 percent of the parkland is now available for off-leash activity, yet the proposal would not only reduce that space but could forbid even leashed dogs in some places people love to visit. Any new lands added to GGNRA, under this proposal, would prohibit dog walking (even leashed) by default, unless a specific exception was made.

Neighborliness works better than drawing up battle lines. It's not a question of pet owners vs. non-pet owners, hikers vs. walkers, or any other oversimplified interest group. Our shared space is exactly that'shared. There's room for everybody, within reason, and within balance.

Census data show that there are more dogs than children in San Francisco, but again, it's never either/or. This city has always recognized and embraced animal companionship. For many of our citizens, their pet companions are family. After all, this is the city of St. Francis.

The GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan is a major departure from the established, balanced use of parklands that's prevailed here for forty years. Vastly reducing the off-leash areas in GGNRA would harm the quality of life of tens of thousands of dog guardians and, of course, the behavioral health of their dogs.

Dogs get the same benefits as people from playing outside. Companionship and exercise shape both dogs and owners into healthier, better urbanites.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors understood the need for dog guardians to enjoy the outdoors with their companions when they made land available to the GGNRA. and cited it specifically. So the Draft Plan's claim that the quality of urban areas is not a significant factor in determining a dog management plan" violates the spirit under which the GGNRA was created. I also fear that restricting dog-friendly spaces would discourage dog adoptions, not only subverting our animal-welfare goals but also threatening the ability of shelters such as the San Francisco SPCA to continue rescuing dogs.

One of my favorite areas to walk the dogs - of which I take only six or seven at a time - would be Fort Funston. This is one of the few areas in which the dogs are now allowed to run and play off leash.

One of the things that makes San Francisco so great is all of the off leash dog walking areas. If anything, dogs need more off leash areas, not less. They can out-run and out-walk us 100 times over. They definitely need areas that are conducive to running, playing and getting all of their energy out. It makes for a much more well adjusted dog..

Please, please reconsider your management strategy, and leave the off leash areas just as they are.

Linda Sherwood  
523 - 22nd Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94121

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6599	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	na, UN na United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To: GGNA				

I'm writing because I do not like the new law. Dogs need to exercise so do people. It public place because it very good for dogs to ran every where. Dogs and dog walkers keep parks safe for example they like raning and be touch by people love to get ball play around with people. It will be nice if you let dogs go out and play at the park and beach. Not all dogs owners are irresponsible.

Thank you for your time,

Shavanna

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6600	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean  
GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

February 14, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Sally Shapiro and I have been a resident of San Francisco 30 years. I run with my dogs on a daily basis at Baker Beach or Crissy Field. Running with my dogs improves both my dogs' and my physical and mental health. Access to the GGNRA for this activity is a critical aspect of the quality of my life in San Francisco.

I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative the proposed Dog Management Plan that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dog(s) in the near and longer term future. Additionally, the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years for come. I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It is managed for financial sustainability and contains both residential and commercial activities as an extension of the urban area that surrounds it. As such, it should to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential and provide maximum enjoyment by visitors to and residents of the Bay Area that recreate regularly on this land.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS permits further restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS strongly suggesting that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of historically granted and important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.



I understand that taking care of our sensitive wild lands is important. I have been a member of the Sierra Club for 25 years in order to further that goal. I also understand that supporting conservation and improvements in the GGNRA is important. I have supported the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy at the William Kent Society level for many years. However, one of the reasons I support the Conservancy is because I am such an active user of the GGNRA. Unfortunately that active use, as well as the financial support it has engendered, would come to an end under the proposed dog management plan.

Sincerely,

Sally Shapiro  
3880 Washington St  
San Francisco, CA 94118

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6601	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean GGNRA Superintendent Building 201, Fort Mason San Francisco, CA 94123				

Dear Mr. Dean,

I have been a half time resident of San Francisco for the past 20 odd years, but I first moved to San Francisco ~1962 and continued on the Bay Area full time until 1990. Since it first opened up I, my family, and my family dog frequently visited areas of the GGNRA. The gradually increasing restrictions on dog walking - specifically off leash dog walking - have reached a point of unfairness. Please recognize that at least the few remaining areas - today I frequent Crissy Field - should remain open to off-leash dogs and responsible dog owners. I am aware that excellent suggestions for managing the open areas have been proposed.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6602	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA NA United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To: GGNRA				

I'm am writing about the law that had been changed because you men you blanded the dog for it and you do not no who did it it could have been homeless people drug diller and can you please change it back because if are dogs stay in the house for a long time and thay will start to tare up the houses then we will have to clean up the mess.

Love Dogs  
With love a students.  
Sincerely,  
Damaya

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6603    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Superintendent

GGNRA

Fort Mason, Bldg. 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

ATTN: Dog Management

Out of respect for the "National Park Service" U.S. Dept. of Interior and years of accumulative research and documentation, Alternative F is sound and should be implemented.

There is, in fact, an immediate purpose and need for action!

Also, thanks to the availability of the hard-copy of the SEIS sent to me - there appears to be a general consensus justifying Alternative F.

-Eve Del Castello

Miss Eve Del Castello

"Eve's Consulting Service"

865 San Jose Ave, #2

S.F., CA 94110

(415) 282-0894

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6604    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Corte Madera, CA 94925  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Brenda Deluca

103 Stetson ave.

Corte Madera CA 94925

February 10, 2014

Dear Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area;

I am urging you to consider the effect that not allowing unleashed pets on GGNRA areas would have.

I have a home at Stinson Beach that I go to regularly with my dog. There are many unleashed dogs that I see on this GGNRA beach and there has never been a problem in the 20 years I have been bringing my dog there. Owners are very diligent about cleaning up after their dogs, I have NEVER found dog feces left behind on that beach!

In fact, it is a ritual with most owners to carry a baggy and pick up ANY trash, of any kind found on the beach. Because we KNOW that it is a privilege to be able to let our pets off their leash in this most beautiful and spectacular beach. It is one of the reasons so many people who love natural beauty come to this beach. The dogs are part of the wonder and joy that everyone shares when they are out.

To not allow unleashed dogs in this area would be a huge disappointment to me and many others. Every dog I have encountered is under voice control and not allowed to roam beyond it's owner's control.

This is one of the few freedoms we have as pet owners. We are respectful and considerate of all who share these fantastic State Treasures with us.

Please reconsider.  
Brenda Leal DeLuca

\*Please reconsider this issue  
It is important to!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6605    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** 402 Median Way  
Mill Valley, CA 94941  
Feb 14, 2014  
Dear Mr Dean

I love Marin County and pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in taxes each year. As a tax payer, a long time resident of Marin County and a dog lover, I strongly OPPOSE Alternative F, your dog management plan.

I do SUPPORT Alternative A, No action Plan.

As it is dogs are restricted to much of the GGNRA. We live in an urban area, dogs are part of the urban environment, and as dog owners, we rely on our dogs using open space.

Thank you.

Susan Denny, M.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6606    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Mill Valley, CA 94941  
Feb 14, 2014  
Dear Superintendent, GGNRA,  
Fort Mason Bldge 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Attn: SEIS

Dear Mr Dean and GGNRA,  
As a tax payer, a San Francisco employer, a long time resident of Marin County and a dog lover, I strongly OPPOSE Alternative F, your dog

management plan.  
I do SUPPORT Alternative A, No action Plan.  
Thank you.  
Kevin Denny, M.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6607    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Occidental, CA 95465  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,21,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Please see attached study re: Rodeo Lagoon. I am concerned that dogs off-leash could impact the endangered Tidewater Goby.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6608    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Rafael, CA 94903  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Marin County Board of Supervisors Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 12, 2014

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

RE: Marin County Comments on  
SEIS - Proposed Dog Management Plan

Dear Frank,

Attached please find Resolution No. 2014-12, A Resolution of the Marin County Board of Supervisors Recommending Modifications to the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas Proposed Dog Management Plan to Accommodate Community Needs Related to Recreational Dog-Walking.

Please accept this as Marin County's official submission to Public Comments, due by February 18, 2014.

Sincerely,

Kathrin Sears  
Supervisor, District Three - Southern Marin  
President, Marin County Board of Supervisors

RESOLUTION NO. 2014-12

RESOLUTION OF THE MARIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
RECOMMENDING MODIFICATIONS TO  
THE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREAS  
PROPOSED DOG MANAGEMENT PLAN TO  
ACCOMMODATE COMMUNITY NEEDS RELATED TO RECREATIONAL DOG-WALKING

WHEREAS, the enabling legislation that established the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), Public Law 92-589, October 27, 1972, states, in part, "In order to preserve for public use and enjoyment certain areas of Marin and San Francisco Counties, California, possessing outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values, and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is established"; and

WHEREAS, in other language, the GGNRA was established, among other things, "...to create an area that concentrates on serving the outdoor recreation needs of the people of the metropolitan area"; and

WHEREAS, these lands are intertwined with vibrant communities whose residents rely on the open space of the GGNRA every day for exercise and for the opportunity to experience the natural environment; and

WHEREAS, there is a long-standing respect for the wildlife-urban interface and a commitment in Marin County to preservation of open space and natural habitat, including the set-aside of 80% of Marin's lands in perpetuity as agricultural, open space and park land; and

WHEREAS, the County of Marin shares the objectives of the GGNRA to provide a variety of visitor experiences, preserve and protect natural and cultural resources and natural processes, maintain park resources and values for future generations, reduce user conflicts and improve visitor and employee safety; and

WHEREAS, the GGNRA adopted in practice the "Approved Guidelines for a Pet Policy" on February 24, 1979, with public input, that allows licensed dogs off-leash and under voice-control in the 18,000 terrestrial acres owned and managed by GGNRA; and

WHEREAS, changes in park usage over time require a review of management policies, and it is recognized that all parks and open space areas in the Bay Area have experienced an increase in use by all types of visitors, including families, seniors, cyclists, horseback riders, hikers and dog owners, necessitating a review and potential revision of policies; and

WHEREAS, there are estimated to be up to 100,000 dogs in Marin County, which has a population of approximately 250,000 people, and many have historically exercised their dogs and themselves on GGNRA trails and fire roads; and

WHEREAS, of the 52.7 miles of trails and fire roads in the Marin County portion of GGNRA, since 1972 dogs on-leash have been allowed on an estimated 24.2 miles of trails and fire roads, and dogs under voice control (off-leash) have been allowed on an estimated additional 16.1 miles of trails and fire roads; and

WHEREAS, a review of the policies governing the GGNRA was undertaken, which included a component covering the management of dogs in the GGNRA, and on June 28, 2005,

the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee for Dog Management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established; and

WHEREAS, the GGNRA released a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Dog Management Plan on January 15, 2011, which proposed, via the Preferred Alternative 'F, to dramatically restrict dogs in all of the GGNRA, including Marin County, the City and County of San Francisco and San Mateo County; and

WHEREAS, in contrast to the intent of the 1972 enabling legislation to provide recreational open space and serve the outdoor recreation needs of the surrounding metropolitan areas, the 2011 Draft General Management Plan called for much of the GGNRA land to be managed as nature zones that provide backcountry types of visitor experiences, defined in the plan as a sense of remoteness and self-reliance, low visitor use, controlled access, with few amenities, where challenge, risk, and testing of outdoor skills would be important to most visitors; and

WHEREAS, in the Public Comment response to the Draft EIS, the National Park Service received over 4,700 responses, with the ratio in opposition to the Preferred Alternative F at 3:1, and the County of Mann Department of Parks and Open Space submitted a letter on May 27, 2011, expressing concerns that the proposed limitations to dog walking in GGNRA would move the displaced users to County open space and parklands and MMWDs watershed, each comprising approximately 20,000 acres, resulting in significant impacts to county parks by the displaced users; and

WHEREAS, the County's May 27, 2011, letter encouraged certain changes to the Draft, including continuing to allow dogs off-leash on most beach areas and on-leash while crossing sensitive habitat areas, that Alta Trail remain designated off-leash to serve the residents of Marin City and Sausalito, that some off-leash trail use be allowed in Oakwood Valley, which would also accommodate some off-leash trail use in Homestead Valley; and

WHEREAS, on September 6, 2013, the GGNRA released a Supplemental EIS for the Dog Management Plan, with a Preferred Alternative F which restricts dogs on-leash to approximately 8.8 miles of trails and fire roads and dogs off-leash to a half mile section of one fire road, thus reducing access for dog walking on-leash by approximately one third from current rules and down to one half mile for dogs under voice-control in the Marin Headlands, the only off-leash area remaining would be the north end of Rodeo Beach; and

WHEREAS, the SEIS does not adequately address the impacts on county parks and open space, or traffic in neighboring communities as a result of implementing Alternative F; and

WHEREAS, Muir Beach restrictions may result in significant displacement impacts on Marin County-owned Little Beach; and

WHEREAS, the Muir Beach Community Services District unanimously adopted a resolution on December 4, 2013, opposing the Preferred Alternative 'F, requesting that dog access be granted from Coyote Ridge Trail to Miwok Fire Road to allow hikers with dogs to cross from Muir Beach into Mill Valley, and expressing preference for Alternative A (no change - status quo); and

WHEREAS, the Marin GGNRA peripheral fire roads are on average twelve feet wide,

allowing for a variety of users, including those with dogs, to safely share the road, and are accessible from many neighborhoods and locations outside of the GGNRA, encouraging people to walk directly into the recreation area instead of driving to the GGNRA or to other park and open space lands.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Marin County Board of Supervisors supports GGNRA efforts to protect sensitive habitat and enhance the visitor experience, recognizes the need to revise regulations to respond to changing patterns of use, and encourages the GGNRA to continue to manage the GGNRA as a metropolitan recreation area, distinct from all other National Parks, Wilderness Areas and Monuments; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board requests that continuous trail loops, instead of dead-end trail sections, be created that are accessible to dogs; that off-leash opportunities continue on Muir Beach; that educational signage and enforcement be used to change visitor behavior with respect to sensitive habitat, refuse and visitor and staff interaction; that fire roads, which are on average 12 wide and allow for multiple types of users, continue to be accessible to on-leash dogs, with off-leash being preferable; that continuous access be created that allows traversing of GGNRA lands with dogs from Muir Beach to the Golden Gate Bridge, and that the GGNRA accommodate access for dog owners in neighboring communities, including Tam Valley, Tennessee Valley, Marin City, Sausalito, Homestead Valley and Muir Beach; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board submits that the Preferred Alternative F is too restrictive, that access for dogs off-leash, and under voice-control be reinstated on fire roads, that dogs be restricted to on-leash near sensitive habitat areas as well as other trails that provide linkage access to fire road Loops and that the GGNRA consider time-of-use rules that would allow off-leash use of some areas, such as beaches, to early and late afternoon times on weekends; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Marin County Board of Supervisors understands and supports the need for habitat restoration, especially of threatened and endangered species, but would encourage the restoration of sensitive habitat be planned in more remote areas of the park where possible, and away from heavily trafficked fire roads and connecting trails, and that fencing and educational signage be used when restoration is by necessity adjacent to roads and trails; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board requests that the GGNRA accept these comments as part of the Public Comment to the SEIS; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this resolution be sent to GGNRA Superintendent Frank Dean; National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis; National Park Service Pacific-West Regional Director Christine Lehnertz; US Senator Dianne Feinstein; US Senator Barbara Boxer; US House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi; US Congressman Jared Huffman; Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewel; Chairman of the US Subcommittee on National Parks, Forest, and Public Lands Rob Bishop; Ranking Minority Member of the US House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands Raul Grijalva; Chairman of the US House of Natural Resources Committee Doc Hastings; and Ranking Minority Member of the US House Natural Resources Committee Peter DeFazio.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Marin held on this 11th day of February, 2014, by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS Judy Arnold, Susan L. Adams, Steve Kinsey, Katie Rice,  
Kathrin Sears

NOES: NONE  
ABSENT: NONE

PRESIDENT, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
Katlin Sears

ATTEST:  
Matthew Hymel

The foregoing instrument is a  
correct copy of the original on  
record in this office.  
MATTHEW H. HYMEL, Clerk  
of the Board of Supervisors  
of the County of Marin  
State of California

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6609	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94110				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 14, 2014				

To: GGNRA

I'm writing this letter to oppose the proposed GGNRA Dog Management Plan. I have lived in the Bay Area all of my life and in San Francisco for 25 years. Every one of those years has been spent exploring and enjoying the public recreation areas near me with a four-legged friend.

I'm highly concerned about the proposed leash-only areas and am wondering what the ramifications will be? How many altercations will ensue? How crowded will the off-leash parks around me become? What about parking? How will my dog get her exercise? How will I get my exercise? The questions are endless. The reasons to pass the plan are few and unproven.

I strongly oppose this new plan.

Do not pass this plan!

Thank you for your time,

Pamela Schulting, Teacher, SFUSD  
28564 25th St, San Francisco, CA 94110

---



**Correspondence ID:** 6610    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94942  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Marin Audubon Society Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,21,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 18, 2014

Sent Via US Mail and Electronically

Frank Dean, General Manager  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94 123-0022

RE: Comments on Golden Gate National Recreation Area Draft Dog Management  
Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Dean,

The Mann Audubon Society (MAS) appreciates the opportunity to comment on GGNRA's Draft Dog Management Plan Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS). As noted in our comments on the Draft EIS, Mann Audubon has a long history of working to protect wildlife and wildlife habitat. We understand that the Park Service is under intense pressure to open more areas to on- and off-leash dogs. We applaud GGNRA's focus on protecting wildlife and habitat and we urge that that approach be sustained and strengthened, most importantly to protect endangered species, wildlife and habitat. Our specific questions and recommendations discussed below. Our comments address Marin County sites only, but we support protecting wildlife, habitat and endangered species throughout GGNRA.

It is a primary responsibility of the National Park Service (NPS) to ensure that natural resources, particularly endangered species and their habitats, are fully protected. This includes ensuring that endangered species are not harassed or otherwise adversely impacted by people, dogs and other stressors.

MAS continues to support Alternative D because it would provide more comprehensive and effective protections for the natural resources within the boundaries of GGNRA. It is clear to us, after reviewing the record, that protecting wildlife and habitat is the primary reason the NPS has restricted dogs use on Marin trails. MAS supports this criterion for guiding decisions. In our view, however, adequate protection will not be achieved because the proposed restrictions are not adequate, enforcement is unclear and compliance is far from certain. The Plan is weighted in favor of dogs and dog walkers and does not go far enough to protect habitat. The DSETS proposes to allow dogs on every Marin area and, since the DEIS, dog use has been expanded on a number of Marin sites, including Muir Beach, and Rodeo Beach.

According to our calculations from acreage figures in the DSEIS, 25.32 miles of trails and 54.32 acres of beach are open to dogs on GGNRA in Marin County. Considering this, it is hard to believe that dog walkers are not able to sufficiently exercise their pets on

GGNRA trails. We also note that the Mann has many dog parks, and more than 200 miles of public trails. Dogs are allowed on most, if not all, of the trails in Mann. It is unfortunate some dog owners can't rise above their own interests to support protecting habitat for endangered butterfly, owls, fish and other at-risk species, in the limited areas where these species need to live.

We appreciate the extensive research that went into the preparation of the Draft SEIS, especially the 24 peer reviewed studies that confirm the impact of dogs on wildlife and habitats. The findings of these studies are applicable to impacts of dogs everywhere and provide ample support for recommendations to limit dog use to protect wildlife in sensitive habitats.

We also appreciate that fire roads are not considered separately from trails because use of fire roads by dogs can be just as damaging to adjacent habitats and wildlife as dogs on trails. They may even be more damaging because they are wider and could encourage more heavy use.

Inadequacies of the DSEIS:

Precedent Setting Nature Not Addressed

The DSEIS reports that GGNRA is the only facility in the entire national park system that allows off leash dogs. "Dogs that are not controlled by caging or a leash no longer than six feet are currently prohibited across the entire national park system (36 CFR 2.(a)(2))...." The DSEIS should address the nationwide implications of opening areas to off-leash dogs at GGNRA. It is a significant concern that allowing off-leashed dogs at GGNRA could be used to justify and encourage opening other parks to off-leash dogs. This would significantly broaden the adverse impacts of off-leash dogs on wildlife and natural habitats. This is a major potential impact that should be addressed.

Monitoring Based Management Strategy Unclear

As explained in the Park Operations section: All sites would be regularly monitored. When the level of compliance is deemed unacceptable, based on violations and impacts to resources, primary management actions such as focused enforcement of regulations, education, time and use restrictions, establishment of buffer zones and SUP restrictions would be implemented. If non-compliance continues, secondary management actions including short-term closures would be implemented through the compendium. The schedule includes a 1-3 month period of public education followed by a 1-3 month period testing the monitoring based strategy.

With the above process, the NPS expects that impacts on wildlife and habitats would also decrease. How would those impacts be evaluated and what criteria would be used? What level of non-compliance would be tolerated? Would there be a plan for monitors to visit all sites at regular intervals over what period of time? We understand that monitors not be able to issue warrants but would have to communicate findings to enforcement staff. How would monitors communicate with enforcement personnel efficiently? How would such a communications system successfully identify violators in a timely manner and hold those violators accountable? By the time enforcement personnel appear, wouldn't it be likely the incident would be over?

## Enforcement not Adequately Addressed

Enforcement is key to successful implementation, to compliance and to protection of wildlife and habitats. Too many people seem to feel that they will never get caught, don't care, or feel that they are somehow different and entitled to behave as they wish. The description of the enforcement program or management activities is vague and leaves many components poorly defined.

There should be a more comprehensive description of the planned enforcement program. What are the anticipated threshold levels for implementing management actions and would they differ among sites? What thresholds or triggers would be used to decide when to take enforcement actions management actions such as to close a trail? What specific enforcement actions would be initiated, besides issuing warrants to violators and or closing trails, and for what non-compliance activities would they be initiated?

GGNRA is in the process of developing a warrant process. Information should be provided about the warrants: how they would be issued; for what infractions; how many times would offenses have to be repeated before warrants would be issued?

## Problems with Impacts Analyses

### - Compliance Not Accurately Evaluated

The cumulative impact analyses for virtually all trails, roads and park segments consistently cite park programs such as restorations by the Golden Gate Park Conservancy and "ecologically beneficial" restoration and management activities by others, including controlled burns and invasive plant removal. Impacts at each location and cumulatively are deemed negligible when compared and considered with the restoration and management activities and agency projects. We have several problems with this approach:

The impact analyses as well as the Environmentally Preferred Alternative rely on compliance to evaluate the impacts of the Plan as negligible. This is an unrealistic approach because many people will not comply. The Plan, therefore, would be ineffective in achieving impact levels that are negligible.

The DSEIS acknowledges that even with "assuming compliance" the preferred alternative would result in localized impacts but these would be considered minor based on the assumption that dog users will comply with the regulations. Repeated observations of dog users over time, however, clearly demonstrate that this is not the case. Dog's users throughout Mann County violate dog restriction, ignore signs and sometimes destroy or steal them, and disregard policies and regulations with impunity. While many people do obey the law, particularly if they understand why, many will not. This cannot be ignored in evaluating the significance of the impacts. In addition, even localized impacts could be major when endangered species and their habitats are involved.

Conclusions that the potential impacts will be negligible are unsubstantiated and invalid until and unless the NPS presents a dependable program that will ensure dog walkers will stay on trails and not harass wildlife or damage habitat. The only way this can be assured is through an effective monitoring and enforcement program. At minimum, there needs to be a strong enforcement program that ensures dogs are restricted from sensitive habitats.

It would also be helpful if dogs were restricted on more trails.

The DSEIS should acknowledge that non-compliance is a likely possibility and is highly probable. This impact should be addressed by identifying an enforcement program and actions that would mitigate this individual and cumulatively significant impact.

#### - Significance of Impacts Not Adequately Assessed

The DSEIS evaluates the significance of impacts in comparison with and consideration of beneficial activities that are being conducted in the GGNRA and even outside of GGNRA. The impacts of dogs are weighted and evaluated with activities being conducted by GGNRA, the Park Conservancy and others, including wetland and other habitat restoration and enhancement projects and management actions such as controlled burns. Offsite restoration projects and projects implemented by others than the federal government are also cited. This is a slippery slope.

These restorations/enhancements are not being implemented to mitigate for or justify dog impacts. Furthermore, most or none of the restorations would not in any way offset impacts from dog use. The argument can be made that restoring habitats would actually increase impacts because the habitat areas that dogs could disturb would be increased. Also most or all of those restoration/management activities within the park would be done anyway because it is GGNRA's responsibility to protect, enhance and restore habitat for endangered species.

Finally, the NPS must consider the consequences of claiming unrelated restoration activities as mitigation to offset or balance impacts of their project. What if shopping center or housing project developers were to claim their impacts are negligible because restoration projects of GGNRA and others created offsetting beneficial conditions? This is a real and potentially disastrous outcome, if perhaps unintended, of the approach taken in this document. MAS certainly doesn't want habitat restoration projects we have implemented to be used to offset damage to other habitats

The only effective mitigations for dog impacts are suitable protective restrictions and an education and enforcement program that works.

#### Impacts of Increased Visitor Use Not Considered

It should be recognized that, just as use of GGNRA lands has increased over the years, uses will undoubtedly continue to increase as our human population increases. Mitigation should be presented to address the increased impacts on habitat and wildlife that would accompany the anticipated increased uses of some or all of the trails.

#### Need for Environmental Review for New Trails

It appears that trails that are not presently in existence are being considered part of the Management Plan and evaluated in this DSEIS, such as new trails at Homestead Valley. It also appears that the trail locations may have not even been determined at this time.

This DSEIS should provide sufficient information about these and any other trails that are not currently in place. This is necessary to enable evaluation of the potential adverse impacts on adjacent habitats and wildlife of human and dog use and to evaluate whether

there is a less environmentally damaging alternative location. If this information is not provided in this DSEIS, a separate environmental review for these non-existent trails should be conducted.

Comments on specific sites:

#### Stinson Beach

We continue to support Alternative D which complies with federal regulation that dogs not be allowed on swimming beaches. We question whether it is the responsibility of GGNRA, or any jurisdiction for that matter, to provide access to property owned by others. Should GGNRA continue to allow their land to be used to reach Upton Beach, an effective barrier should be constructed. The nature of this barrier should be more thoroughly discussed in this DSEIS. Whatever kind of barrier is used, it must be designed to not impede wildlife movement.

#### Homestead Valley

GGNRA preferred Alternative would allow on-leash dogs on the Homestead Fire Road and on future neighborhood connector trails that are yet to be established. We are concerned about approving additional "neighborhood connecting" trails without knowing their location, so that their impacts can be adequately evaluated. Further, MAS has a long-standing position in opposition to the development of new trails because there already are ample trails in Mann County and in GGNRA. We recommend that any new trail construction be accompanied by decommissioning of an existing trail of the same length in the same area. In particular, because Homestead Valley habitats support the endangered Spotted Owl, it is essential that any new trails, as well as all existing trails, be carefully evaluated to avoid habitat for this endangered species. In this sensitive habitat, at minimum all dogs should be required to be on-leash.

The DSEIS speaks to actions that would benefit the Spotted Owl, but these are merely suggestions in the Main County Plan for Homestead Valley. This plan was recently out for public review and, at that time, the plan discussed the presence of Spotted Owl but did not include protective policy recommendations or policies that even recognized endangered species.

The DSEIS also mentions that the Barred Owl has more impact on the Spotted Owl than dogs. It is not a matter of "either-or". The impact analysis should consider the impacts of both dogs and Barred Owl cumulatively. Impacts from both sources increases the significance of the impacts of both.

#### Alta Trail/Orchard and Pacheco Fire Roads

The Preferred Alternative now would allow on-leash dog walking on various sections as well as walking more than three dogs with a permit. According to the DEIS, the areas that support Mission Blue Butterfly habitat are located "away" from the trails, which is beyond the 6-foot LOD corridors.

In this area, protection of endangered Mission Blue Butterfly would rely on compliance with leash restrictions. Dogs would no longer be allowed on social trails. Impacts from commercial dog walkers are expected to increase, but are considered insufficient to cause

a change in the threshold level. The "threshold level" is not defined.

The preferred approach would not provide effective protection for the endangered Spotted Owl and its habitat. Monitors and enforcement personnel would have to be present frequently or daily to ensure that no social trails are used.

#### Oakwood Valley Trail

The preferred alternative for this site has been modified to allow on-leash dog walking on the fire road and on a portion of the Oakwood Valley Trail to the junction with Alta Trail. Dogs would no longer be allowed on social trails that meander through Mission Blue habitat. We support on-leash dogs on the fire road only. People without dogs also should be restricted from the social trails to protect Mission Blue Butterfly habitat. We strongly support not including a ROLA because of its impact on wildlife movement.

As with the Alta Trails above, for this Alternative to be effective frequent monitoring and effective enforcement will be required to ensure people do not go off designated trails.

#### Muir Beach

The protective provisions of the previous preferred Alternative D, have been greatly modified, to allow dogs on the bridge, Muir Beach Trail and the beach. This site supports multiple endangered species including Red-legged Frog, Coho Salmon, Steelhead as well as shorebirds. This is also the location of a large habitat restoration project to benefit the endangered Red-legged Frog and other aquatic resources.

The discussion on page 113 states that fencing would be installed to protect the dunes and lagoon, would serve as visual barrier and would enable the NPS to manage the area to protect the natural resources. It is acknowledged that the fences would only be visual barriers, and would not actually "protect resources as off leash dogs would still be able to access resources." In apparent conflict the discussion on page 862 states that the preferred alternative would "provide protection of the habitat at the lagoon and Redwood Creek. ..."

It appears that the NPS is going out of their way to provide dog access in this sensitive location. We have little confidence that visitors will comply with leash regulations to ensure protection of the habitat and endangered species. The DSEIS acknowledges that the proposed fencing and leash provisions will not be effective in keeping dogs out of this sensitive habitat area.

The preferred alternative might protect the visitor experience for dog walkers, but would do little to protect wildlife and habitat. Its success is based on assumed compliance which, as discussed above, is unrealistic and not supported by observations. No information is presented to change our minds that on-leashed dogs should be allowed only in the parking lot and picnic areas.

#### Mann Headlands

Alternative F for this area was modified to expand on-leash dog-walking on the Rodeo Avenue and Morning Sun Trails, also on the Lower Rodeo Valley trail corridor, the North Lagoon Loop Trail, Old Bunker Fire Road and Batteries loop trail. Allowing dogs on perimeter trails only is intended to preserve the integrity of the interior habitat. The

DSEIS reports that Mission Blue Butterfly habitat is not located along the roads/trails therefore impacts would be negligible.

Again, this alternative relies on "assuming compliance" to evaluate potential impacts on Mission Blue Butterfly to be negligible. As discussed above, compliance cannot be assured. Various actions are mentioned to benefit Mission Blue Butterfly: protecting habitat outside the Headlands and Fort Baker; several past projects, and "Additional acreage of mission blue butterfly habitat that will be restored under an agreement with the USFWS." The success of the two completed projects (1984 and 2007) is not stated, nor is it clear how they would offset or render negligible impacts from dog use. They could simply be providing more habitat for dogs to impact. Also, it is not clear what additional acreage would be restored, where and when, and whether or how these projects would minimize or offset impacts from continued and increased dog use. It is not demonstrated that the projects described would offset or mitigate the impacts of dogs on the species, but at least the impacts would largely be confined to the perimeter.

#### Rodeo Beach and Lagoon

A ROLA is established on Rodeo Beach and dog use is expanded to the entire north beach, south to the sea stacks. A post and cable fence would be constructed along the west side of the lagoon. It is acknowledged that such a fence would discourage but not physically exclude dogs and people from the lagoon area. Dogs of certain breeds would find it most inviting to leap over or under a fence to fun and swim in the lagoon. Water quality and habitat degradation are noted as causes of the listing of Tidewater Goby, which inhabit the lagoon. The discussion reports water quality and habitat degradation, both of which would result from dogs swimming in the lagoon, are reasons this species is listed as federally endangered.

Protection of any birds that may land on the beach depends on off-leash dogs being under voice control. How will the NPS assure that dogs are actually under voice control and that their owners even are paying attention to their activities? The justification for allowing unleashed dogs here is that shorebird counts on this beach are low. It does not appear to have been considered that the numbers are likely low because of dog use.

Impacts are expected to increase from commercial dog walkers but are not expected to increase enough to change the "threshold level" although what that level would be is not defined. Again, the effectiveness of these restrictions will depend on compliance which in turn will depend on monitoring and enforcement. Assuming compliance is especially troublesome at this location because few, if any, dogs are actually under voice control.

#### Fort Baker

Leashed dogs would be allowed basically everywhere except the beach area. We think there should be some trails, other than the beach, in this area where dogs are not allowed. It is important that dogs not be allowed on the beach to better ensure protection of the lagoon waters for aquatic birds.

We continue to support our previous recommendation: to allow on Bay Trail and other paved roads/trails, but not on unpaved trails.

#### Conclusion

Thank you for considering our input. We very much appreciate the efforts of the NPS to protect the natural resources of the park and we urge that you continue and increase efforts to do so.

Sincerely,

Barbara Saltzman, Co-chair  
Conservation Committee

Phil Peterson, Co-chair  
Conservation Committee

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6611	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94121 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,03,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To those who are concerned				

I am writing on my own behalf to protest the intention of the GGNRA to restrict dogs running freely on the San Francisco beaches, in particular: Baker Beach. I DO NOT HAVE A DOG! But I enjoy the dogs and their very fine owners enjoying, as I do, the wild and full ambience of the beach. they are not harming any living thing, and their owners are meticulous about cleaning up their poop, as well as, cleaning up other detrius on the beach! I think to leash these souls would be a crime! Hense I have written this letter.

Respectfully yours,

Sally Salaus  
(a Sea Cliff Resident)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6612	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Los Altos, CA 94022 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 8, 2014				

Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am opposed to the plan by the GGNRA to shut down areas to residents, who for



years have enjoyed walking in those areas with their dogs, off-leash.

I believe most everyone who walks their dogs in those areas are responsible owners and for many, walking there is the highlight of their day.

Restricting off-leash areas will increase pressure on dogs which I believe it will be detrimental to safety similar to the impact that dog parks have when there are too many dogs.

I believe older owners who currently enjoy taking their dogs to these areas will have a more difficult time if the areas are restricted. The sense of community is important to those people as well.

I don't think it's reasonable to change the long-standing agreement and I hope this plan will be reconsidered.

Sincerely,

Alice Sakamoto  
Los Altos, CA  
alices@earthlink.net

cc: The Honorable Jackie Speier  
155 Bovet Road  
San Mateo, CA 94402

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6613	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Palo Alto, CA 94303 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** I am a dog owner in the bay area and I occasionally use the GGRA to exercise my dog. It seems to me that most of the dog owners that use these areas are responsible people who just want their dogs to be healthy and have a place to run in a city where that is not possible in most places. My dog as well as most of the dogs I see there are under voice control. Removing these wonderful off leash beach places will make more dog owners break the law so that their dogs can have some healthy exercise. Please leave these off leash beaches as they are. There are so many dogs in the area that need a place to go. Has there ever been a survey to see how many people and dogs use these areas? There are an awful lot of dog owners in the San Francisco Bay area. Thank you,  
Roberta Rovner  
Bay area dog owner

I am not usually a protestor but I feel strongly that dogs need a place to run where they are not caged in by a fence!

Roberta

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6614    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 7, 2014

Superintendent  
Golden Gate Recreation Area  
Ft, Mason, Bldg. 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
ATTN: SELS

Dear Superintendent Dean:

I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

I urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management Plan that adheres to all National Park Service management policies and practices, protects park resources, and will provide the opportunity of a quality National Park experience for all visitors.

I think commercial dog walking is not an appropriate activity for National Park lands. Use of the GGNRA by the commercial dog walking industry constitutes an exploitation of park lands strictly for private financial gain.

Sincerely yours,

Nancy B. Ream

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6615    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** 158 Eighth Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94118  
Feb. 16, 2014  
Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco CA 94123-0022  
Re: Draft Dog Management Plan, Draft  
Environmental Impact Statement  
Dear Superintendent Dean,  
My name is Robert Dewey. I am 69 years old, a native Californian and a resident

---

of San Francisco since 1972. I am a writer and editor who lives on Eighth Avenue, just south of the Presidio. I have walked in the Presidio and Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) with three successive dogs since 1978. I also walk with my dog in Mountain Lake Park where I have been active in efforts to restore the lake.

During walks in the Presidio my dogs and I have come to the aid of an owl caught in barbed wire fencing. We alerted to Presidio post veterinarian who freed the bird and saved its life. We have chased off vandals, reported broken water lines and participated in various activities to benefit the park.

GGNRA is an important resource for us for exercise, quiet contemplation, picnics and pleasure. We have submitted comments during the past several years that GGNRA management has been muddling about what to do about dogs in the park.

I'm appalled that after all of these many years, draft plans and redrafted plans and delays, GGNRA's proposed Dog Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement pays so little attention to the public's input. In fact, with each iteration GGNRA's gets more restrictive and less responsive.

What's missing is recognition that GGNRA is an urban recreation area. Taking that stance is contrary to the GGNRA's founding principal. Why does GGNRA refuse to create a balanced plan for a recreation area that recognizes that people with dogs use and enjoy the park?

â€¢ Specifically I oppose the plan's "Preferred Alternative" because it is too restrictive.

â€¢ I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences may make for good neighbor relations out on the range - - not within the city. We don't need animal pens here.

â€¢ The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) does not adequately consider comments to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) from dog walkers and appears to have dismissed nearly all of them. There is no information in the SEIS about why these comments (e.g., negative impacts on community and human health from off-leash restrictions) were dismissed and not considered in the development of the preferred alternative.

â€¢ The SEIS still lists impacts that "might," "can," or "could" happen, while providing no site-specific evidence that any of those impacts are occurring now or have ever occurred in the GGNRA.

â€¢ The SEIS says that, during the last six years, National Park Service (NPS) staff did extensive literature searches to look for reports of impacts from dogs in other parks. Why didn't they bother to study GGNRA and the Presidio? After all that's the subject at hand.

â€¢ The SEIS relies on anecdotal observations of impacts made by NPS staff. These comments have no context ' how frequent were they, how serious, etc.. How can these be used to set policy? NPS staff is recognized for its long stand bias against dogs and the people who walk them. That's all the more reason to discard any anecdotal observations.

â€¢ SEIS never gives results of public comment on the DEIS. It reports more than 4,700 comments were received, but says nothing about how many comments were in support or opposition. Shouldn't public sentiment be reported and considered?

â€¢ The SEIS still does not adequately analyze impacts on nearby parks of the Preferred Alternative. What little attention is paid to this is just an estimate.

Why wasn't the issue studied thoroughly as the San Francisco board of supervisors has requested?

a The SEIS data still do not support claims that there are major safety problems from dogs that require off-leash restrictions. Between 2008 to 2011 it reports 95 dog bites. That's a minuscule number considering the tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of dog walks that must have taken place within the GGNRA during those four years. I'm just guessing but I imaging there were thousands of more instances of vandalism in the park during those four years. That's a "serious" problem. It's caused by people, not dogs. I've seen no effort to close off substantial portions of the GGNRA to people as you are proposing to do with dogs.

Overall, I see little in the way of a response to the public interest in this latest Draft Dog Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Based on the response from dog-owner groups, local governments and various elected officials, I'm not alone in my view.

Why can't you either create a plan that responds to the public interest or quit wasting time and taxpayers' money and just maintain the status quo?

Sincerely,

Robert A. Dewey, Jr.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6616	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	na, UN na United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 14, 2014				

To: GGNRA

I'm writting this because people lie about dogs and their owners that they are irresponsible but some are and dogs just want to have fun with their lives. There is no proof to not let the dogs in areas. If you don't let dogs play they will trash their owner's house. Sometimes dogs protect their owner to keep them safe. There is no reason to blame dogs in areas when they didn't do any thing and you didn't see any proof of them being naughty; homeless; irresponsible people are causing problems for dogs.

Thank you for your time,

Michaella Ravelo  
age10  
fourth grade

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6617	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	na, UN na United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

---

**Correspondence:** February 14, 2014

To: GGNRA

How do you know if the dogs are doing it dogs need to be free they need fresh air. Our dogs need exercised and a place to have fun is there even proof that dogs are making a mess. Please don't pass the law We love dogs it's mans best friend. 50% of homes in SF have dogs. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe.

Thank you for your time  
Rafael

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6618    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Mr. Frank Dean

GGNRA Superintendent

Building 201

Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123

February 17, 2014

Dear Mr. Dean,

I am writing to strongly encourage you to choose the no change option and continue to enforce the 1979 GGNRA Pet Policy. I think you know that the majority of responders to your ask for comment are against the proposed changes.

Before you try a different path, I feel that the GGNRA needs to consistently enforce the rules that are in place. Part of the reason for the issues that you cite in your study result from the lack of policing of the rules currently in place to preserve the resource.

I have lived in the Marina/Cow Hollow area since 1991 and have always enjoyed the unique natural/urban intermingling along the waterfront from the Marina to the Golden Gate Bridge. It was not that long ago when much of Crissy Field was a fenced off crumbling paved area. This area needs to be evaluated in its unique setting and the GGNRA should not use rules that were written for National Park settings far from cities to curtail dog access and off-leash walking.

Please reconsider your drive toward restricting dog access and off leash walking. Please listen to the many voices that are also asking you to reconsider. The public's view of the Recreation Area and your administration is at stake.

Sincerely,

Charles Dicke

2730 Lyon Street

San Francisco, CA 94123

William Kent Society Member, 10 years

CC: Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

Senator Diane Feinstein

Senator Barbara Boxer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6619    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 11, 2014

Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Attn: SEIS

Dear Superintendent Dean,

As a frequent visitor to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) at the Rancho Corral de Tierra (Rancho), Mon Point, Sweeney Ridge, Fort Funston, and Crissy Field, I am writing to comment on the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS. I am a Montara resident and a member of the Montara Dog Group. In the SEIS, the National Park Service (NPS) is advocating Preferred Alternatives for GGNRA sites that significantly reduce both on-leash and off-leash dog walking recreation opportunities.

This is contrary to the substantial number of comments in support of dog walking access by visitors and elected officials in the region surrounding the GGNRA. It is unfortunate that the NPS has decided to reduce access to one of the GGNRA's largest visitor groups and has lost sight of what should be an important mission for the GGNRA- to provide recreational opportunities.

In Montara, our community has a history of responsible off-leash dog walking in the Rancho. The Montara Dog Group has over 400 members on the San Mateo County Coastside, maintains dog waste bins to reduce the impact of dog walking in the Rancho, and advocates policies that promote responsible dog walking. Since the NPS provides no waste removal in the Rancho, visitors also deposit trash in the dog waste bins. Weekly, our members haul this trash for removal by our local trash service. Despite this stewardship of the land and the established off-leash history, the SEIS Preferred Alternative for the Rancho will reduce the trail miles available to dog walkers in the Rancho and eliminate off-leash dog walking. As it has taken control of the GGNRA Rancho site, I am disturbed that the NPS has chosen to alter the usage patterns of local residents.

The existing NPS policy is that dogs are allowed on-leash on all trails within the Rancho. As a minimum, I suggest that this policy be continued (SEIS Alternative A). In the Visitor Use Section pertaining to the Rancho, the SEIS cites an informal trail study that shows the primary use of the Rancho is dog walking. How does the NPS justify reducing access to the primary users of the Rancho?

As a dog owner training dogs hours every week for agility competitions, I agree that on-leash activity is an essential part of a dog training regime. However, it is also accepted that off-leash socialization with other dogs is critical for the development of a non-aggressive, well-balanced dog. I urge that an off-leash dog walking alternative be allowed within the Rancho in specific areas near Montara and El Granada. Without this allowance in the Rancho, the nearest off-leash dog walking opportunity will be at Fort Funston in San Francisco County (one hour round trip drive). In fact, the SEIS Preferred Alternative allows for no off-leash dog walking in San Mateo County. How does the NPS explain allowing access to off-leash dog walking in one county and denying it in an adjacent county?

Unfortunately, the Regulated Off-Leash Area (ROLA) suggested for Rancho (SEIS Alternative C) does

not support the off-leash usage patterns similar to other GGNRA sites (e.g., Fort Funston or Crissy Field). The SEIS proposes a ROLA between Tamarind and LeConte in Montara that is too small for an off-leash hike. Over 80% of the perimeter of this ROLA is adjacent to Montara land, instead of Rancho land. Rancho maps from the Montara Dog Group for proposed off-leash areas were delivered to the NPS at an open house meeting during the original EIS comment period. it is unfortunate that the NPS failed to work seriously with local groups when determining the location and composition of the Rancho ROLA analyzed in the SEIS.

Currently, dog walkers are allowed access on less than 1% of the GGNRA's 80,000 acres. The SEIS advocates reducing that access by 90% - denying people with dogs access to 99.9% of GGNRA lands. In closing, I ask that you reconsider this drastic reduction in GGNRA dog walking access being advocated in the SEIS.

Respectfully,

Russ Pritchett  
Member Montara Dog Group  
P.O. Box 371531  
Montara, CA 94037

Cc:  
Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell  
Congresswoman Jackie Speier  
Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi  
San Mateo County Supervisor Don Horstey

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6620	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Leslie Dicke				

2730 Lyon Street  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
February 17, 2014  
Frank Dean  
GGNRA Superintendant  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendant Dean,

I am a San Francisco native and have lived in this wonderful city for all but 5 of my nearly 50 years. Growing up in the Richmond district, I have happy memories of taking our two cocker spaniels for family outings at Baker Beach. They would run the beach, chase each other and play with their toys. These were some of the days we enjoyed most as a family and the dogs always came home tired and satisfied. If they had been forced to remain on a leash, or even not allowed on more than half of our wonderful Baker Beach, it would have been an exercise of frustration, similar to taking a kid to a candy store and not allowing them any candy.

Now with a husband, two children and two dogs of my own, we enjoy this resource so much, in fact, that we have been members of the William Kent Society for 10 years. Our daily walks with

our dogs are often the happiest part of my day. I take them for runs down to Crissy Beach where they get a welcome reward swimming in the Bay, retrieving balls just offshore on East Beach, where we rarely run into very many people (yes, even sometimes on warm weekend days). On the days when I am short on time and they are not able to swim, run and play on East Beach, they look at me with disappointment and we return home feeling largely unsatisfied, sad and even frustrated.

I write now, after having written a letter to the Draft EIS in 2011 which was ignored, in partner with the SF Board of Supervisors, Mayor Ed Lee, Congresswoman Speier, Congresswoman Pelosi, The Crissy Field Dog Group, Animal Care & Control of SF, Peninsula Humane Society, Montara Dog Group, Save Off Leash, and thousands of tax-paying individuals who strongly object to the proposed GGNRA preferred alternative dog plan as far too restrictive, far too limiting in where we can recreate with dog(s), unfair to dog owners, and not fact-based in its planning or findings. This proposal demonstrates a lack of understanding that the Bay Area GGNRA must serve an urban population.

When the GGNRA was created in 1972, dog walking was already a long-standing use of the lands that were turned over to the park. Dog walking was specifically referred to as a long standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, and as such this specific recreational use and part of the San Francisco Bay culture ' and this use must continue indefinitely.

I strongly support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This plan works and if properly enforced, I believe it would strike a balance between many users of this great resource. The Bay Area GGNRA is a unique national recreation area in an urban environment ' not an isolated park in the wilderness. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

With more than 120,000 dogs in San Francisco alone, and millions in the greater Bay Area. People who work, who have families like mine, and have dogs need access close to home that allows off-leash dog walking in the mornings, afternoons and evenings. The proposed preferred alternative will results in millions of people being unable to recreate with their dog(s) ' in the GGNRA lands these same families support with taxpayer dollars.

The conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed. The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking, only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off-leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties.

In Mann County, it will be disaster if there will only be one beach where all Mann's residents and visitors can recreate with their dogs off leash. The beach has extreme tides, forceful waves, and will be packed with thousands of dogs if this plan is enacted 'because it's the only off leash beach that will be preserved for all Mann County in the preferred alternative. Additionally, the SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on or off-leash).

The GGNRA's preferred alternative intentionally proposal sets up the proposed dog policy to fail ' by restricting a large dog and urban resident population to use such small areas that over crowding is inevitable. The overcrowding will result in friction between residents with and without dogs. And the fact that this will cost millions of dollars of our taxpayer money is inexcusable. You are spending our money on a plan that the majority does not want and that will not work.

I understand that part of the rationalization for this overly-restrictive policy is to protect the wildlife, particularly birds. In my many days at Crissy, I have never seen dogs chasing birds. They leave each other alone. There is a large group of geese that visit the big lawn regularly and this provides an environmental concern greater than the very rare and occasional dog (or even human!) poop. When our son was exposed to goose poop, he suffered serious diahrea that required antibiotic treatment.

Here are a few questions regarding my serious objections to this proposal:



- Why does the GGNRA rely on outdated studies and information for the latest environmental impact statement?
- Why hasn't the GGNRA updated its enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released?
- How is it that the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented? How is it the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis?
- How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply ignore the voices of so many individuals, groups and elected representatives?
- How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply not consider or address a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS?

These unanswered questions lead to the conclusion that the process is only for show and the GGNRA never intended to incorporate public or even elected representatives' views. I cherish the opportunity to walk with my dogs at Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Land's End, Rodeo Beach, and Fort Mason. Please don't follow through with this seriously flawed plan. Putting an off-leash dog area next to busy Bay Street across from Safeway is only one of the terrible ideas incorporated in this plan.

Your consideration will be greatly appreciated for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Leslie B. Dicke

William Kent Society Member, 10 years

CC: Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

Senator Diane Feinstein

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6621    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Tiburon, CA 94920  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** 14 February 2014  
Superintendent of GGNRA  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, 941 23  
Attn: SEIS

RE: GGNRA Dog Management Plan

I would like to voice my opinion in favor of allowing more areas of the GGNRA for use by people with dogs. This would include expanding areas where dogs are allowed both on and off leash. The present state is far too restrictive and results in a large concentration of dogs in a limited area.

After all, the GGNRA is a "Recreation Area". It is part of the Bay Area's wealth and it is to be enjoyed by all of its citizens and not for the exclusive recreation of those without pets.

Many of the negative comments come from people who have had a bad

experience with a dog. Though unfortunate, negative situations will occur but are almost always covered by specific regulations that are broken by careless dog owners. To apply a blanket restriction because of a few scofflaws is inappropriate. The vast majority of dog owners are responsible. Don't let the few that are not responsible restrict our rights.

I am a Marin County resident who frequently uses of the GGNRA.

Sincerely,

Dixon Power

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6622    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** February 17, 2014

Superintendent, GGNRA

Fort Mason, Bldg. 201

San Francisco, CA. 94123

Attn: SEIS

Subject: Dog Management Plan

To The Superintendent:

As a native of San Francisco, and a long-time resident who raised 3 children in this city, I have used the GGNRA, and before that, the beaches and the Presidio to play with my children, grandchildren and dogs for years. We are responsible people, parents and dog guardians. We clean up after ourselves, our children and our pets. We care for and about one of the last open space refuges in an urban environment. In 1979, the Department of the Interior entered into an agreement with the City of San Francisco, which included provisions to retain off-leash areas for dogs as they existed at the time. We ask that this arrangement be maintained.

Cities are urban environments for people. People require open space as it exists currently for recreation, as reflected in the name of GG National Recreation Area. We do not like being restricted to roped off trails and large areas being removed from access. Dogs also require the ability to roam freely under their guardians supervision. It makes no sense, to take away very limited freely open space along a few miles of urban shoreline when over a 1,000 miles of California coastline exists for other species of plants and animals.

I, for one, recoil from the intimidation of those people who think that access must be restricted for one reason or another, and I recall my children being yelled at and intimidated by one of these folks who told them that rolling down a sand hill at Baker Beach because it would cause a mature Monterey Pine to collapse because they would cause "erosion". That tree is still there.

If erosion is an issue, stop killing off the ice plants that for years have prevented erosion only to have it replaced with so-called "native species" that are not capable of retaining the sand.

Gophers cause more damage to plants than dogs do.

How many dogs climb cliffs to disturb cliff dwelling swallows. Scared by dog shadows? Give me a break!

Snowy Plovers? There is a lot of vacant coastline and how many dogs are dedicated bird chasers anyway? Fishing and crabbing from shore doesn't drive these birds away also.

Please stop trying to contain, limit and control us. Please maintain the original agreement as is.

A. C. Eisenberger  
2845 Noriega St.  
San Francisco, CA. 94122  
(415) 519-6652

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6623	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Montara, CA 94037 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,10,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 7, 2014 FEB 102014				

Dr Lisa Eshman  
P.O. Box 371262  
Montara, CA 94037  
Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Bldg 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Attn: SEIS

Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I last wrote you in 2011, regarding the Rancho open space use. Thank you for hearing my further comments regarding dog walking in GGNRA.

My credentials are: BS in biological sciences from Stanford, practicing small animal veterinarian in the coastal Bay Area since 1996, active member of the Montara Dog Group, committed outdoor enthusiast who backpacks regularly, occasional member of Trails Day on Montara Mountain, and member of Friends of Fitzgerald Marine Reserve.

The new plan has increased restrictions on dog access to the recreation areas with no scientific rationale. I had hoped to be able to comment on substantive changes, but I will be reiterating my last 2 letters (attached) as I have the same concerns. Looking at the map on your web site, trails where dogs are allowed have been reduced and there is no provision for off leash dog walking. I have been hiking these hills almost daily with my dogs since 1996. With other members of the Montara Dog group, I met with Mr. Ken White at the Peninsula Humane Society to discuss potential environmental impacts of dogs in the Rancho. After consideration with his wildlife experts, they felt that allowing the status quo to remain would not do harm to the environment. Yet, the GGNRA does not have any science to back up its restrictive policy: just possible problems as evidence by choice of language. (see letter to Secretary Jewell from the Save Off Leash Dogs Coalition dated 1/14)

There have been years of successful mixed use on these trails. Please remember the mandate of the GGNRA: it is a recreation area and not a national park with pristine lands that need to be protected at all

costs. This property is robust and well adapted to the participants who care for it and recreate there. In 15 years of enjoying the Rancho, I have seen multiple users respectfully avoid problems whether with dogs, horses, bicycles, strollers or large groups. I urge you to work with the local groups to allow responsible dog walking in the entire open space as well as a designated off leash area selected with local input. In my first letter (2009) to Superintendent O'Neill, as well as in personal meetings at Open Houses with you, Howard Levitt, and George Durgerian I have encouraged creative solutions to continue to permit dogs but increase control. There are models for this in Santa Cruz and Boulder Colorado. Before implementing onerous rules that restrict my ability to enjoy all of the trails in the Rancho with my well controlled dogs please at least consider working with the local community in deriving a science based approach to on and off leash dog use.

Rep Jackie Speier encouraged the GGNRA to form a recreational committee of all users (surfers, equestrians, dog walkers, bicyclists, kite boarders, hikers) to inform policy. This group would see the recreational areas as dynamic and responsive to community needs. It would request and review science based studies on use of lands. The current plan is restrictive and does not allow for further areas to open as needed: it only allows for more area to be taken away from dog access. By severely restricting dogs to ever smaller areas, it becomes a self fulfilling prophecy that there will be problems. You put more pressure on the dogs to interact in smaller spaces. People who love their dogs will drive as far as they need to for off leash areas. By limiting people in Marin and San Francisco you force them to converge on areas where off leash use is allowed. More dogs in smaller spaces will lead to more conflict. Why not take the No Action Alternative (using existing off and on leash areas in the Rancho) and honor the 1979 pet policy while convening a recreational committee to consider all of GGNRA. This should be a living document, responsive to the needs of the urban community and using science to protect the lands we all love.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Lisa Eshman, DVM

Cc:

U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein  
U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer  
Congresswoman Jackie Speier  
Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi  
San Mateo County Supervisor Don Horsley  
Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell  
National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis  
Christine Lehnertz, Regional Director National Park Service

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6624	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94947 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,21,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 18, 2014				
Superintendent's Office					
GGNRA					
Fort Mason, bldg. 201					
San Francisco, CA 94123					

---

Dear Superintendent,

I just heard about the ban on dogs that you are proposing for the GGNRA, and I am absolutely in favor of it! Dogs are overrunning Fort Funston, and I used to love hiking there, but hiking there now is unpleasant experience. Other beach areas are impacted also, taking away some of the relaxation aspect of visiting the ocean. And of course, the shorebirds along the beaches are impacted the most by the loose running of dogs along the beaches, especially the snowy plovers. I see no reason for domestic animals to run loose in natural areas at all, and I feel that it degrades the experience of being there, as well as degrading the natural habitat. And because often people don't seem to care to take responsibility for their dogs, including how they harass other people or animals, or even cleaning up after them properly, I feel that dogs need to be nm only at parks designated for dogs. I just want to end by saying, I completely support the ban on dogs in the GGNRA, and if there is any other way I can help support this, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Heather Evergreen

1 Los Alondras Ct.

Novato, CA 94947

415-897-1624

heatherevergreenl@gmail.com

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6625	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA NA United States of America
-----------------	--

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter
-----------------------------	--------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	To: GGNRA
------------------------	-----------

Do you like dogs? I want dogs to be safe and behave. Dog walkers could be the best dogs in the world because they have lot of exerise they did. My dog could not be safe at the parks because thier were lot of jerks. going on over there. Dogs would never be irresponsible no more because you have to teach them to do exerise. I think dogs could be safe at GGNRA because don't just let them be alone. I likes to thank you for the dogs are safe.

Thank you for your time.

Nyarini Faavone.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6626	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94132 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form
-----------------------------	-----------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	Protecting Wildlife is absolutely important.
------------------------	--

In the parks without dogs or people bothering wildlife, I have seen a live wildcat, and a wild lion. Both were great to see.

I see them in our zoo, but it is not the same thrill.

I have seen lion tracks probably made by a young male at a gard pit area in San Carlos. Two of my great nephews were so thrilled just to measue the length of their strides and kow they have seen it.

No zoo or TV or documentary can replace this experience.

---

During my life I and my nephews have had pets - dogs - cats - fish - etc, but the a tue wild is the mearucble experience,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6627    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Jim Pohl  
21 Longview Ct  
San Francisco, CA 94131  
415 412-0531  
JPohl@aol.com

Dog Owner and Parent

January 29, 2014  
Congresswoman Jackie Speier  
Representative, 14th District  
211 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Ms. Speier,

I support the National Park Service's plan to define dog access to public land. I am a dog owner, and my family enjoys walking with him on the beach. I also believe it is reasonable to define areas where dogs must be on leash, and where they are not permitted to wander freely to protect wildlife and provide safe space for people. There are wonderful places along our shoreline where unleashed dogs make it difficult to enjoy the waterfront, especially for children. There are more than 60,000 children age 14 and younger in our great city, and only 20,000 properly licensed dogs (SF Animal Care & Control). Please support the NPS dog walking plan for public land.

"Of all the questions which can come before this nation.. there is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us." ' Theodore Roosevelt

Sincerely yours,

Jim Pohl

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6628    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA NA  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

---

**Correspondence:** To: GGNRA

Do people eat dogs at sf? Why can't dogs be free? Why can't dogs talk, I want them to?  
How do dogs keep the park or beach clean? can dog run faster then the horses? Can Dogs Die when they Don't eat food. Do dogs eat people because they like meat uh is we one of the meat are we? Why Do we have to have dog in SF so dog can eat people or be friend with them. can we take others dog from finding then in the street or in are house or in are backyard. Do dog realy have to do exercis to stay alive or not. And if I grow up and I will get a dog I will feel so happy.

Jake Fager

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6629	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 17,2014				

Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94 123-0022

Comments: Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Dean:

I am a senior and a home owner in San Francisco. I was introduced to Fort Funston even before moving to San Francisco in 1998, and thus have had the pleasure of walking in the GGNRA both with and without dogs for nearly two decades. At present, I have no dog, but I still walk at Fort Funston and Crissy Field, because that is where the dogs are, and the shared community of dog owners and dog lovers which has grown up around the recreation of walking with ones best friend.

Why dont you listen?

You encourage us to "focus [our] comments on the changes in the draft planJSEIS that were made as a result of comments on the 2011 draft EIS" (1), but these changes are so minimal, compared to the extraordinary destruction of dog-walking access in both the draft and supplemental EIS, that one must focus on the fact that you have disregarded the overwhelming opposition to your "Preferred Alternative", reflected in thousands of responses to the DEIS.

It is instructive that the SEIS never explicitly states the numbers opposed to the DEIS or the reasons for that opposition in clear qualitative or quantitative form. One is given "sample comments", whether they are representative of many, few or one. From the data that are available, one may posit that you are disregarding the profound negative response to your "preferred alternative". For example, of the respondents who made what you consider "substantive" comments regarding Fort Funston, only 33 supported your plan. On the other hand, 522 substantive responses opposed the plan. Another 271 responses suggested other alternatives, or changes in proposed alternatives 2. These figures alone should have sent the GGNRA back to the drawing board for a rethink of the importance and value of dog walking in the GGNRA. but instead resulted in only minor changes to that same benighted and disastrous "preferred alternative".

I oppose the Preferred Alternative. It is too restrictive, it disregards the importance and expanding activity of dog walking as traditional recreation, and it runs contrary to the spirit and substance of the enabling legislation which created the GGNRA.

### The Enabling Legislation

The significance attached to recreation is stated in the title and intent of virtually every document related to the transfer and use of the lands which provide the basis of the GGNRA, and memorialized in the naming of the lands themselves, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

When Congress established the GGNRA, it was as a:

new national urban recreation area which will concentrate on serving the outdoor recreation needs of the people of the metropolitan region [with the objective] to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available in this region. (emphasis added)

(HR. Rep. No. 1391, 92d Congress, 2d Session [1972])

The use of the GGNRA for off-leash recreation was addressed specifically during the hearings before the U.S. House of Representatives, and dog-walking was an enumerated activity in the US. House Report (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, p. 4854, cited in a letter from Edwin J. Sayers, President, SF/SPCA to Superintendent Brian O'Neill, GGNRA, Aug. 16, 2000). The importance and legitimacy of off-leash recreation was reconfirmed by the GGNRA Advisory Committee in 1979.

### Recreation and exercise

The importance of recreation has not lessened in the intervening years. Rather, it has increased. From the White House to local initiatives, improving health and fitness is a high priority in an increasingly obese and unfit population. The National Park Service itself has introduced the Healthy Parks, Healthy People program, which was the subject of a well-publicized conference in the GGNRA in April, 2011. Thus, the GGNRA should be and could be in the forefront of one of the most important initiatives to improve health in a national context, by highlighting and showcasing people exercising with their dogs in the GGNRA.

The people walking dogs in the GGNRA are engaging in a form of exercise now recognized as a compelling and effective route to better health. Research has shown that walking with a dog is likely to result in lengthier and more frequent walks than walking with another person or with a group (See, e.g., Marcus, 2008; and Brown and Rhodes, 2006.)<sup>(3)</sup> The health benefits of walking with one's dog in the GGNRA, widely noted by those who visit with their dogs, and those who come to see and walk with the dogs, are ignored by the Dog Management Plan.

The severe truncation of space and opportunity reflected in the GGNRA "preferred alternative" sends the wrong message regarding exercise, and regarding off-leash recreation.

The GGNRA is failing to capitalize on the opportunity to recognize and support the value of walking one's dog as a means of maintaining fitness and improving health in an incremental, continuous and positive manner. With its present Pet Policy, the GGNRA is on the cutting edge of demonstrating and providing a venue for lifelong recreation and a multi-generational healthy life style. The GGNRA should be a model for healthy exercise in an urban setting, positive treatment of pets, and the creation of community in an urban context. This is a model to be celebrated and replicated, not destroyed.



## Community and safety

As a senior and a woman, I thank the GGNRA for providing what is at present a safe place to walk with ones dog. The GGNRA abuts a city of 800,000 people, and yet walking in Fort Funston, for example, is walking among friends. Many others, both with dogs and without, walk in the off-leash areas, enjoying the neutral and very beautiful space (and often challenging weather conditions), and creating community in this urban recreation area. In a culturally diverse social environment, as varied as the urban setting around us, a shared enjoyment of dogs and of nature creates friendships and new acquaintances. In a time of increasing alienation and focus on individual pursuits and technology, areas such as Fort Funston and Crissy Field are a haven, a solace and a port in the urban storm.

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

However, the planned reduction of space which will corral the dogs and their owners into a tenth of the one percent of land now available, and the requirement to walk dogs only on-leash on trails will create a dangerous situation for both owners and dogs. (4) In a recreational use survey of Fort Funston carried out in 2000, it was noted that Fort Funston alone accommodates more than five percent of GGNRA visitors, but comprises less than 0.3 percent of GGNRA acreage. (5) The reduction of space and access proposed by the Dog Management Plan is unnecessary and untenable, will lay the foundation for negative behavior and territoriality, and will destroy what is now a viable, valuable, and beloved national recreational resource.

Site-specific, peer reviewed studies have not been carried out

It is unacceptable that the Dog Management Plan, already costing millions of dollars and purporting to justify major changes to traditional off-leash recreation, lacks the most rudimentary baseline data. For example, with regard to vegetation, the SEIS specifically states that "Site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have not been conducted at the GGNRA sites ... [regarding] impacts to vegetation or soils from dogs." (6) With regard to water, the SEIS states that "Although water quality monitoring currently occurs at GGNRA, no site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at the GGNRA sites to document impacts to water quality specifically from dogs." (7) With regard to wildlife, "Very few site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at GGNRA for the purpose of documenting impacts to wildlife as a result of dogs." (8) Yet that lack of data is simply used to create a series of hypotheticals to support the GGNRA position. Thus, dogs "can increase turbidity by stirring up sediments into the water column," (9) dogs "can potentially trample... vegetation..." (10) "dogs can be carriers of exotic plant seeds...." (11) etc. With regard to wildlife, lacking their own baseline data, the GGNRA discussed potential impacts of dogs by referring to other studies in other places, thus ignoring the specificities of the GGNRA urban environment. Without site-specific data, this plan, with its profound consequences to off-leash dog walking, is inappropriate, ill-advised, and unsubstantiated, for it is not predicated on even the most basic of scientific data.

Hypotheticals stand in for hard data

Access must not be removed on the series of hypothetical consequences run up the Dog Management Plan flagpole, to see who will salute them. Hypotheticals are not data, and dogs (and their owners) must not be blamed and exiled for "possible" or "potential" problems. This is unscientific and unfair. And it is disingenuous to roll out a list of every endangered or threatened species in the GGNRA, in order to slam off-leash exercise, which is presently permitted only in a minimal space and primarily in the most

urbanized and heavily used areas of the GGNRA. Fort Funston, with Nike silos in the parking lot and gun batteries on and fallen from the cliffs, is not pristine wilderness.

#### Conflict of interest

Throughout the SEIS, lacking the authority of site-specific, peer-reviewed studies, conclusions are reached on the basis of anecdote, hypotheticals, and the "best professional judgment of NPS staff." Yet this is the very staff which has been seeking to curtail off-leash dog walking for the past decade and more. This is the very staff who had the "stealth fences" put up overnight at Fort Funston, before being forced by the Federal Court to follow public process. And this is the very staff that has failed to maintain the lands they purport to protect by allowing trails, such as the Sunset Trail in Fort Funston, to fall into disrepair, and by not bothering even to put in a proper toilet at Fort Funston in all these years, although it is one of the most visited of all GGNRA sites. This is the very staff that stated that "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard". (12) GGNRA staff has shown a strong bias against dog walkers and dog walking, and cannot be used to support the conclusions of the SEIS. The use of "best professional judgment" of GGNRA employees represents a serious conflict of interest, and must be called into question.

#### Your bias is showing

The SEIS objectives do not reflect, mention, or otherwise show any positive value of off-leash dog walking in the GGNRA. (13) Rather, your emphasis throughout the SEIS is to portray people and their pooches in relation to problems, issues and impacts. It has been noted elsewhere that the very word "recreation" is absent from your objectives, and absent too from your index. (14) This is a telling omission, for the value of recreation, the lodestone and basis of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, is only begrudgingly recognized in the SEIS. Recreation is a cultural resource, and is the most embedded, and indeed the eponymous park value in the GGNRA. Yet throughout the SEIS, recreation is posited as oppositional to environment, rather than being an integral component of environmental resources. Were you to embrace the values upon which the GGNRA was established, were you to work together with those for whom a walk in the GGNRA is the highlight of their day, then together we could ensure the thriving future of the GGNRA for all its visitors.

#### The SEIS requires peer reviewed site-specific data

According to the Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review, from the Office of Management and Budget, "A scientific assessment is considered 'highly influential' if the agency or the OIRA Administrator determines ... that the dissemination is novel, controversial, or precedent-setting, or has significant interagency interest." (15) The ongoing machinations of the GGNRA to divest itself of the offleash recreational mandate which is part of its birthright is nothing less than controversial, and has already resulted in a number of court cases and decisions against the GGNRA. The changes that the GGNRA wants to put into effect with regard to the dog management plan are controversial, and yet the bases for those changes are not predicated on rigorous scientific assessment (peer-reviewed site specific data), according to the SEIS itself. Such assessment must be done as a basis for a document such as the SEIS, if the GGNRA is to maintain any credibility whatsoever.

In the Response to Comments document, many respondents pointed out that baseline data is not available, and that policy decisions cannot be made without scientific backing. The government response is jaw-dropping:

Additional data may help to refine the conclusions in the draft plan/SEIS and reduce uncertainty regarding the level of impact on the human environment; however, all NEPA

analysis is based on a prediction of potential future conditions and, as such, is always uncertain. In lieu of site-specific data, research methods generally accepted in the scientific community and best professional judgment have been used to draw conclusions regarding expected impacts to resources.... The available data provides sufficient information to allow the decision maker to make a reasoned choice among alternatives. (16)

The OMB Guidelines do not permit the disregard of site-specific data in the case of this controversial policy, controversial found data and controversial conclusions. The limitations of the data, taken from other sites and in many cases from disputed data (some of which were finally dropped from the SEIS, as the data had been challenged and shown to be false or fraudulent) do not provide a sound basis for future action. Astonishingly, the GGNRA administration is using the fact that the future is unpredictable, to make decisions based on what respondents demonstrated to be incorrect, biased, insufficient and/or irrelevant data. And again, that "best professional judgment" is necessarily suspect because of the GGNRA bias against dog walking. This is unconscionable.

Dogs arent the problem

The one place where the SEIS found some hard data was in relation to "dog incidents" in the GGNRA. In the four years from 2008 to 2011, with the hundreds of thousands of people and dog visits to the GGNRA, most of the dog incidents reported had to do with leash law violations. In this entire period, there were only 95 cases of dog bites or attacks. (17) In contrast to this, over that same period, 89% of the reported safety incidents had nothing to do with dogs, and they included murder, larceny, rape, robbery and drugs. The GGNRA should begin to realize that their safest areas are those where the dogs are, as is the case also in city areas where people walk with their dogs. It would be nice to know the number of people and dogs who walk in the GGNRA, but as the GGNRA is not monitored, this data is unavailable.

Impact on the city

Surprisingly, the SEIS states that, "potential impacts on social and economic conditions [in San Francisco] would be highly unlikely to exceed a negligible threshold, and are therefore eliminated from detailed consideration..." (18) This is wrong, and has already been proven wrong. The effect on city parks and on continued ability to recreate on the limited open space in the urban Bay Area will be both profound and deleterious.

This was already graphically demonstrated by the half-day closure of Fort Funston on March 11, 2011, the day of the expected tsunami from Japan. On that Friday morning, Stern Grove in San Francisco was overrun by cars and by hundreds of people and dogs, as dog owners and walkers sought other sites for their daily recreation. (19)

The GGNRA comprises a large part of the recreational land in San Francisco; any plan proposing change in off-leash access must recognize and reflect the impact of such change in San Francisco itself; and must be considered in conjunction with the City. The Board of Supervisors and the Mayor of San Francisco have formally opposed the GGNRA "preferred alternative", because they are well aware of the disastrous consequences of thousands of local residents suddenly seeking alternative accommodation for exercise for themselves and their pooches in the very limited spaces available in city parks. The enabling legislation is there for a reason: to keep traditional recreation, including off-leash recreation, in the GGNRA.

Dont fence me in!

After years of saying that fences are not the answer, the SEIS has now arbitrarily put fences into the mix

of appalling solutions to what the GGNRA still has not shown, on the base of any scientific data, is a problem! You have already fenced people and dogs out of many acres of the GGNRA, particularly at Fort Funston. Apparently, your new plan is to fence dogs in. Stop! Stop it! Is there no one on your entire staff who actually walks at Fort Funston or Crissy? Are you not aware that thousands upon thousands of people are, have been, and intend to continue to walk with their well-socialized dogs on the trails and open spaces of the GGNRA? And are you not aware, including from your own data, that these walks are overwhelmingly peaceful, enjoyable, invigorating and healthful? Will you have us all pacing from side to side or, as is often the case in circumscribed areas, standing still in the new Fort Funston pens you seem to be planning? Is this your new "visitor experience" - cages? How many new ways can you find to let dog walkers know that they are unwelcome in the GGNRA? And how does this fit in with the recreational mandate?

Remove the new poison pill

The Monitoring-based Compliance Strategy, which has replaced the "Compliance-based Management Strategy", is still a poison pill, designed to pennit increased curtailment and ultimate ending of off-leash recreation. This is unjust.

The emphasis is on leash violations. The SEIS states, "Noncompliance would include dog walking within restricted areas, dog walking under voice and sight control in designated on-leash dog walking areas, and dog walking under voice and sight control outside of established ROLAs." (20) Yet the GGNRA, in seeking to drastically curtail opportunities, trails, and areas to walk off-leash, and seeking to force the hundreds of thousands of dogs and their people to walk in ever-decreasing spaces, is setting up the definitive scenario in which almost everyone who does not have their dog on-leash almost everywhere in the few places in the GGNRA where dogs are permitted at all, would be more likely than not to do something unlawful, because the off-leash areas are so few and far between.

The GGNRA already has policies and penalties for those who break the laws. Using these penalties to reduce off-leash or any canine access still further is vindictive.

The solution

Retain the 1979 Pet Policy, with all the land included in the policy, and then expand these areas, particularly in Mann and San Mateo Counties. San Mateo has no off-leash GGNRA trails at all, and this should be rectified forthwith. Reinforce and retain the benefits - in exercise, in community, and in safe and healthy use of shared resources - of the authorized and mandated use of GGNRA land for traditional recreation.

In addition, given the demonstrated importance and value of off-leash recreation in the Bay Area, and the clear need for healthy exercise in the population in general, designate and create new off-leash areas and trails in the new lands being added to the GGNRA.

Increase education about off-leash etiquette; work with the many groups that have already proved their commitment to both the GGNRA and off-leash activity; and reap the harvest of enlightened administration, good stewardship, and demonstrated respect for both the history of the GGNRA and for its future. Off-leash dog-walking is an established activity. The active and devoted group of GGNRA visitors who walk with their dogs respect the land, value the resources, and cherish the experience of walking in these small corners of the GGNRA.

Sincerely,

Dr. Renee Ilene Pittin  
cc.:

Secretary Sally Jewell, Department of the Interior  
Jon Jarvis, Director, National Park Service  
Christine Lehnertz, Pacific West Regional Director, NPS  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
Congresswoman Jackie Speier  
Mayor Ed Lee  
Supervisor Scott Wiener

FOOTNOTES:

- 1 <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=303&projectID=11759&documentID=55416>
- 2 GONRA Draft Dog Management Plan] Draft Environmental impact Statement - Comment Response Report, pp 5-6.
- 3 Dawn A. Marcus, MD, Fit as Fido: Follow Your Dog to Better Health, IUniverse, 2008.
- Shane G. Brown, B.Ed., and Ryan E. Rhodes, Ph.D., Relationships Among Dog Ownership and Leisure-Time Walking in Western Canadian Adults, America., Journal of Preventive Medicine, Volume 30, Issue 2, Pages 131-136, February 2006.
- 4 The San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare Commission held a hearing on this very issue, and heard from a number of animal behavior experts regarding the consequences of the preferred alternative on canine behavior. On the basis of expert input, the Commission recommended that the Board of Supervisors oppose the preferred alternative.
- 5 Karin Hu, Ph.D., Survey of Fort Funston Recreational Use, included in Opposition of Fort Funston Dog Walkers and San Francisco Dog Owners Group (SFDog) to the Proposal to Close Twelve Acres at Fort Funston, unpublished, 2000.
- 6 SEIS, Vol. 1, p. 373.
- 7 SEIS, Vol. 1, p. 28.
- 8 SEIS, Vol. 1, p. 376.
- 9 SEIS, Vol. 1, p. 28.
- 10 SEIS, Vol. 1, p. 15.
- 11 SEIS, Vol. 1, p. 16.
- 12 Daphne Hatch, quoted in the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 7, 2005.
- 13 SEIS, Vol. 1, p. 2.
- 14 Kenneth S. Weiner, Comments on Supplemental Draft GGNRA Dog Management Plan/EIS (SDEIS), Feb. 14, 2014.
- 15 OMB, Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review, Dec. 2004, p. 23.
- 16 Draft Plan/EIS Comment Response Report, September 2013, p. 79.
- 17 SEIS, Vol. 1, 2p.1.
- 18 SEIS, Vol. 1, p. 25
- 19 Tsunami warning triggers Stern Grove dog wave, West Portal Monthly, Vol. XXI, No. 111, March, 2011.
- 20 SEIS, Vol 2, p. 1339.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6630	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94117 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				

---

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** To: Frank Dean

I do not agree with the GGNRA T5M current preferred alternative as it significantly restricts and eliminates off-leash dog walking in many areas within the GGNRA. The proposed changes to the existing conditions (1979 Pet Policy) and to the new lands in San Mateo County are not based upon sound science or long-term monitoring of site-specific conditions.

It is essential for the GGNRA to consider reasonable and balanced alternatives for dog walking on new lands and existing lands. While I am concerned about the long-term preservation of the GGNRA TMs natural resources and want to protect these important natural areas, I believe other options (besides restricting dog- walking access) should be considered first. I favor an approach that balances recreational use (including dog- walking access) with preservation. I think that a multi faceted approach that incorporates educationflmproved signage and physical/vegetative barriers is preferable to restriction as a first choice. It is imperative that the DEIS include such an alternative as a reasonable option.

The proposed cecompliance-based approach punishes many for the perceived transgressions of a few. It is a set up for failure and should be modified to create a baseline of current conditions and then measure impacts vs. compliance. The GGNRA should partner with the community to make the plan work, not assume an adversarial relationship with failure the goal.

The DEIS fails to consider that the GGNRA is the front/back yard for a large metropolitan area. The fundamental purpose of creating the GGNRA was to provide open space for recreation (including dog walking as a form of recreation) for residents of the Bay Area. NEPA requires evaluation of impacts on the cehuman environment , but the DEIS fails to do so by failing to adequately address how the proposal affects cerecreational values for these local residents.

After careful consideration, I support a modified Alternative A (the cNo Action alternative ) and would also include the cNew Lands areas in San Mateo County. The current plan should be modified to provide clearer rules, more signage, improved vegetative barriers, and education and outreach as part of the overall program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Francine Fillice  
710 Ashbury St  
SF 94117

P.S. I take my dog, who is well behaved, to Crissy Field, Fort Funston Ocean Beach to run. If he had to be leased neither of us would get people exercise. Please consider a balance for this issue. Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6631	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Address:</b>	private, San Francisco, CA 94115 United States of America						
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual						
<b>Affiliation:</b>							
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	SEIS Comments						

Dear Superintendent Dean:

---

Most of my comments pertain to the stated goal of NPS in developing a dog management policy: to "...minimize conflicts related to dog use by providing a variety of safe, high-quality visitor use experiences, including areas where dogs are allowed" (SEIS, p. 2). I do not believe that the SEIS has provided evidence that NPS can allow mixed use of an area where off-leash dogs are allowed while providing a variety of safe, high-quality visitor use experiences. I generally support the concept of compromise regarding protecting certain areas of the Park from off-leash activity, while allowing off-leash activity in other areas. However, I do not support the Park Services preferred alternative as presented in the SEIS, because it does not describe the true level of impacts of off-leash activity, and certainly does not provide a management framework that adequately addresses the impacts, stated and not-stated, caused by the presence of off-leash dogs in the GGNRA.

## VOICE CONTROL

Voice control should not be used as a concept in the EIS. NPS has not presented any evidence to indicate that voice control is a meaningful concept. The law enforcement incident reports indicate that dog owners routinely bring dogs to GGNRA, over which they cannot exercise voice control. Incident reports show that sometimes they cannot even recall their dog after a serious incident occurs. Superintendent Frank Dean admitted at a public forum on dog management on January 30, 2014 that voice control does not work as a policy for managing off-leash activity. GGNRA biologist William Merkle in an email of January 11, 2010 to Sarah Kosher, EA Engineering, Science, & Technology, appears to indicate that voice control is not effective in reducing the tendency of off-leash dogs to chase shorebirds.

The law enforcement incident reports are full of instances of owners of off-leash dogs not being able to recall their dogs or completely losing sight of their dogs leading to hazardous incidents. A few of the incident reports indicate that owners knowingly allow high risk dogs off-leash in GGNRA, including dogs with troubled histories that are being rehabilitated for adoption or known aggressive dogs. Since GGNRA does not monitor or issue permits for voice control, there is no way to control the risk to visitors caused by such dog owners who have the poor judgment to allow such high risk dogs to roam off-leash. There are only three meaningful classifications of Park space for dog management: 1) areas where dogs are prohibited; 2) off-leash areas; and 3) areas where all dogs must be on a leash. GGNRA further must recognize that off-leash areas are essentially single-use areas when crowded and are not safe or appropriate for all user groups.

## VISITOR SAFETY

Visitors with children who play along the water's edge or in the sand and are approached by dogs, either aggressively or not, may feel that their child's safety may be at an elevated risk for dog bites or other injuries. (SEIS, p. 22)

Visitors with children feel that their child's safety is threatened because in fact their child's safety is threatened. The issue with the safety of children is not just a perception of visitors, it is an established fact. This fact is almost completely ignored in the SEIS. It should be noted that although there is a considerable literature on the especial risks of dogs attacking children, there is little literature on other groups that may be similarly vulnerable, including the elderly, physically or emotionally disabled, and those engaging in sports or other physical activity that conflicts with off-leash dog activity. Although the SEIS does mention that children and the elderly have an increased likelihood of being the victims of attacks by dogs, the SEIS does not fully address the safety issue in an explicit manner and apply safety risk management to policy alternatives of dog management.

Public parks shared by running children and off-leash dogs are potentially unsafe for children (Kahn et al

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

Dog walkers cannot be relied upon to control the behavior of their dogs to reduce the safety risk of off-leash activity. One study found that dog owners had limited knowledge of dog behavior and were unaware of factors that increased the risk of dog bites to children (Reisner & Shofer 2008). Many dog owners surveyed in the study who indicated that they were comfortable taking their dogs to public areas were making unsafe assumptions about interactions between dogs and unfamiliar children. Reisner and Shofer reported that 41% of respondents surveyed thought that it would be OK to allow their dog off leash in an area where they saw children running.

The GGNRA visitor cannot control the risk to her/his safety where off leash dogs are permitted. Certain types of dogs, such as pit bulls, may be associated with a higher risk of serious bite injury (Bini et al. 2011) and older, active children are more often bitten by pit bulls (Reisner 2013). In one review of dog bite data, most older children bitten in an outdoor setting were unfamiliar with the attacking dog and were not interacting with the dog (Reisner et al. 2011). As stated above under Voice Control, some dog walkers bring high risk dogs to GGNRA and allow them to run off leash.

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

When an attack on a child does occur, there is a significant chance of a fatality. One study estimated that a risk of 2 fatalities per 1,000 reported dog bites exists nationwide (Wright 1985). Although most studies show that fatalities typically occur in residential settings, there is still a real possibility of a fatality in GGNRA because of the concentration of visitors with children and lack of control over the type of off-leash dogs present. GGNRA must fully and explicitly address this risk in the EIS.

## NEEDS OF URBAN RESIDENTS

Additionally, the adjacent city, county, and state public lands have fewer areas available for dogs and/or more restrictions on these areas, so potential use by urban dog owners is therefore pushed onto NPS lands. (SEIS, p. 22)

Under Needs of Urban Residents, the SEIS refers to the needs of urban Park visitors as if dog owners were the only urban visitor group. Although there does not appear to be a specific estimate of the proportion of visitors to GGNRA that are dog walkers, one of the surveys cited in the SEIS (Tierney et al. 2009) indicates that among the survey participants, only 13% of those interviewed listed walking a dog/pet as the primary reason for visiting GGNRA. Other survey results suggest proportions of dog-driven visits at around 10%. What about the needs of the other 90% of urban residents?

In San Francisco, leash laws are almost never enforced in any of the City parks, and many parks, such as



Pine Lake Park, are defacto dog parks. For San Francisco residents wishing to pursue an outdoor activity outside the presence of off-leash dogs, there are extremely limited possibilities for enjoying the outdoor environment. The EIS should discuss the limited options for outdoor space not just for dog walkers but for all visitor groups, especially visitor groups especially vulnerable to safety risk from off leash dogs, including: children; the elderly; the physically disabled; equestrians; hand gliders; joggers; etc.; and those who wish to have an outdoor experience without being harassed or disturbed by off leash dogs, such as hikers and naturalists.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION OBTAINED FOR THE SEIS

During the past seven years the park staff has amassed as much information as could be found on dog management-related topics. (SEIS, p. 28 ff)

Although the park staff amassed information, critical information or analyses were overlooked. My review of FOIA requests for dog management documents by the Center for Biological Diversity in 2004 and Wild Equity in 2011 suggested that NPS staff actually did a poor job in collecting and reviewing relevant information in some areas. The literature reviews for disturbance issues related to shorebirds was initially poor, suggesting that GGNRA staff and EIS authors did not have a good understanding of the basic biology of shorebirds. NPS must realize that allow such a serious impact as offleash dogs into sensitive areas where visitors and resources are put at risk is not a management policy that has been generally allowed. There has been little need to study such a situation, and few specifically relevant studies have been done that address the degree of off-leash activity occurring in GGNRA. Relevant literature searches by non-specialists will often return little information. In order to prepare an adequate EIS, the study authors must have adequate understanding and knowledge of the basic biology and other relevant sciences pertaining to the resources, sociological knowledge of visitors, and knowledge of canine behavior. It will be difficult for Park staff and contractors who are most likely generalists to obtain the required knowledge without consulting with specialists

The following critical areas of knowledge for dog management seemed to be virtually non-existent in GGNRA records previously reviewed:

- Risk assessment of off-leash dog activity for visitor safety and experience.
- Research of the issues involved in dogs impacting the quality of visitor experience: why are people bothered by off leash dogs and what can be done to mitigate or eliminate the problem?
- Development of professional management techniques for reducing the impact of off-leash dogs on natural resources, visitor safety, and the quality of visitor experience. GGNRA relied on such tools as 'voice control' and 'visitor education' to improve compliance with dog management regulations. Such tools have proven to be ineffective over the years. GGNRA apparently had no information to suggest such tools would be effective yet relied on them in management documents. GGNRA seemed to make to no effort to understand why leash law compliance was poor and seemed to take no steps to improve compliance.
- Analysis of dog-related incident data to understand how and why dog-related incidents occur and to incorporate such knowledge into Park management.

## COMPARISON OF DOG MANAGEMENT POLICIES & REGULATIONS/RISK ASSESSMENT

(SEIS, p. 31 ff)

The SEIS mentions the dog policies of National Parks, California State Parks, and other parks or open spaces of counties, municipalities, or other local entities. This section would be much more useful: 1) if

there was some discussion about in what proportion of parks and other open space areas entities ban off-leash dog walking and what type of risk assessment led to those policies, and 2) if in those entities where off-leash activity is allowed, what warnings and rules for visitors entering off-leash areas are operative. Such a survey would provide a much better context to proposed dog management alternatives in relation to how the issue has been handled by other entities than by simply mentioning policies of those different entities.

My initial survey suggested that most parks that allow off-leash dogs have enclosed "dog parks". Most parks that allow off-leash dog play activity provide specific warnings to visitors about the risks involved in entering an off-leash dog zone. There is frequently mention that the park or other entity cannot guarantee the safety of visitors. Since GGNRA is proposing to allow off-leash dogs on some GGNRA beaches and in mixed use areas, the EIS needs to explain how and why NPS thinks it can overcome the problems of off-leash dog activity cited by the other entities while attaining its stated goal of minimizing conflicts related to dog use by providing a variety of safe, high quality visitor use experiences.

An example of some of the regulations and warnings to visitors provided by other entities include the following.

The City of Evanston Illinois provides a Dog Beach Information Packet. The 2011 edition of the document lists the following points among others under a section, Risk and Responsibility of dog Owners Using the Evanston Dog Beach:

- A dogs behavior or actions, no matter how well trained, if startled or frightened, can be unpredictable and potentially life-threatening.

- Even a well trained dog may attack a patron, another dog, park wildlife or a curious child without provocation or notice.

- Other risks include a dogs natural reactions, such as jumping, pulling , resisting and biting, and the negligence or irresponsibility of a dogs owner/handler.

- It must be recognized that it is impossible for the City of Evanston to guarantee absolute safety.

- Dog owners must understand they participate in Dog Beach activities at their own risk and the risk of their dogs.

The Clark County Nevada Parks & Recreation Dog Park Rules include the following warnings concerning visitor use of dog parks (<http://www.clarkcountynv.gov/Depts/parks/Pages/dog-parks.aspx>):

- All dogs have the potential to bite

- One adult to supervise several children or an infant and the family dog is not sufficient to ensure everyones safety and control.

- Not all dogs are child-friendly! Never allow your child to approach or pet a strange dog without the owners presence and approval.

- The Dog Park is Not a Place for Your Child!

- Never let your child have toys or food in the Dog Park. A friendly dog might knock down your child to

get at a bright ball or cookie.

- Canine and human visitors enter at their own risk.

- Owners are legally responsible for their dogs and any injury or loss caused by their dogs.

- Clark County will not be responsible for injuries to visiting dogs, their owners or others using the park.

The City of Centralia, WA makes the following statements about visitor use of a dog park

<http://www.cityofcentralia.com/Page.asp?NavID=449>:

- Entry to the Dog Park is at the risk of dog owners, handlers and guests. Small children must not be permitted to run loose within the off-leash area.

- To prevent fights, no food or toys allowed inside the off-leash area.

- Owners are legally responsible for their dogs and any injury or damage caused by their dogs.

- Maximum 2 dogs per adult allowed in the off-leash area at any time.

The Manatee County Florida Dog Park Rules include the following statement (<http://www.myanatee.org/home/government/departments/parks-andrecreation/parks/dog-parks/dog-park-rules.html>):

- Canine and human visitors enter at their own risk. Manatee County cannot be responsible for injuries to visiting dogs, their owners, or others using the park.

I noted that a dog behavior expert, Richard H. Polsky Ph.D (dogexpert.com), provides the following among a list of warnings to dog owners for reducing the risk of injury to others caused by their dog (<http://test.webzler.com/richard/dog-bite-prevention-safety-for-children-and-others/>):

Comply with local leash laws. Letting your dog run loose in an urban environment or residential area could be dangerous, and imposes substantial risk to the safety of others. For example:

- Your dog might approach a person and frighten that person, causing that person to fall;

- Your dog, albeit non-aggressive, might approach and try to interact with a dog-aggressive-dog (possibly being walked on leash), an altercation starts, and somebody gets injured;

- Your dog might run into the street in pursuit of a squirrel or cat and get hit by a car or possibly cause a traffic accident;

- Your dog could injure a person if it accidentally collided with a person while in pursuit of some object like a cat (or another dog), or while playing with another dog.

(I note that the GGNRA law enforcement incident reports contains specific examples of all of these types of incidents described by Dr. Polsky.)

The SEIS has failed to explicitly discuss the issue of risk to visitors. Although it is mentioned that there is literature on the risk of injury to some types of visitors, there is no attempt made to assess the fact that surveys suggest that a high proportion of visitors don't want to be around off-leash dogs and will probably avoid areas of the park where off-leash activity occurs.

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

Here are examples of how risk analysis could be useful.

I examined 29 incidents from the 2009 and 2010 incidents reports involving visitors being attacked by dogs. In 16 of 29 (55%) incidents reviewed, the owner of the attacking dog either absconded from the victim or law enforcement or provided contact information that was bogus. This result suggests that a high proportion of visitors walking off-leash dogs are scofflaws in terms of taking responsibility for the actions of their dogs and having consideration for the other visitors affected. Visitors must realize that if attacked by a dog, it is likely that the perpetrating owner will not be identified. Visitors may have to undergo rabies shots and may not have any possibility of recovering costs associated with a serious injury. Such scofflaw behavior needs to be taken into account by GGNRA in formulating dog management regulations. It suggests that GGNRA should require that all dogs wear collars with proof of vaccination and that off-leash activity should be strictly compartmentalized within the Park, so that visitors wishing to minimize the risk can go elsewhere.

I also examined 37 incidents from the 2009 and 2010 incident reports involving visitors or pets that were either bitten or harassed by off-leash dogs. The incidents were classified according to how many dogs the owner of the attacking dog had off-leash at the time of the incident. In seven cases, there did not appear to be information on how many off-leash dogs the owner had. In the other 30 incidents, 17 of 30 incidents (57%) involved owners who had three or more off-leash dogs at the time of the incident. (It should be noted that such a result is conservative in terms of my analysis, since from the incident report it could not always be verified that an owner with one dog did not have other dogs besides the attacking dog.) The EIS does not present data on the distribution of the average number of dogs for dog walking visitors, but the result of the NAU survey (NAU 2002b) indicated that 77% of survey participants owned only one dog. Therefore, it is likely that a highly disproportionate number of serious incidents are associated with visitors with three or more dogs. Even the proposed limit of three off-leash dogs may not limit the risk associated with visitors having more than one dog off-leash. Such a result suggests that GGNRA should take a careful look at the risks of allowing multiple dogs off-leash, and suggests that any area of the Park where this occurs may not be appropriate for vulnerable visitor groups, such as children.

GGNRA must fully address the risk issue. The best way to control the risk for visitors would be to enclose areas where off-leash dogs are allowed and/or to segregate off-leash activity into specific well-defined areas, outside of which visitors can be reasonably certain they will not encounter off-leash dogs. Based on the management policies of most or all other park or open space entities, GGNRA is going against the grain of management practices across the country by proposing to allow multiple use of space, where off-leash dogs are allowed. It is incumbent upon GGNRA to explain how they can control such risk that most or all other entities have chosen to avoid.

## COMMUNITY BENEFITS OF OFF LEASH DOG WALKING

Visitors with dogs, including elderly and handicapped visitors may experience beneficial effects of walking their dogs. Dog walking provides mental health benefits by providing a social community for many people."

Studies have shown that dog owners exercise more than people who do not own dogs. A study in Australia looked at how dog ownership influenced physical activity (Cutt et al. 2008).

(SEIS, p. 35)

These statements suggest that the SEIS is claiming that allowing more off-leash dog walking in GGNRA will somehow have health benefits for the community. These statements are presented in a suggestive manner that probably leads to false conclusions by the reader. The main policy issue of the SEIS and the underlying management decisions is how much off-leash dog walking to allow in the Park. There is no indication that on-leash as opposed to off-leash dog walking has any less of the health and recreation benefits to humans. The study referred to (Cutt et al. 2008) compares dog owners vs. non-dog owners in a housing tract in Perth, Australia. The study shows slight differences in the total weekly amount of self-reported physical activity of dog owners vs. non-dog owners in this housing tract. However, it is unclear what health benefits, if any, are associated with such differences. There was no statistical difference in vigorous leisure-time physical activity between the groups -possibly the most significant physical activity measured that would be associated with actual health benefits. The study may have just measured the fact that people who own dogs have to walk their dogs, so they walk more than people without dogs on average.

Any claim about the health or community benefits of off-leash dog walking should be given the context of the costs to others in the community who may be negatively impacted by off-leash dog activity in GGNRA. What about all the other types of activities in GGNRA that foster physical activity and social community: jogging, biking, fishing, horseback riding, picnicking, etc? Law enforcement data suggests that those engaging in physical activity in GGNRA, such as playing, jogging or biking, have an increased risk of being bitten by or attacked by off-leash dogs, and the presence of off-leash dogs probably reduces the access to GGNRA for people who want to engage in these activities. If Cutt et al. 2008 is cited, there should also be references to articles on the potential benefits of an increase in physical activity realized by providing safe and accessible places for other types of physical activities besides walking dogs, such as running, biking, nature observation, etc., and a discussion of the potential negative impact on these activities by off-leash dogs.

#### SHOREBIRDS / BEACH WATCH DATA

(EIS, pp. 119/259/261)

Data from Beach Watch surveys (Beach Watch 2006; 2009) is used in the SEIS. Although the data from this survey may be appropriate to use to mention the presence and general abundance of certain species of shorebirds, there are severe limitations to this data. This data is based on encounter rates as were the Snowy Plover surveys done by GGNRA, so the data on shorebirds cannot be considered as an accurate survey of shorebird populations. The surveys were done every two weeks and may not have been conducted during peak migration periods and may have completely missed the presence of some bird species during migration and the peak number of individuals of various species during migration. Although some aspects of the data may be useful, I do not think it should be used to draw conclusions about the relative species numbers or the habitat importance between different sites, such as on p. 260 of the EIS:

Muir Beach and Rodeo Beach sites had documented low shorebird abundance and diversity compared to other GGNRA coastal beaches that had high shorebird abundance and diversity such as Ocean Beach (Central and South) and Fort Funston (or Thornton Beach North) (Beach Watch 2006, 11)

Such a statement may or may not be true. Any use of the data must address the limitations of the survey methods and the fact that some species may have abandoned sites, especially smaller sites, due to off-leash dog activity over many years. The EIS needs to avoid such simplistic interpretations of the data.

#### VISITOR EXPERIENCE I SURVEYS (SEIS, p. 372 ff)

Although GGNRA has utilized various surveys to attempt to collect information on Park visitors and visitor experience related to dog management issues, the surveys have limited usefulness in understanding the impact of off-leash dogs on various visitor groups. The NAU (2002) survey was helpful in revealing that a majority of the surrounding community was in favor of enforcing restrictions on off-leash dogs. As I stated in my comments on the initial EIS draft, the NAU survey did not flesh out why people want restrictions on off-leash dogs and how off-leash dogs affect or would affect their safety and visitor experience. The NAU survey followed up with respondents supportive of off-leash dog walking, who were asked a series of questions probing specific preferences to gain a deeper understanding of the nature of the dog walkers use of resources, but there was no similar attempt made to gain insight into why, for example, 35% of respondents strongly opposed off-leash dog walking.

The subsequent surveys provided no real further insight into the visitor experience related to dog management. The other studies, including Tierney et al. 2009, relied on intercepting visitors at sites heavily used by off-leash dog walkers, where visitors not wanting contact with dogs had been excluded for many years, leading to extraordinarily biased samples of visitors. (For example, I live within a few miles of Fort Funston but have not been there in over seven or eight years because of the off-leash dog activity.) Nakagawa et al. (no date)s survey compared attitudes across ethnic, age, and income groups but not across various Park user groups. Respondents in this and other surveys were not asked questions specific enough to allow for probing specific preferences related to potential conflict with off-leash dogs. In the Tierney et al. (2009) study, respondents were evaluating their visitor experiencing concerning dogs along with factors outside of Park control, such as the weather or park and community infrastructure - essentially incommensurable factors.

Many casual or infrequent visitors to GGNRA do not know the extent of the problems caused by off-leash dog activity and would not be aware of those problems unless informed during the survey. On an average visit, a casual visitor may not see or recognize the significance of dogs chasing birds and may be lucky enough not to have any conflict with off-leash dogs. It should be noted that Tierney et al. (2009- Table 71) found that a visitor who had made 101 or more visits to GGNRA in the 12 months prior to the survey had a seven-fold increase in likelihood of mentioning restrictions on dogs as a factor that would improve the experience of visiting the Park compared with visitors who had made one or none previous visits. The NAU survey asked respondents for their opinions on enforcing restrictions on off-leash regulations before and after reading them a mission statement of the National Park Service. The same type of before and after polling could be done by providing respondents with a description of the nature and extent of problems caused by off-leash dogs, such as hazardous conditions and safety risks to vulnerable populations. The 35% category of respondents strongly in favor of enforcing restrictions on off-leash dogs would surely have increased.

The surveys have failed to elucidate the real problems faced by different user/visitor groups in the Park. I am stunned that the SEIS does not refer to the work of Vaske & Donnelly (2007), which provides some insight into why visitors to a park/open space have conflicts with off-leash dogs and to what degree their visitor experience was affected. To be effective in addressing the visitor experience issues at GGNRA related to dog management, a survey would have to involve stratified sampling and detailed probing of the impacts of off-leash dogs on various user groups and vulnerable

populations. However, I believe that NPS can make use of existing information if a conservative approach is taken towards addressing the visitor experience issues that are known or can be inferred related to off-leash dog activity in GGNRA.

Given the available information, including anecdotal information in NPS files, the inescapable conclusion is that off-leash dog activity in many cases leads to single-use user group dominance of a space by off-leash dog walkers. The SEIS has failed to connect the dots about the consequences of off-leash dog activity on Park visitors.

## VISITOR SAFETY INCIDENT REPORTS

From the years 2008 through 2011, a total of 2,775 dog-related incidents were recorded in GGNRA for leash-law violations, dog bites or attacks, hazardous conditions or pet rescues, having dogs in closed areas, and failure to pick up pet excrement (tables 11-28.). (SEIS, p. 337 ff)

The SEIS presents data on dog-related incidents but does not provide a discussion of the limitations of the data and the context needed to understand and interpret data. The raw data is presented in a way that might lead one to draw conclusions about the total number of dog-related violations per year in GGNRA or to compare the number of dog walking violations and hazards between specific areas of the Park. Without information on the effort on the part of law enforcement involved in patrolling each area and the normal behavior of off-leash dog walkers, the data is just a random collection of numbers that show nothing beyond the existence of certain types of violations by dog owners in the Park. In fact, the data represents such a small sliver of the actual violations occurring that without further data it is impossible to even estimate the number and type of violations actually occurring.

For Ocean Beach it does seem possible to make some estimate of the total number of annual leash law violations, since information on the rate of leash law compliance and the number of dogs observed on Ocean Beach (Hatch 1996), suggests that the number of citations for off-leash dog walking in an entire year could be exceeded by the number of off-leash violations occurring in a single day on the beach. Based on Figure 11 in Hatch (1996), it appears that the median number of dogs observed on Ocean Beach in the seasonal closure area during a two-hour weekday survey is approximately 35. Assuming a 40% rate of leash law compliance, in the high range of this rate based on field surveys at various times by GGNRA, there would be approximately 21 violations encountered by an observer walking the entire Beach over two hours. Over eight hours there would be a median number of approximately 88 violations encountered. The actual number of violations would be much higher, as an observer would not encounter all such violations on the Beach while walking a transect. 150 violations would be a conservative estimate for the median number of violations per day based on this data. Although additional assumptions would need to be made to reach an annual estimate, that estimate would probably be around 40,000 per year. The EIS should make a similar estimate and discuss it in relation to the actual incident report data. The numbers of leash law violations reported for Ocean Beach between 2008 and 2011 was between 131 and 345 - truly a minute window into the number of violations actually occurring there.

There is also no discussion about the lack of systematic enforcement of dog-related regulations in GGNRA and how the lack of systematic enforcement biases the dog related incident data. My review of documents obtained through a FOIA request by CBD in 2004 and Wild Equity in 2001 suggested that GGNRA never had a systematic professional management plan for enforcing dog-related regulations and protecting public safety, natural resources, and the quality of visitor experience. The GGNRA response to complaints about off-leash dog behavior in those documents and personally to me from former Supervisor O'Neill elicited this type of response: Call law enforcement when you see a violation! Yet, as I discussed in my comments to the first EIS draft, informing GGNRA dispatch about a dog-related incident rarely, if ever, results in mitigation of the incident or citation for a violation.

The annual number of off-leash violations issued at Baker Beach varied by a factor of 10 between 2008 and 2011 and was greatest in 2009. Why? Does the data reflect something that happened in 2009 or is this great variance symptomatic of the fact that the data does not reflect the reality of off-leash dog violations? In essence, the incident data we have appears to be some artifact of random and/or inconsistent enforcement activities that may vary from site to site, from year to year, or from individual ranger to individual ranger. The data do not allow any conclusions about the relative behavior of dog walkers compared between sites or to the actual behavior at a site or the trend over time.

On 1/17/2009 a Park Ranger patrolling Ocean Beach encountered 55 dog walkers with off-leash dogs in violation of the seasonal beach closure. Only two violations were issued. The conclusion, besides the fact that the overall risk of a leash law violator actually receiving a citation is low, is the fact that because there were few if any other days on which 50 warnings and/or citations were issued, apparently Ocean Beach was not being patrolled.

Another missing context for the data is a discussion of what proportion of the violations are associated with off-leash dogs vs. on-leash dogs. This result would provide some idea of to what degree different types of violations could be eliminated by limiting offleash activity.

I reviewed FOIA data obtained by the Center for Biological Diversity in 2004, including law enforcement data from GGNRA and from National Parks nationwide. My impression was that the number of serious dog-related incidents in GGNRA documented was in the same ball park if not greater than all incidents from the rest of the U.S. National Parks combined. The EIS should refer to dog incident data from other Parks in performing a risk assessment of off-leash dog activity and discuss this in the EIS to provide some context for the dog incident data from GGNRA presented in the SEIS.

## NONCOMPLIANCE MONITORING

SEIS, p. 64 if

One of the most troubling developments in the SEIS is the proposed monitoring-based management strategy, under which Park Service staff will monitor noncompliance and impacts to natural resources and propose mitigation measures at a later date, instead of using automatic triggers that were originally proposed. This development is clearly the result of lobbying and political pressure and does not have any factual relevance. The previous target for 75% compliance was itself far too low to have any meaningful impact on protecting visitor experience or natural resources. Such a compliance level would not change the type and degree of risks to visitors exposed to off-leash activity, as described above under Visitor Safety. Vaske & Donnelly (2007) found that even a single negative encounter with an off-leash dog by a park visitor can qualitatively change the quality of experience. Goss-Custard et al. (2006) have used models to estimate in their study area, the a species of shorebird is disturbed more than between 1.0 and 1.5 times per hour in good feeding conditions or 0.2 to 0.5 times per hour in poor feeding conditions a reduction in fitness would result. As I discussed in my previous comments on the initial draft EIS, just one or two aggressive dogs can cause serious disturbance over long stretches of Ocean Beach, which may be visited by dozens of dogs per hour.

NPS is simply hiding from reality regarding the enforcement issue. It is clear from law enforcement incident reports that dozens if not hundreds of dog walkers, who are aware of leash laws, purposefully violate the laws and are contemptuous towards NPS and any attempt to restrict off-leash activity. An estimate for the number of annual leash law violations at Ocean Beach of 40,000 should immediately indicate to NPS that a high level of enforcement is needed in that area. In discussing management



alternatives at various other sites, NPS admits that the level of leash law compliance at many other sites is low. Yet the impact of noncompliance on visitor experience and safety and on resources at those sites is not explored. It should not be necessary to re-evaluate compliance rates to establish enforcement targets, as proposed in the SEIS, which re-evaluation process would allow serious impacts to occur for several more years. It is obvious that as appropriate in the case of contempt for regulations that direct enforcement of rules is necessary (McCool & Christensen, 1996).

It is unsettling that NPS has not performed a full risk-assessment and resource analysis of the impact of off-leash dog activity in GGNRA in the SEIS. It is difficult for me to find NPS credible in the claim that they will monitor compliance and provide a realistic and effective solution to any problems encountered, given the lack of transparency in the SEIS concerning what criteria the NPS will use to evaluate acceptable levels of compliance.

## IMPACTS ON NEARBY DOG WALKING AREAS OUTSIDE OF GGNRA

(SEIS, p 360 if)

The section on the potential impacts of dog management policy alternatives on off-leash dog use of nearby dog walking areas outside of GGNRA is removed from the reality of off-leash dog activity in the Bay Area, specifically San Francisco. It is also another example of the EIS being written in places with blinders and not considering that there are many user groups of GGNRA besides dog walkers.

This section is written with apparently zero knowledge of the actual situation of off-leash dog use of San Francisco City Parks. Although official policy limits off-leash dog use to certain designated areas within specific parks, in actual fact there is almost no enforcement of this policy. For example, Pine Lake/Stern Grove is essentially a dog park. All of the negative consequences discussed in the SEIS in the event of dog management in GGNRA more restrictive to off-leash dog walking are already occurring in Pine Lake/Stern Grove, for example. The authors of the EIS need to be informed that most off-leash dog walkers in San Francisco ignore restrictions on off-leash dog walking in City parks.

In addition, this section also needs to cover the impact of various alternatives on other user groups, comprising approximately 90% of GGNRA visitors, who might need to seek alternative areas outside of GGNRA based on dog management alternatives that fail to protect their safety or visitor experience from off-leash dog activity.

## DISTURBANCE TO WILDLIFE

(SEIS, p. 376 ff)

Although the section on disturbance to wildlife has been improved since the initial EIS draft, something is missing. Although some relevant literature is discussed regarding disturbance, there is little discussion on the actual disturbance that is occurring at GGNRA that can be observed on a daily basis. A reader of the SEIS who had not observed disturbance by off-leash dogs at GGNRA might not realize the seriousness of the disturbance actually occurring. GGNRA scientific staff have decades of experience observing this disturbance, yet the only actual instances of disturbance mentioned are from law enforcement incident reports, which are random and non-systematic observations that only occur because of a violation documented by law enforcement staff, not scientific professionals. Observations from scientific staff would be much more useful. The SEIS needs to relax its focus on only using peer-reviewed sources. The Department of Interior guidelines for the use of science are concerned with the integrity of the use of science. Over reliance on peer-reviewed sources that may not be relevant lacks integrity compared with judicious use of peer reviewed and other sources. There is a sufficient body of literature to describe and

determine the probable level of impacts of off-leash dogs in much more detail than currently in the SEIS.

The impact of off-leash dogs on shorebirds in the beach environment at GGNRA is not subtle (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r75OTvJdX8>). As I described in detail in my comments to the initial draft EIS, off-leash dogs frequently chase flocks of shorebirds for great distances along the tide line. This impact is so severe and obvious that there is little relevant scientific literature on a bird populations chronically affected by off-leash dogs to a similar degree, because off-leash dogs are usually banned in beach environments that have significant shorebird populations. It is not difficult for someone with knowledge of shorebird biology to discuss the degree of the disturbance and the potential impact on shorebirds of the disturbance observed at Ocean Beach. However, this is not done in the SEIS, probably leaving most readers questioning why it is important to prohibit off-leash activity where sensitive bird populations occur.

## ROLA ENCLOSURES

NPS stated that enclosures are undesirable because an enclosure would hinder or prevent wildlife movement. (SEIS pg. 95). This statement is not credible. There is a vast literature of how artificial wildlife corridors have been successful in mitigating the impact of natural or artificial enclosures or barriers to wildlife movement.

Sincerely,

Charles Pfister

## REFERENCES

(Note: For references not mentioned below, see the SEIS bibliography)

City of Evanston, Illinois. 2011. Evanston Dog Beach Information Packet.

Bini, John K., et al. 2011. Mortality, mauling, and maiming by vicious dogs. *Annals of surgery* 253:791-797.

Chu, A.Y., Ripple, M.G., Allan, C.H., et al. 2006. Fatal dog maulings associated with infant swings. *J Forensic Sci.* 51:403-406

De Keuster, T, Lamoureux J, Kahn A. 2006. Epidemiology of dog bites: a Belgian experience of canine behavior and public health concerns. *Vet J*; 172: 482-487.

Goss-Custard, J.D., Triplet, P., and A.D. West. 2006. Critical thresholds of disturbance by people and raptors in foraging wading birds. *Biological Conservation* 127:88-97.

Kahn, A., Bauche P., Lamoureux J., et al. Child victims of dog bites treated in emergency departments: a prospective survey. *Eur J Pediatr.* 162:254-258.

Love, Molly, and Karen L. Overall. 2001. How anticipating relationships between dogs and children can help prevent disasters. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 219: 446-453.

McCool, Stephen F., and Neal A. Christensen. 1996. Alleviating congestion in parks and recreation areas through direct management of visitor behavior. *Crowding and*

congestion in the National Park System: Guidelines for management and research.  
University of Minnesota Agriculture Experiment Station Publication (1996): 86-1996.

Reisner, I.R. 2003. Differential diagnosis and management of human-directed aggression in dogs. Vet Clin North Am Small Animal Practice. 33:303-320.

Reisner, I.R., Shofter F.S., Nance M.L. 2007. Behavioral assessment of child-directed canine aggression. Injury Prevention 2007; 13:348-31.

Reisner, I.R. and Shofer, F.S. 2008. Effects of gender and parental status on knowledge and attitudes of dog owners regarding dog aggression toward children. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association 233:1412-1419.

Reisner, Ilana R., et al. 2011. Behavioural characteristics associated with dog bites to children presenting to an urban trauma centre. Injury prevention 17: 348-353.

Reisner, Ilana. 2013. The Epidemiology & public health issue of dog bites: who, where & why. Western Veterinary Conference. Summary accessed at:  
<http://www.wvc.org/images/session notes 2013/2013 SA7.pdf>

Rohrich, R.J. and Regan B.J. 1999. Man's best friend revisited: who's watching the children? Plast Reconstr Surg. 103:2067-2068.

Vaske, Jerry, & Donnelly, Maureen. 2007. Visitor Tolerances and Standards for Off Leash Dogs at Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks. (HDNRU Report No. 75). Report for Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks. Fort Collins: Colorado State University, Human Dimensions in Natural Resources Unit.

Wright, John C. 1985. Severe Attacks by Dogs: Characteristics of the dogs, the victims, and the attack settings. Public Health Reports, Vol. 100, No. 1 (Jan - Feb), pp. 55-61.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6632	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America
-----------------	---

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Affiliation:</b>	
---------------------	--

<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00
------------------	----------------------

<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter
-----------------------------	--------

<b>Correspondence:</b>	10 Feb 2014
------------------------	-------------

Frank Dean, Superintendent

GGNRA

Building 201

Fort Mason Center

San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Dear Frank Dean,

I am writing to oppose the seriously restrictive GGNRA Dog Management plan. It bears repeating to point out that the GGNRA is an urban recreational park and the land that it includes has always been so. It's not Yosemite, Bryce, Zion etc., for which the Park Service bureaucracy properly has different regulations, because the users of those parks are infinitely less diverse. The GGNRA's users include not only tourist-visitors but also residents of all descriptions: parents & little children, parents with bigger

children, cyclists, skaters, picnickers, walkers, runners, nature lovers, dog walkers both professional and dog owners (even cat & rabbit owners) and just about any other SF resident who feels like a brief stay in a beautiful park. Members of these groups are,,alas, at one time or another messy (drop trash) and destructive (cycling on grass, crushing plants, damaging structures etc.) A vast majority of dogs are well-behaved and their owners clean up after them and they don't drop candy wrappers, Saran wrap, aluminum foil, coffee cups and other human detritus that is o filthy, and ugly. (I have seen humans urinate & defecate at Crissy Field). Many people don't like children and elderly folks are scared of cyclists & rowdy ball/frisbee players, who probably also frighten wildlife.

Given these conditions it's not surprising that the GGNRA Dog Management Plan has aroused increasing opposition since it surfaced in 2010. Basically, so far as San Francisco is concerned (wild areas in Marin may merit different rules) the GGNRA is just another city park, where dogs along with all other users should be subject to urban requirements - not rules suitable to Grand Canyon etc., areas traditionally under the authority of the Park Service.

How about discriminating against children (must play only in fenced playgrounds), cyclists (can't cycle where pedestrians walk), frisbee players (can't play on grass areas), picnickers (can only eat at established picnic areas) - well, you get the picture. All these users must be accommodated according to their needs, and regulated in reasonable ways consistent therewith. The current GGNRA plan isn't practical or reasonable given the unique nature of the GGNRA. And finally, your limited staff must have more constructive things to do than cite dog owners.

Sincerely yours,

Louise Frankel

2710 Scott St.

San Francisco, CA 94123

415-931-2710

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6633    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94117  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,13,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent

Building 201, Ft. Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123

February 11th, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Claire Petitt and I have been a resident of San Francisco for 16 years. Everyday I walk on either Crissy Field, Baker Beach or Ft Funston with my 8 year old dog Django. Every day I bring extra waste removal bags (poop bags) to clean up the beach of trash that has been dropped or washed up along the shore. Please see the attached picture as an example of a typical day's haul. Being able to walk and frolic in these places with my dog is presicely the reason I feel the need to be a steward of these open spaces and do my bit to leave it cleaner then I found it. One of the reasons why my family has chosen to stay in the city is because the city offers these beautiful places located in an urban environment and that they are used by so many for casual and formal recreation. I am a member of Environment California and actively participate in trash clean ups

and fundraising for environmental protection and legislation lobbying in Sacramento.

I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dog in the near future. Additionally, the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years for come. I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Regarding the process, it seems that a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.

Sincerely,  
Claire Petitt  
1241 Stanyan street  
San Francisco, CA  
94117

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6634    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127-1612

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent dean,

Please think of the joy that will leave all the lives when you restrict the off leash laws.

My biggest pleasure at 78 years old is spending freetime with my dog, tally, & bringing along a two legged friend to share the fun. I walk every day!

---

We are a dog loving city please don't ruin our JOY. Let's play ball with our dogs, San Francisco. Join us, please.

Regarts,  
Patie Garelick

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6635    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Re: Draft Dog Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I am 66 years old, live in San Francisco and have been enjoying walking my dog in the GGNRA lands for 20 years. I have a serious back condition and cant go to the gym or run but I can and do walk every day. I cant tell you how important this regular exercise is to my health. Before I got my first dog 20 years ago I barely knew these GGNRA lands existed. I love nature and have become an avid hiker. The GGNRA lands are my favorites: the Oakwood Valley Trail in Mann, Mon Point in San Mateo County, Cnissy Field, Lands End and most of all Fort Funston in San Francisco. I would be devastated if access to these places were to be restricted.

I very much disagree with the GGNRAs current preferred alternative. It is far too restrictive. In some places  
Dog walking is totally eliminated. Your science regarding environmental impact is unsubstantiated. The 1979 Pet Policy adressed both environmental and recreational issues. We should continue to abide by it. We dog owners currently have access to less than 1% of the GGNRA lands. There should be no more restrictions!

When the GGNRA was created it was agreed that the recreation that existed would be continued and that the city would be consulted on future changes within the GGNRA. The GGNRA needs to be accountable to their promise to San Francisco. These lands are in a densely populated urban area and the recreational needs of the people of San Francisco and surrounding areas must be preserved.

I believe the GGNRA needs to carefully differentiate between recreational and professional dog walkers. I think the GGNRA should do as the City of San Francisco has done and issue permits that limit the number of dogs walked at one time. Perhaps they could even limit the number of permits issued.

And I am very upset that again we must take precious time to write supervisors and congressional representatives when the GGNRA ignored all the substantive comments supporting dogs and opposing the same plan two years ago. I dont understand why you wont work with the dog people to resolve any problems there may be.

These GGNRA parks mean the world to so many of us. Please consider other alternatives and continue to keep them accessible to responsible recreational users and our dogs.

Sincerely,

Andrea Patterson

114A Porter St.  
San Francisco, CA 94110

SFDOG, Fort Funston Dog Walkers, Northern California Alaskan Malamute Association

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6636	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Larkspur , CA 94939 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Angela & Daniel Osborne 120 Marina Vista Avenue Larkspur, CA 94939				

9th February 2014

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason,  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Angela Osborne and my husband Dan and I live in Larkspur, Marin County. We have lived here for 14 years and for the past 6 years, have enjoyed walking our dog in areas around Marin and San Francisco including Rodeo Beach, the Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach, Muir Beach, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Baker Beach and Chrissy Field.

We exercise in these areas with our dog off leash and under voice control for both our own health as well as the health of our dog. We are also avid hikers and cyclists. Like many people who come to Marin County, my husband and I moved here to be close to nature and pursue a healthy, outdoor lifestyle. Our dog has played an instrumental part in getting us out into that wonderful Marin environment.

My husband and I are writing to let you know that we strongly oppose Alternative F, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) preferred dog management plan to restrict off-leash and dog-friendly access to the GGRA. Instead, we support Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

With its plan, the GGNRA appears to have lost sight of its original purpose. The GGNRA is not a national park. It was established to provide recreational activities to local residents in a densely populated urban area. It is not a wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite and therefore requires a different management strategy than a National Park.

As Marin residents, my husband and I rely upon and enjoy its open space. Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the GGNRA. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%. Local residents have fought hard for many decades to create and preserve the vast tracts of open space that contribute so much to the views and the outdoor lifestyle cherished by most who live here. Access for all users, including people and their dogs, was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained. It needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in all three areas - San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo County - and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

The GGNRA's plan would only allow for more restrictions and does not provide for opening up more areas for dog recreation. This is a fundamentally unfair process to set up and lacks justification. It is also extremely worrying, as it does not factor in any growth or change in the urban population. Marin has the most people it has ever had living in its borders and more than twice as many dogs as school children. This reflects the recently released U.S. Pet Ownership & Demographics Sourcebook from American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) that reveals that more than 50% of California households own a dog.

The GGNRA plan would seriously restrict dog walking in that less than half (7) of the 22 areas in the three counties would allow off-leash dog walking. There is no justification in the SEIS for major changes in any of the 22 areas affected. In fact, the SEIS did not adequately consider comments made to the DEIS by responsible dog guardians last time around, suggesting the will of the people is being ignored. A significant number of comments submitted in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's current dog plan. This is very worrying.

There is inadequate factual basis in the current plan for the proposed changes. The GGNRA claims it is responding to what it said were rising complaints from park visitors and park officers, yet it has failed to provide current data to back up that claim. We walk our dog in these areas and have rarely seen any altercations other than minor (and natural) dog-on-dog interactions.

The new plan does not adequately analyze the impact of the preferred alternative on nearby parks. The public and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors requested this analysis in 2011. The new plan claims that, because some off-leash space will still be available in the GGNRA, albeit much smaller, most people will continue to walk their dogs there and not move to nearby city parks. No evidence is given to support either assumption. The GGNRA has not adequately studied the dispersion effect of its plan on local communities, neighborhoods and residential areas. These include parking, traffic congestion, driving patterns and increased miles traveled to reach dog-friendly areas.

In addition, the monitoring-based management strategy needs to be re-worked because it primarily focuses on 100% compliance of leash laws and therefore allows the GGNRA to change the status if it deems park users are in non-compliance. It reserves the right to restrict further dog walking if there



are unspecified violations or impacts in the future. The plan makes inconsistent assumptions and is arbitrary.

My husband and I would like it on record that we adamantly reject the idea of constructing fences to delineate any off leash areas in the GGNRA. It is a bad and costly idea that will make all people, with or without dogs, feel penned in. In addition, any barriers put up will impede the natural movement of the very wildlife the GGNRA claims it seeks to protect.

There hasnt been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports the proposed drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are not only occurring now but that dogs are causing them. Dogs and their walkers are not going off trail so how many dogs are in fact leaving these trails and invading critical wildlife habitat? The GGNRA should take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis, provide the data and stop speaking hypothetically. We would ask the GGNRA to conduct the necessary site specific peer-reviewed studies before making any changes to the uses of our recreational land. After 2-1/2 years in review, the new plan has not been modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan, opposing the original plan by a margin of 3:1.

Given 99% of the GGNRA is already off-limits to dogs, it is hugely discriminating to seek a plan that reduces that 1% any further. At a time when restaurants, shops and other local businesses are providing access, water and treats for dogs, the GGNRA's plan to restrict them shows how out of touch it is with both its mission, purpose and a significant segment of the society it was formed to serve.

What the people of the Bay Area need is a new plan that describes how the space will be managed as a recreation area, which is what the lands are mandated to be. A proper forum should be set up to review recreation management and should include dog walkers and other park users such as cyclists, equestrians, hikers, and surfers and sail boarders. This type of committee would be valuable for the GGNRA in order to hear directly from their users and to engender their support in maintaining the GGNRA lands through volunteer opportunities supporting collective access.

The restrictions in Marin County are extremely far-reaching to the point of leaving practically no areas for off-leash dog recreation and many areas off limits all together. Marin is the hardest hit by the GGNRA preferred alternative as it would eliminate off leash dog walking at Muir Beach, all trails at Homestead Valley, Marin Headlands and Oakwood Valley. There is no factual basis to support this. The only off leash area in Marin would be a remote stretch of Rodeo Beach. The closure of these areas will place a huge burden on other open space lands in Marin, causing overcrowding in what few dog parks remain.

In San Francisco County, the GGNRA's proposed alternative is extremely restrictive for off and on leash dog walking in areas that my husband and I currently enjoy walking with our dog including Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Lands End, Baker Beach and Chnissy Field. Approximately 75% of dog walking access in San Francisco will be eliminated if the GGNRA preferred alternative is adopted. With the harsh restrictions in both Marin and San Francisco County, we will be forced to travel further and further to find outdoor recreational areas to enjoy with our dog. In short, the GGNRA preferred plan would severely impede our ability to enjoy the Marin and Bay Area lifestyle that originally brought us to the area. The GGNRA plan does not simply limit dogs. It limits all that is wonderful about the Marin County and Bay Area lifestyle, culture and community.

Sincerely,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6637    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94110-5599

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, General Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreational Area

Fort Mason #210

San Francisco, CA 94 123-0022

Dear Superintendent Dean:

Though 13 years have elapsed, and Bob and Annie are in dog heaven, (replaced by Solly and Florrie), I would respectfully ask that my Letter to the Editor, December 3, attached, be made part of your record, ID 11759 and ID 55416. My comments then are certainly appropriate now.

I'm now 80 years old, still active, and walking my dogs off leash, as I have for the past 40 or so years. My health and mental well being are in your hands. I'm hoping justice will prevail.

Thank you,

Mort Gensberg

mortgensberg@earthlink.net

December 3, 2001

Letters to the Editor

San Francisco Chronicle

901 Mason Street

San Francisco, CA 94110

Gentlemen:

Dogs at Ft. Funston

For Arthur Feinstein of the Audubon Society to dismiss dogs as a "nuisance" is a disservice to dogs everywhere. Dogs are our companions; they comfort the infirmed, help the impaired, and in more recent tunes, assist in our national security.

Dogs, like birds, were meant to be free. Dogs need to socialize and exercise as we do. To prohibit their movement, when safety allows, is a form of abuse. Abused animals in turn become frightened and aggressive.

Lastly, the dogs have never been a threat to the bank swallows over these many years. I've been walking my dogs off leash at Ft. Funston for at least 20 years. I

ask why do the swallows return, year after year, despite the incursion of humans, dune buggies, horses, dogs, hang gliders, heavy equipment and attempts to alter their ecosystem.

As an aging veteran with two active, very friendly dogs, I think Bob, Annie and I are entitled to the same protections as our avian friends. I'd like to see a return to "RECREATION" at the GGRNA.

Thank you.  
Mort Gensberg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6638    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134-2103  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Frank Dean - General Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Building 201, Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

RE: GGNRA Dog Management Plan

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

"In this process, you haven't seen the same level of compassion  
extended to wildlife as to dogs."

Mike Lynes, GGAS

Greetings once again Superintendent Dean,

I've been actively involved in the general issue of dogs in parks and other wild lands for well over a decade and have submitted numerous written comments to the GGNRA ever since U.S. District Court Judge Alsup's 2005 decision to unleash dogs in the GGNRA. The entire process has been so disheartening that I almost decided to forgo this last ditch comment period because it's increasingly clear that support for pets has continued to relentlessly gnaw away at any semblance of wildlife protection in the GGNRA. There's no question that Mike Lynes' statement is absolutely accurate 'wildlife continues to be pushed aside by the alarmingly boisterous and well-organized dog booster groups, as well as most politicians and newspaper publishers who all seem to confuse affection for pets with concern for wildlife. You've heard all of the arguments so now it comes down to you as the only person that's actually charged with upholding the NPS mandate to "preserve and protect", the very essence and reason the GGNRA exists. Wildlife needs your voice!

Sincerely,

M. Bruce Grosjean

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6639    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416    **Private:** Y

**Address:** private, San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** In-Put for GGNRA Dog Management Plan prospects  
San Francisco parks and beaches - - February 2014

The Return of Common Sense

In General Common Sense:

Domesticated canine pet use of public land must be strictly controlled. Domination and bullying tactics, which have rendered all other uses secondary, has run its course and proven to be unfair,

---

unsafe, unsustainable, and never in the best interest of all other users ' including wildlife. Dog owners have proven that they cannot act in goodfaith in the interest of cooperation to assure any other uses of public play spaces other than their confused belief that pets are not "children" and do not have priority over other uses and natural wild plant and animal sustainability.

The idea trumpeted by dog owners that dogs should be a primary consideration in all future land management decisions because they claim in that there are more dogs than children (prove it) and that the dog population is only going to grow (crystal balls?) is FALSE and must be ignored. Ten thousand dogs does not replace the value of one human being, one bird, one native plant, the cleanliness of one grain of sand, the pleasure of one child's laughter at experiencing nature, or the quality of one drop of Ocean or Bay water.

Small dog ownership, which places a smaller demand on the size of spaces needed to adequately accommodate their exercising, should be encouraged over larger dog breeds.

The culture of dog ownership has been allowed to dominate the discussion and refocused political weight as an issue with priority in public park land management. The common sense principle must be strongly reinforced that dog owner public land domination by bullying and convenient ignorance of the Law is not the default practice and will be returned to a system of accountability for misuse and dismissal of the concerns and peaceful use of others.

Dog use is a privilege, not a right, allowable only under very controlled conditions. Misuse of this privilege is subject to withdrawal at any time when violations of this trust are dismissed. Dog owners will never be satisfied with pet restrictions. They have been allowed to masterful manipulate City officials and citizens alike by using tactics of creating their own packs and use people's reluctance at being subjected to bullying should they dare to express opposition to dog misuse of parks and pitting neighbor-against-neighbor to get what they want. This must stop NOW.

The idea that dogs will crowd interior parks when the GGNRA restricts off-leashes use is LUDICRIOUS! Dog's owners already dominate public parks, fields, courts, slopes; this practice will not change. Owners go to beaches and to parks with their dogs strictly at the CONVENIENCE to owners, not the preferences of dogs. Parks are convenient for the daily toileting of dogs... beaches are a nice but not necessary ventures. Parks have always and will always take the brunt of this misuse.

Do not make the same mistake as the SF Rec. & Park Dept. has made by fearing the misperception of dog owner political power and not enforce dog use. As it is now, RPD staff (gardeners, managers, recreation directors) is instructed to not confront dog owners when they violate Park Codes, yet welcome private residents to "self-police" and take the brunt of dog owner rage at being told they must stop bad behavior in local parks and playgrounds. The number of Park Ranger officers is very low and enforcing dog rules has deliberately been virtually ignored. Commercial dog walkers should prove easily visible training, licensing, and with proper personally supplied cleaning materials versus taxes paid for and supplied.

Voice Control: A very rare talent not mastered by hardly any owners and should never be criteria for where or when dogs are allowed in public spaces.

Even if a rare owner has managed to get a pet to respond to their voices in a controlled home setting, when put in an environment with many other not-tethered dogs, said dogs typically revert back to

instinctual pack behavior of domination and submission within the pack and ignore their owners. The result is that other users of public spaces become secondary and are subjected to unpredictable and dangerous behavior of animals which owners cannot stop.

Licensing: For Public Safety: No person shall be allowed to take dogs into public spaces unless there is a uniform and easily recognizable method of identifying the animal as licensed, with all necessary up-to-date vaccinations, and the owner as having received sufficient training in dog handling. No license ' no public land use.. .period. Dog owners must provide their own dog feces and urination cleaning supplies versus public paid for and stocked.

Enforcement: All established Dog Management Rules must be strictly and uniformly enforced at all times ' no more exceptions, no more "education," no more "warnings," no more excuses. Signage must reflect with words, maps, and other illustrations the consequences of non-compliance. Fines for violations of "POSTED RULES" holds more monetary weight than a fine for a dog "unleashed;" enforcement officers must opt for the highest possible monetary fine in order to solidify the overwhelming need to compel dog owners that the public demands their compliance versus continuing to all their perceived entitlement of being an exception to the Laws and certainty that officers will continue to not hold them accountable.

Unleashed Dog Areas: All designated areas which allow not-tethered dogs must be well defined with beginning and full-circle endings of impenetrable barriers where dogs cannot escape and where others do not have to deal with most owners' inability to restrain pets.

Unleashed areas must not span public paths-of-travel walkways, driveways or be open to any adjacent areas where not-tethered dogs are not allowed. Owners will claim ignorance, bully any other park user who dares to ask them to tether their pet, and ignore rules anyway if not strictly contained within an area.

Water Fronts: Unless completely remote and well defined by signage and where natural features illustrate a common-sense natural edge of a space, all beaches must be NO DOGS ALLOWED or DOGS ON LEASHES ONLY.

â€ Ocean Beach: NO dogs off leashes must be allowed anywhere on this most crowded of all San Francisco beaches. As shown in current proposed maps, dogs are suggested to roam free right with families, tourists, and all manner of unsuspecting humans gather ' including the only parking lot designed to access this beach. This difficult bullet must be bitten, and although dog owners will scream and threaten, loose dogs on this entire beach cannot be tolerated ' we cannot duplicate the mistakes the SF Rec. & Park Dept. made in this regard: see Dolores Park where at least three-quarters of this crowded park is for dogs off-leashes with no barriers or signage to inform unsuspecting humans who are currently, as we speak, sitting where dogs have more right to be than people. Safety to the Snowy Plover must be given precedence to all other uses ' dog and human. There is no map which illustrates the need that all dogs be leashed on all of Ocean Beach.

â€ Upper Fort Mason: Map 9- -F is the closest to an acceptable dogs off-leash spaces in that it is secluded to a furthestmost area that does not require others to cross; although the too large a space.

â€ Crissy Field: There is no map which is adequate. All examples are blatant examples of giving into the screaming of dog owners who currently believe that they own this prime location which is always crowded with residents and visitors.

Map 10 D can be adjusted. As currently shown...

â€ The designated dog area does not have hard barriers defining that space ' a mistake.  
The off-sand (inland) dog area crosses walkways and people must walk through the dogdominated area and become secondary to dog behavior ' a mistake.

â€ The sandy beach area where unleashed dog may access the water's edge makes a right-hand turn to allow dogs to run along the long stretch of water's edge in front of where people may access the water ' a very big mistake.

â€ If dogs are allowed to be at and in the Bay water, it must be only directly in front of and only as wide as the off-sand designated un-leashed dog area.

A dog space must not be anywhere close to the Tidal Marsh as the smell and barking of dogs is threatening to birds.

â€ This Dogs Off-Leashes Area is far too large. It must be reduced in size and situated between walkways so that others never have to walk through it or be forced to take longer walkway detours to go around it.

â€ IF any waterfront access is allowed, it must be DIRECTLY IN FRONT OF and NO WIDER or longer than the inland area. It must be apparent where dogs would naturally be confined and intuitive that people would not want to wander into it with the use of natural barriers and signs.

â€ Any dog space must always be away from picnic tables, food and grills, the Warming Hut, and where people are entering or exiting vehicles in parking areas.

â€ Remember: Dogs are NOT the primary users or interest in our public play spaces.

Ft. Funston and all other Headlands: This cliff and beach area is more remote and more suited to less disturbing waterfront recreation, it still presents...

trampling damage to native plants and chasing of bird life in fields and beaches,

â€ places hikers and equestrian recreation in constant unwelcome and often volatile surprises on trails from dogs allowed to get ahead complacent owners,

â€ expends too much public money to secure safety and rescue from falls off of cliffs,

â€ compromises sensitive cliffs from even more rapid erosion.

Off Leash dog use must be confined to the most common sense remote areas of Ft. Funston and all other Headlands regardless of size. All trails whose sides cannot be fenced must be for Dogs On Leashes Only. Enforcement of beach and trail use must be strictly enforced.

Map 16-C closes illustrates an acceptable compromise with the EXCEPTION that the inland off-leashes area and next to the parking lot MUST BE REMOVED and allow for dogs to be released ONLY when they get to the beach. More sensitive trails must be removed and ON-leashes until they arrive completely down the trails to the beach is acceptable.

Map 16-D is preferred, but it would be hell frozen over to enforce.

Ft. Point: There is no reason whatsoever for dogs to be in this area whose purpose if strictly for historical review by humans.

Baker Beach: Map 12-F seems to illustrate that this small beach with large crowd use and a dangerous rip-tide reputation is not suited for dogs anywhere off leashes and with a strong need for control over dogs at all times. Frankly, the same goes for small children who are often placed in the same dangers by hapless guardians.

Land's End- -Ft. Miley: Although these narrow trails would all be best suited to no dogs, limited use by Map 13-D closest illustrates a compromise.

Sutro Heights Park: Only the fewest of trails should be allowed for any dogs, however Map

14C is a compromise from 14D.

Back to Real Life...

We appreciate that this has been an extremely stressful process that even we with stronger stomachs have had to avoid from time to time for reasons of being targeted by dog owners who recognize us amongst those who will stand up and hold them accountable for their bullying and misinformation.

We Thank the National Park Service for withstanding this necessary process and encourage that whatever the final configuration of this Plan, that it be enforced and honored for the good of all concerned. We look at this as a Plan that must withstand the test of a very long millennial future after we are ourselves consumed into History.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6640    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Montara, CA 94037  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** John O'hara  
PO Box 371057  
1015 Tamarind Street  
Montara, Ca. 94037

Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate Recreational Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

RE: Comment on GGNRA draft Dog Management Plan / SEIS

Dear Sir,

Thank you for providing me the opportunity to comment on the Dog Management Plan. I just returned from Hawaii and had the great pleasure to enjoy Volcanoes National Park. We did a number of hikes in the park and something struck me while I was there. There were no dogs. I was able to enjoy the natural environment, it was peaceful and stress free. Over my lifetime I've spent a significant amount of times in our national parks and go there to appreciate the beauty of nature and the solitude it provides.

This brings me to the controversy at hand. I live across the street from what is essentially a National Dog Park. When I take hikes through the park I'm frequently accosted by dogs mostly off leash. It's not at all like the experience I had in Volcanoes NP. While on a recent hike, I was immediately pounced on, by a dog. It's owner assured me that it was a "friendly dog" but it pushed me off the trail and into the bushes. I kept walking and passed numerous dogs running loose some without an owner in sight. As a hiker I don't know which dog is friendly and which isn't. I've asked owners to "please leash their dog", and the response in general has been quite hostile. During this hike I observed two owners that had their dogs on leashes the rest of the dogs were running free. I find hiking in this park, not at all stress free and often is unpleasant.

I don't believe this is what John Muir had in mind when he lobbied for Yosemite to be preserved or Teddy Roosevelt when he created the initial parks. The National Parks should stand apart from local Parks, as more than a recreation area for dogs. They should provide sanctuary for their inhabitants, as well as a place humans, can experience the natural world in a non-intrusive way.

I further understand from the proposal that one option is to build a dog run across the street from my house. This would add insult to injury. I would like to see an outright ban on dogs in the park, but know that isn't going to happen. I think that the dog owners have organized themselves quite well. I would like to enjoy the parks natural environment. At a minimum, I strongly request that the current leash laws be enforced so that those who want to enjoy the park without harm, can do so.

Best regards,

John O'Hara

Attachment: Dogs off leash photo's

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6641    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94116  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Randall F. Ham

435 Dewey Blvd.

San Francisco, CA 94116

GGNRA Superintendent,

Bldg. 201, Fort Mason,

San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My wife and I have regularly walked with our dogs in the GGNRA (principally Fort Funston) for the past thirty plus years. I am writing to express our strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft dog management plan. In our view, it is far too restrictive. It will prevent us from recreating with our dogs for our own health and that of our dogs as we have on GGNRA properties for many years.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there has not been a single peer-reviewed, site-specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

We oppose having fences surround or delineate off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions. Individuals who break the rules should be penalized, but the majority who do observe the rules and keep their dogs under control should be punished for the misdeeds of others.

The GGNRA has in our view lost sight of its purpose: it was not established in a remote wilderness area to preserve primeval nature intact. It was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy should be formalized



and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on future GGNRA acquisitions.

Sincerely,  
Randall Ham

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6642    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern at the GGNRA,

I am writing to voice my concern about the latest draft of the Dog Management Plan for the GGNRA. I am a native San Franciscan, single mother of a preschooler and lifetime owner well mannered sporting dogs. I have exercised myself, my dogs and no my son virtually every day of my life in this city at Crissy Field of East Beach on the berm. My son plays in the sand while my dog retrieve in the water Quite often this is our best time of day. As a "lifer" at Crissy Field, I have walked when it was but a muddy parking lot, when it was an obstacle course of old austrip boulders, in rain or shine, every month of the year.

I greatly appreciate the beautiful setting, the improved parking and the maintenance of garbage which were greatly improved with the funds from the Haas Family. As a matter of fact I sat with the Haas Family on opening day in 2001, with our happy OFF leash dogs celebrate.

The success and high usage of this urban park surprises everyone. Visiting on weekends is now quite a challenge with hikers and joggers going about and not paying attention to the main path.

Do not blame off leash dogs and scapegoat my chosen form of recreation in my city. Packs of tourists riding bikes for the first time in a long while are not a valid reason to ban dogs East Beach.

We are here rain or shine enjoying the peace, the wildlife and the clean air. We clean up after our visits and insist the GGNRA continues its agreement of the 1970 policy allowing off-leash recreation. Leave off-leash policy alone on GGNRA lands in the Bay Area

My son and I attended the Open house meeting in Novermber at Ft. Mason. This was his first political demonstration for our family's recreation rights. He still chants "take it back". Out of the mouths of babes!

Ann E O'Driscoll

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6643    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,21,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Dean of the GGNRA,

My name is Alexander and I am three and a half years old and a native San Franciscan. My mommy and dog, Zoe, go to Crissy Field every day. Zoe is a very good swimmer and swims very far. I play in the

sand. We are there rain or sunshine.

My dog is only allowed to swim for exercise because she has a problem with her elbows so she is not supposed to walk or play on hard surfaces.

I am a good swimmer but not as good as Zoe! She has to swim off leash.

Please Mr. Park man let my family keep playing off leash at Crissy Field on the East Beach.

Thank you,

Alexander O' Driscoll

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6644	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent Building 201, Ft. Mason San Francisco, CA 94123				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Kathryn Nyrop and I have been a resident of San Francisco for over 35 years. I applauded the transformation of the former Army base to the beautiful Presidio. The Presidio is a tremendous national treasure precisely because it is located in an urban environment and is used by so many for casual and formal recreation.

I walk in the Presidio daily and often hear and see red-shouldered hawks and owls and even the coyote. I have shared these many hours in the Presidio with my dogs over the years.

I am writing today to express my opposition to the process the GGNRA has run to evaluate where dogs may be allowed in the GGNRA. Additionally, the conclusions reached are not fair and flawed.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred as a use for the newly created GGNRA, it should not be restricted by the Park Service. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreation area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential. Restricting recreation use will decrease the use of the Park, which is a tragedy. The consequences of this decision regarding dogs is very similar to the decision to make Morton Street field in to riparian habitat. What a shame to deny thousands of San Francisco youth recreational access to Presidio? The same applies to on and off leash dog walking.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the supplemental EIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this management plan allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in the latest supplemental

environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last EIS was released. Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Nyrop  
2545 Baker Street  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
415 931 1673

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6645	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Pacifica City Council Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,21,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 11, 2014				

Mr. Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason Center, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Subject: Comments on the Draft Dog GGNRA Management Plan! Supplemental EIS

Dear Superintendent Dean:

I am writing on behalf of the City of Pacificas City Council to provide comments on the Draft GGNRA Dog Management Plan/Supplemental EIS. The comments in this letter reflect a discussion held on January 29, 2014, among the Council members, members of the City's Open Space and Parkland Advisory Committee, City staff, a GGNRA representative as well as citizens who attended and provided comments.

The City of Pacifica had previously provided comments on the Draft Dog Management Plan/EIS in 2011 (copy attached). Thank you for modifying the preferred alternative for Mori Point by adding the Pollywog Trail as an on-leash trail. We also appreciate the modification of the preferred alternative for Sweeney Ridge/Cattle Hill to add on-leash dog walking at Sweeney Ridge on Sneath Lane and on the Baquiano Trail from Fassler Avenue to, and including, the Farallon View Trail.

At their regular meeting of February 10, 2014, we held a public meeting, reviewed and deliberated on the comments relating to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Dog Management in

GGNRA lands within the limits of the City of Pacifica, and voted unanimously to submit the following additional comments:

**Enforcement:**

We strongly feel that the protection of sensitive habitat is important. We encourage enforcement of park rules to limit the disturbance of wildlife, vegetation, and possible special-status species habitat. We encourage the GGNRA to work with the community with regard to prior outreach and education.

**Clear Signage at Enforcement Transition Zones:**

We would like to reiterate this comment that was previously made about signage. There are a number of locations where there is a transition between GGNRA and City-managed lands. Without clear and prominent signage a person walking a dog may suddenly find they are no longer on City property but GGNRA land and in violation of the new regulations. An example of such a transition zone is at the south end of the berm (owned by the City of San Francisco but managed and used by Pacificans) which transitions seamlessly into GGNRA Mon Point land. Therefore we encourage GGNRA to clearly post these transition zones.

**Site-Specific Comments**

The following are comments specific to the alternatives presented by the SEIS plan for lands in Pacifica. Our overall rationale for suggesting these changes include:

- 1) parklands were set-aside to protect important natural resources
- 2) the need for more recreational access on GGNRA lands for on-leash dog walkers in Pacifica. The current proposal is too limiting in the amount of on-leash dog access. Alternative F removes approximately 63% of the existing trails from recreational use with dogs; and
- 3) the belief that the current proposal may have unwanted economic impacts.

**Sweeney Ridge:**

We recommend allowing on-leash dog access on the Baquiano Trail and opening the trail from Sheldance Nursery to the Nike Missile site to on-leash dog access. Proper enforcement of the rules should ensure that few if any violations occur, in which case the environmental effects from site access on this parcel would be minimal.

**Milagra Ridge:**

No Comment.

**Mori Point:**

We suggest that the Mori Point Headlands Trail be modified to allow on-leash dog access. We also recommend connecting the Mori Point Bluff Trail to provide a loop. We believe the likelihood of either the redlegged frog or the San Francisco garter snake being harmed or negatively affected is extremely remote.

**Pedro Point:**

We suggest opening up the South Middle and Valley Ridge Trails to on-leash dog access. These Trails would connect to the Devils Slide Trail slated to open on March 22, 2014 to on-leash access making Pacifica a destination for multiple visitor experiences.

Lastly, as we mentioned in our May 2011 letter, we are concerned that a loss of on-leash dog access on lands within Pacifica might have unwanted economic consequences, as dog walkers will go elsewhere, effectively eliminating the possibility of patronizing Pacificas restaurants, hotels, or other retail outlets. While this cannot be readily quantified, we wish to express our concerns about this possibility, as it has

been the City's long-held desire to see just the opposite occur. Our partnership with the GGNRA has been premised on the mutual benefits that Pacifica and the National Park Service can have from expanded open space. We encourage you to consider these effects while making final evaluations of the proposed actions in the SEIS.

We thank you and your staff for your dedication and hard work. We continue to be grateful for all that you have done and continue to do for the advancement of park lands in and near Pacifica.

Sincerely

Mary Ann Nihart  
Mayor

Attachmect: Letter to GGNRA, May 24, 2011

cc: Council Members Karin Ervin, Len Stone, Sue Digre, and Mike ONeil  
Open Space and Parkiand Advisory Committee members  
City Manager Lone Tinfow  
Planning Director George White

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6646	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94118				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean				
	GGNRA Superintendent				
	Building 201, Ft. Mason				
	San Francisco, CA 94123				

February 15, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Les Nagy and I live in San Francisco. I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative the proposed Dog Management Plan that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dogs in the near and longer term future.

I have lived here for 2 years. My family, including our three dogs, visit Crissy Field at least 3x per week. Our dog love to swim and play with the other dogs. We enjoy socializing with the other dog guardians and with non-dog walkers who are also enjoying the beach. These places offer a safe place where we can enjoy some open space in an urban environment. Access to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (which is not a National Park, but a Recreation area) for this highly social activity is an important aspect of the quality of life in San Francisco. It is also important to me that my wife and children have a safe place to go when I am traveling. The presence of other dog owners and professional dog walkers adds a critical element of safety to these areas. People walking their dogs are alert to things that do not look right and are always quick to help others at

the park. Further, when my elder parents visit they enjoy walking with us and our dog, on and off leash. Access to these areas is critical for a safe walk.

The conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

In addition to finding the GGNRA preferred alternatives to be grossly ill considered and discriminatory, I strongly oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens, make the dogs feel trapped and visitors using them will feel segregated and discriminated against.

Because dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created Golden Gate National RECREATION Area in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years to come per GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It is managed for financial sustainability and contains both residential and commercial activities as an extension of the urban area that surrounds it. As such, it should be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential and provide maximum enjoyment by visitors to and residents of the Bay Area that recreate regularly on this land.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS permits further restrictions in the future and on newly acquired lands, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on or off-leash).

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated ' it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. Additionally, in reviewing the SEIS it appears that a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS. Such clear disregard for a large number of comments strongly suggests that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Specifically addressing Crissy Field, when Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. This proposed reduction in off leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. This makes no sense and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of historically granted and important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come. The SEIS seems to select dog walking as a single threat to the GGNRA. I note the negative impact of businesses in the

Presidio and the traffic and noise that they bring, the large charitable events that are held at Crissy Field, and special events such as the Americas Cup. There seems to be no mention of this in your report or any efforts to curtail these activities. The singly focus on visitors with dogs to environmental impact at Crissy Field and other GGNRA locations is flawed and deeply troubling.

Dog guardians, parents with children, older citizens, disabled citizens and large groups for special events should all have equal access to all GGNRA areas that are not historically designated as wildlife protected areas of the parks. Dogs and people are co-existing now and visits by both groups have grown in the recent years as improvements have been made to the GGNRA lands. Restrictions on dog owners make us a separate class of GGNRA visitors with restricted access.

The current preferred alternatives outlined in the SEIS are flawed, based on incomplete information and discriminate against a large population of visitors to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I urge you to consider alternatives that provide equal access to all families and visitors.

Sincerely,

Les Nagy  
3953 Washington Street  
San Francisco, CA 94118

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6647	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Kelseyville, CA 95451 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, General Superintendent Golden Gate National Recreation Area Fort Mason, Bldg. 201 San Francisco, CA 94123 Attn: SEIS Frank Dean:				

It has come to my attention that significant changes in use policy are being reviewed regarding the access of GGNRA to dogs and their humans. As you are certainly aware the number of dogs as family members, companions and as medical care givers has significantly increased over the past several decades since the GGNRA was founded. These dogs and their humans use GGNRA as was the original purpose for recreating, exercise and the enjoyment!

To ban humans with canines from use of GGNRA would be in the eyes of these people nearly the same as banning children with their parents from using the same trails and open spaces of GGNRA. Reasonableness must prevail in the use of GGNRA for all people, children and dog friends. Having areas designated for people & dogs just makes sense! Please consider designation of both on leash and off leash areas to responsible humans and their dogs. I walk nearly every day with other

---

humans and their dogs and am always impressed with how responsible people are with their dogs as we trek the hills and valleys of Northern California.

Just a few areas of GGNRA where humans & dogs cohabitate well are: Oak Wood Trail of Tennessee Valley, the Alta Trail, Muir Beach and Chrissy Field Beach. The loss of these areas to humans and their dogs would boarder on tragedy for these and all users of GGNRA.

I implore you to proceed with your deliberations with caring and reason!

Fellow lover of GGNRA,

Tom Harty

Copies to Members of Congress: Senator Feinstein, Senator Boxer and Mike Thompson, U.S. House of Representatives.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6648	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,04,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 2, 2014				

Mr. Frank Dean  
General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason  
Building 201 San Francisco, CA 94123

Re: Dog Walking

Dear Mr. Dean:

This is to advise you that in the interests of providing a proper National Park experience for all visitors, I support the National Park Service efforts to regulate recreational dog walking within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. I also urge the National Park Service to adopt a Dog Management plan that adheres to all established NPS management policies and practices, and protects park resources.

This includes enforcing laws banning dogs from certain areas of the park. In my 7 years as an HRT volunteer in the Marin Headlands, I have seen, first hand, how the increasing number of illegal dogs, even on a leash can harm natural habitat, jumping at quail, relieving themselves on native plants, and barking at visitors.

However, I'm especially concerned about commercial dog walkers using the GGNRA for their commercial business. This activity is clearly not appropriate in any National Park. Use of the GGNRA for this purpose exploits park lands strictly for private financial profit.

Commercial dog walking provides absolutely no service or benefit to any park user. To the contrary, it will adversely impact park resources and values, and will serve only private enterprise at the expense of the american public. At Fort Funston, I've often seen dog walkers with several dogs, frequently off leash, disturbing, even frightening other visitors, and in two instances causing injury! This aside from environmental damage they are causing.



Thank you very much for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Jim Morrell  
HRT volunteer  
Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6649	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Rancho Cordova, CA 95670				
	United States of America				

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Suzanne Hawley

Russell Rosenberg

286 3rd Street

Montara, CA 94037

(residence only, not a mailing address)

Frank Dean, General Superintendent

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Building 201, Fort Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Attn: SEIS

February 15, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

As someone who walks regularly with my dog in the GGNRA, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the preferred alternative described in the GGNRA's new draft management plan. It is too restrictive and will prevent me from recreating with my dog for my own health and my dogs health the way I have on GGNRA properties for many years. My husband and I chose to buy a house in Montara because of the opportunity to hike and walk our dogs, off leash, in an open space such as Rancho and to live in an area with a large dog population which also serves as a social link that binds this community together. As it states in the SEIS, most of the current Rancho Corral de Tierra park users are local and dog walkers.

The communities of Montara, Moss Beach and El Granada have a long history of responsible off-leash dog walking in Rancho. The Montara Dog Group (MDG), which has over 400 members and represents over 600 dogs from Half Moon Bay to Pacifica, have been good stewards to the area, providing waste bins, promoting responsible dog guardianship and caring for an area the GGNRA, presently, does not have the infrastructure or resources to maintain. Despite this history of responsibility, GGNRA's preferred alternative does not provide any off-leash opportunities for dog walking in Rancho. San Mateo County is the only county where the GGNRA is proposing to completely ban off-leash dog walking

where it is needed most desperately. What is the rationale for this proposal?

I have been told it is because of endangered species habitat and mixed use considerations. Despite the long history of off leash dog walking in the area, there is still habitat for a number of endangered species that no studies have been done to link off leash dog walking to negative impacts on any endangered species. In fact, the one creek in question that is within the boundaries of the off-leash area proposed by the MDG, there are more often children in the creek catching frogs and tadpoles. Unless you plan to prohibit or leash children too, perhaps education, barriers near crossing and/or proper signage would be

a better alternative than shutting out users.

Historically, Rancho has been used by equestrians (many with off leash dogs), bikers and hikers along with off leash dog walkers. There are no facts, studies, or scientific data that support restricting the recreation of off-leash dog walking over the other types of recreation enjoyed by park visitors. We have all managed to successfully share the space for all of our preferred activities.

My husband and I strongly urge that you continue the policy of on leash in all spaces in Rancho with the additional provision that off-leash in areas in Montara, and El Granada, where the practice has been going on for decades as off-leash dog walking, is truly the baseline at Rancho. This area is defined in the map of off -

leash areas provided by the Montara Dog Group.

Overall the proposed management plan that will reduce dog access area by over 75% is too restrictive and is not taking into consideration the impacts on local dog parks, roads, additional air pollution and the limited space you are considering. Many of the proposed areas to continue off leash dog walking are less accessible and do not take into consideration the guardians that have limited mobility that need to exercise and enjoy their dogs. Fenced in off leash areas are too small, generally have surfaces that are either harmful to the paws of running dogs or muddy and do not allow us to hike and exercise with our dogs.

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive comments in response to the first plan. I

do not feel like you are listening and it seems that you are trying to take the

recreation out of GGNRA, in the proposed parameters for visitor use, signage and printed materials.

The effort to officially change the parks name did not pass legislation and the GGNRA must continue to be an urban outdoor space for millions of citizens to get out and get moving. This area is not the same as Yosemite or The Grand Tetons and every single National Park has anomalies in the rules to allow for considerations relevant to their users and locals. You have lost sight of the original purpose of the GGNRA. The trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

Regarding trails within Rancho please include in the trails maps the trail that runs directly behind and around Farallone View School and continues West parallel to 2nd street on the South side of the creek to connect at Kanoff Street. Also include where the same trail branches off at the Southwest corner behind the school, to connect with the end of 2nd and East Streets for residents access to Rancho across the drainage ditch.

Cc: Nancy Pelosi

Sally Jewell

Diane Feinstein

Don Horsley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6650    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** Sausalito, CA 94965  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,10,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent

Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Sir,

I have lived in Sausalito for nearly 30 years.

I chose Sausalito as my residence, in large measure because of its dog friendly

---

policies and the extensive urban recreational access both locations afforded. I applaud the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Congresswoman Speier, Congresswoman Pelosi, the Crissy Field Dog Group, Animal Care and Control of SF, Peninsula Humane Society, Montara Dog Group, Save Off Leash, and thousands of tax paying individuals who strongly object to the proposed GGNRA preferred alternative dog plan as far too restrictive, far too limiting in where we can recreate with dog(s), unfair to dog owners, and not fact based in its planning or findings. I too believe the proposed policies are too restrictive and not based in fact. I am surprised the GGNRA is not responding to the comments of so many individuals, groups and elected representatives. Nor do I understand how the GGNRA chose not to address a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS. This has lead me to question if process has been for appearances only and the GGNRA did not intend to incorporate public or even elected representative's views.

The key point missing is that the Bay Area GGNRA lands serve an urban population with millions of residents - not a wilderness.

When the GGNRA was created in 1972, Dog Walking was already a long standing use of the lands that were turned over to the park. Dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, and as such this specific recreational use and part of the San Francisco Bay culture ' and this use must continue indefinitely.

There are millions of people with dogs in the Bay Area. The preferred alternative will result in thousands of people being unable to recreate with their dog(s) ' in the GGNRA lands these families support with their tax dollars. I firmly support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. The Bay Area GGNRA is a unique national recreational area in an urban environment ' not an isolated untouched park in the wilderness. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

It would appear the GGNRA's preferred alternative intentionally sets up the proposed dog policy to fail - by restricting a large dog and urban resident population to use such small areas that over crowding is inevitable. The overcrowding will result in friction between residents with and without dogs. And this will lead to even more restrictions - which is precisely what the GGNRA has apparently preferred all along.

The GGNRA relies on outdated studies and information for the latest supplemental environmental impact statement.

Further the GGNRA has not updated its enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. This makes the conclusions and preferred alternative unfair and flawed as it is not fact based.

It leads to the appearance the GGNRA has gone through this process always intending the end result to be an overly restrictive dog policy that ignores the urban location of the recreation area, is unfair to tax paying residents, and is designed to fail before it is even released - ensuring the GGNRA can eventually simply do away with any dog access in the Bay Area GGNRA locations?

How is it that the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented?

How is it the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis?

I join thousands of residents, elected representatives of California and San Francisco, and groups dedicated to animal safety and I ask the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to

come.  
Sincerely,  
Ken Horiszny  
Sausalito, CA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6651    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To: GGNRA

I'm riting this leter becas dog are are freinds and we need them it might be bum's that liter and poop on the ground dog's should be aloud. Do not pass this plan!  
Thank yo for your time.  
by Ivan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6652    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To: GGNRA

I want dogs to be free! There is no proof that dogs are causing damage. Dogs need exercise and if they are cooped up all the time it is possible that they could incessantly might misbehave. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe and not all dog owners are irresponsible 50% of homes in San Francisco have dogs. There are almost more dogs then children is San Francisco.  
Thank you for your time,  
Jada

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6653    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** To: GGNRA

I'm writing because this new law is not fair, people need to walk their dogs! I'm a dog owner my self and I know for a fact if dogs say cooped up in a small place they will misbehave and not lisen to you. It's not many places allready so why make more less places dogs can't go. My teacher is a great teacher and shes Hawaiian and the beach is the only really place that she likes to go to walk her dog and it reminds her of home in Hawii. She said that if this law stands she will quit and move some were you can walk your on the beach but we don't want her to go!  
Thank you for your time  
Janal

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6654    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** Alameda, CA 94501  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Attn: Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Park Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
RE: dogs off leash in GGNRA  
Dear GGNRA Superintendent:

During the open period for public comments regarding the severe push back you are getting from dog owners, I wish to state that I feel the management of the GGNRA is on the correct path to not allow dogs off leash.

Two reasons will be put forth, but there are others. I want to be brief.

Just on 1/30 the news was that two pit bulls had to be either destroyed or captured because an irresponsible owner had left his dogs in the care of another, I believe in a San Francisco park. The dogs not only attacked the surrogate keeper, but also the owner of the dogs.

The park is for all the people's enjoyment first and foremost. Yes, the majority of owners of dogs are responsible, or so they think they are. But dogs off leash over time will lead to feral dogs. There will be dogs escaping and becoming feral and a threat to people.

Even family pets off leash are often intimidating to small children and even mature adults whose balance is still good, but could be easily knocked down by an over eager dog running into them or near them.

And any large dog running freely is intimidating to those who do not feel comfortable around large animals.

Sincerely,  
Barbara Jolliffe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6655    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Superintendent, GGNRA  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
10 February 2014

Dear Sirs:

RE: Dog Management Plan / EIS & ANPR

The 2,000 page Dog Management Plan for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area appears to be an attempt by the Park Service to restrict off leash dog walking. Please allow off leash dog walking to continue in designated areas of the Golden Gate Recreation Area (GGNRA), most especially Crissy Field/Beach. Areas for off leash dog walking are described in the 10 page July 8, 1996 compendium developed after careful study, by Superintendent Brian O'Neil. The total area designated for off leash dog

walking in Mr. O'Neil's 10 page compendium, is less than 1/2 of one percent of the 75,000 acres in the GGNRA. The Park Service has over thirty-six years of data to support the position already taken by its previous Superintendent, Mr. O'Neil. An on leash requirement would contradict promises made in 1979 and 1996 by the Park Service for the continuation off leash dog walking in specified areas of the GGNRA.

Off leash dog walking was one of the continuing use recreations contemplated when the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) was formed in 1972. The GGNRA's February 24, 1979 "Pet Policy" was formalized in the Compendium signed by Brian O'Neil on July 8, 1996.

The recreational value of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was of the utmost importance to Congress when it established this great urban park. In its words, the GGNRA was to be a "new national urban recreation area that will concentrate on serving the outdoor recreation needs of the people of the metropolitan region. "Its objective was not to restrict but, "to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available in this region."

Sincerely

William R. Kales

Cc: Crissy Field Dog Group

San Francisco Dog Group

San Francisco Chronicle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6656    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94115

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** February 17, 2014

Re: Draft Dog Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have lived in the San Francisco Fillmore District for nearly 40 years and have never had a yard. The public park lands have provided me with many recreational opportunities, and I strongly support the preservation of our environment and open spaces in this densely populated city. I typically spend several days a week at Crissy Field, walking and playing fetch with our dog. When I am unable to take him to the beach, I have dog walkers do so. Our dog Sam is a gentle black lab who loves to swim and play ball. He needs his exercise to stay healthy. Coincidentally, this regular exercise keeps me fit and healthy as well.

Given this background, I read your proposed Dog Management Plan with great interest. My experience is that dog owners are cleaning up after their dogs and respecting posted restricted areas. In the information from the GGNRA, the only data I was able to find showed that in the last year with hundreds of thousands of visits by people and dogs, only 6 dog bites were reported. The data also specified 5 dog fights, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite. These exceedingly low numbers hardly call for a drastic change in the 1979 Pet Policy.

When Crissy Field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create more space for off-leash recreation because of the anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. The proposed dramatic reduction of off-leash space without any real factual basis, is totally unwarranted. Increasing the concentration of dogs in smaller

areas, is certainly not a plan for the good of the community.

Your preferred alternative will significantly alter the quality of my life and the life of my dog, Sam. Spending time at the beach with Sam provides me with an opportunity to get to know my neighbors. Many children want to pet and hug the dog, and some adults want to play fetch or just reminisce about dogs they grew up with. Surely, we need these kinds of interactions in the city. To disrupt this community experience, you need compelling data based specifically on the unique GGNRA lands. You clearly have not provided this data.

I cannot support your Draft Dog Management Plan; you have provided no sitespecific data to support a change in the current Pet Policy. Considering that now the GGNRA only allows off-leash dog walking on 1% of its land, further restricting offleash areas is both unnecessary and punitive to urban residents.

Respectfully,

Joan M. Kaplan

1949 Webster Street

San Francisco, CA 94115

Cc: The Honorable Nancy Pelosi

United States House of Representative

235 Cannon House Office Building

Washington, D.C. 20515-0508

Secretary Sally Jewell

Department of the Interior

1849 C Street N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20240

Mr. Jon Jarvis, Director

National Park Service

1849 C Street N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20240

Senator Dianne Feinstein

United States Senate

331 Hart Senate Office Building

Washington, D.C. 20510

Senator Barbara Boxer

112 Hart Senate Office Building

Washington, D.C. 20510 (202) 224-3553

Supervisor Mark E. Farrell, District 2

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102-2489

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6657	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Pacifica, CA 94044 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,12,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Feb, 10 2014				

Superintendent, GGNRA

Fort Mason Bldg 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent:

Regardless of what the Pacifica City Council & Open Space Committee say, please do not change your off-leash & dog management proposals. I have enclosed clippings from our local paper, "The Pacifica Tribune" to show that most of us want more control over dogs in our town.

I love close to where Pacifica Police had to shoot a pit bull who killed his pregnant owner. The dog was allowed to sleep in his owners bed and was thought of as "one of the family". It was allowed to run off leash at Mori Pt and on the beach. It could have killed someone else as easily as it killed its owner. Children and everyone else deserve to be safe from clueless dog owners like this one. The Pacifica City Council has never taken any action to protect people (or other dogs) from any dangerous off-leash dogs and current laws are not enforced on leashing in the Quarry or anywhere else in Pacifica.

So, as a Pacifica resident with a family, I beg you to not listen to a City Council and Open Space Committee that does not care about safety from off-leash dogs. They also don't realize that many of us are afraid of our neighbors who own pitt bulls and other large, sometimes aggressive dogs and would be affraid to go to a public meeting and take them on. The City Council & Open Space Committee are probably afraid as well.

Thank you for your policy about dogs. Please don't change it!

Julia Thomas  
265 Piedmont  
Pacifica, CA 94044

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6658    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Sausalito, CA N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,06,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
February 3, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,  
I have lived in Sausalito and owned a business in San Francisco for 23 years. During that time I have loved and lost three golden retrievers - and I can honestly say the best moments of those 23 years were spent walking with my dog(s) off leash on beaches in the GGNRA that you now propose to restrict from dog walking.

I chose San Francisco as my place of business and Sausalito as my residence, precisely because of its dog friendly policies and the extensive urban recreational access both locations afforded.

I write now and I join the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Congresswoman Speier, Congresswoman Pelosi, the Crissy Field Dog Group, Animal Care and



Control of SF, Peninsula Humane Society, Montara Dog Group, Save Off Leash, and thousands of tax paying individuals who strongly object to the proposed GGNRA preferred alternative dog plan as far too restrictive, far too limiting in where we can recreate with dog(s), unfair to dog owners, and not fact based in its planning or findings.

How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply ignore the voices of so many individuals, groups and elected representatives?

How is it possible for the GGNRA to simply not consider or address a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS?

These unanswered questions lead to the conclusion that the process has been only for show and the GGNRA never intended to incorporate public or even elected representative's views.

For 23 years I have walked at Crissy Field, East Beach, Ocean Beach, Baker Beach, Rodeo Beach and throughout the hills of Fort Cronkhite. I cherish these walks with my dog(s) and the opportunity to enjoy recreation with my dogs after work, and close to the places I live and work.

I located my business in San Francisco for the very reason that East Beach, Baker Beach and Fort Cronkhite provided easily accessible off leash dog walking on my way to and from work. I have paid California's high taxes on my home, my income, and San Francisco's additional city taxes on my small business - because San Francisco and Sausalito have provided such wonderful dog recreation access.

I'm shocked at the GGNRA's conclusions and preferred alternative which demonstrate a lack of understanding that the Bay Area GGNRA lands must serve an urban population.

When the GGNRA was created in 1972, Dog Walking was already a long standing use of the lands that were turned over to the park. Dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, and as such this specific recreational use and part of the San Francisco Bay culture - and this use must continue indefinitely.

There are millions of people with dogs in the Bay Area. People who work, who have families, and have dogs. Bay area residents need access to off leash dog recreation in the mornings and afternoons - access that is close enough to their homes and work to allow them to strike the balance between work, family, pets, and recreation. The preferred alternative will result in millions of people being unable to recreate with their dog(s) - in the GGNRA lands these families support with their tax dollars.

I firmly support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. The Bay Area GGNRA is a unique national recreational area in an urban environment - not an isolated untouched park in the wilderness. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

Additionally, the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties.

In Marin County there will be one beach where all of Marin's dogs can recreate off leash. This beach has extreme tides, forceful waves, and will be packed with thousands of dogs - because it's the only off leash beach that will be preserved for all of Marin County in the preferred alternative. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

It would appear the GGNRA's preferred alternative intentionally sets up the proposed dog policy to fail - by restricting a large dog and urban resident population to use such small areas that over crowding is inevitable. The overcrowding will result in friction between residents with and without dogs. And this will lead to even more restrictions - which is precisely what the GGNRA has preferred all along.

Why does the GGNRA rely on outdated studies and information for the latest supplemental environmental impact statement?

Why hasn't the GGNRA updated its enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released?

Is it possible the GGNRA has gone through this process always intending the end result to be an overly restrictive dog policy that ignores the urban location of the recreation area, is unfair to tax paying residents, and is designed to fail before it is even released - ensuring the GGNRA can eventually simply do away with any dog access in the Bay Area GGNRA locations?

How is it that the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented?  
How is it the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis?

Again. I join thousands of residents, elected representatives of California and San Francisco, and groups dedicated to animal safety and I ask the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGRNA for generations to come.

Sincerely,  
Lynn Keller  
Sausalito, California

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6659    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

---

**Address:** na, UN na  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 14, 2014

To: GGNRA

I'm writing because dogs need to be free! 50% of homes in San Francisco have dogs. It's a public place for people to have fun! There is no proof that dogs are causing damage. Dogs need exercise. A dog that is not exercised might misbehave. Not all dog owners are irresponsible. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe. Dogs need to run and be free! I you make this law, dogs will have no fun in this free place! All dogs help with everything! Dogs will be sad so please don't make this law!

Thanks for your time,

Irianna Morales

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6660	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,30,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	January 29, 2014				

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have been a resident of San Francisco for over 35 years. I applauded the transformation of the former Army base to the beautiful Presidio. The Presidio is of special value precisely because it is located in an urban environment and is used by so many for casual and formal recreation. It is, accordingly, an unusual asset for the Parks Service. I believe that the Parks Service must adopt goals for the GGNRA that reflect recreation values and a more intense use than might be appropriate in for its holdings in more remote settings.

I walk in the Presidio daily and often hear and see red-shouldered hawks and owls and even the occasional coyote. I have shared these many hours in the Presidio with my dogs over the years.

I am writing today to express my opposition to the process the GGNRA has run to evaluate where dogs may be allowed in the GGNRA. Additionally, the conclusions reached are not fair and flawed.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a use for the newly created GGNRA, it should not be restricted by the Park Service. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential. Restricting recreational use will decrease the use of the Park, which is a tragedy. The consequence of this decision regarding dogs is very similar to the decision to make Morton Street field into a riparian habitat. What a shame to deny thousands of San Francisco youth recreational access to the Presidio. The same applies to on and off leash dog walking.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the supplemental EIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties.

Additionally, this management plan allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash). The policy adopted for the GGNRA should allow for some flexibility in the regulations to reflect how the area is actually used and to respond to

issues and opportunities as they arise.

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.

The SEIS, moreover, has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Stephen Koch

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6661	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Jan,28,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent Building 201, Fort Mason San Francisco, CA 94123				

January 26, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Tom Mitchell and I have been a resident of San Francisco County for 32 years. I walk on a daily basis in areas such as Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Ocean Beach. I walk with my two dogs in these areas precisely because it is located in an urban environment and is used by so many for casual and formal recreation.

I am writing today to express my strong opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative that would limit where I would be able to recreate with my dogs in the near future. Additionally, the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years to come. I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

I ask that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Tom Mitchell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6662    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Frank Dean,

I am a fourteen year old native San Franciscan. One of my favorite things to do on the weekends is play with our retrievers at Crissy Field on the East Beach. Our lab Zoe is a very good swimmer and a great retriever. We like to look at the pelicans and seagulls.

I am a girl scout and do beach cleanup at Ocean Beach - this year it was pouring rain. I picked up lots of people garbage but didn't see dog garbage. Why aren't there garbage cans on the beach? Why are you picking on dogs? We clean up after Zoe always and usually pick up extra garbage too!

My mom says she used to play in the dunes - now its all fenced. My mom doesn't have an answer and she usually does.

Our dog has no interest in dogs or birds only kids. Please let our family have our fun.

Claire Anne Kosewic

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6663    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Superintendent Dean,

I want to report on a meeting I attended a few months ago where the Board of Supes held a hearing on the possible loss of the exercise. If that area is lost, those owners will bring their large dogs to the smaller city parks where there is more danger of overcrowding. Not only dog owners and their dogs will suffer, but small children or elderly or handicapped people may be crowded out.

Many of the dog owners who spoke at the meeting were very concerned about what may happen to their ability to follow their habitual recreation patterns. A wide variety of people spoke: young men and women who are accustomed to run with their dogs, older people who simply go to a park to stroll either with or without dogs and spend some time sitting and socializing, handicapped people who walk slowly using a cane or a walker. Some have dogs that may not be large and rambunctious, but who still need their little walks.

The total area of City parks comprises only about 25 percent of the acreage of the GGNRA lands within the city of San Francisco. If that area is off limits to dog walkers, it will mean that a large area of San Francisco will no longer be available to about 25 percent of its citizens.

I beg of you not to shrink our recreation space. We are all citizens who deserve a fair share of our city.

Sincerely,

Norma Miller  
246 Athens St.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6664    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Dear Mr. Dean,

"I am John and I live in San Francisco. I am almost ten years old. Our dog Sarah goes to Ft. Funston every day to chase her ball. I like playing and running with her a lot. My mommy and daddy and grammy all grew up here. We always talk about how when they were kids they could play in the dunes. Why can't I? My mommy says boys and dogs need to run lots, sleep lots and eat lots to be happy. Please keep us happy and let dogs kids run free at Fort Funston and C. Field."

John F. Kosewic  
written by Mom

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6665    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Mill Valley, CA 94441  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I'm writing to support no action to current policy with regard to the dog management plan.

I've walked GGNRA trails for over twenty years with my dogs, without any negative incidents. The people I run into on these trails (Oakwood, Alta) almost all have dogs, and those that don't, are for the most part very friendly and supportive of allowing dogs on the trails. I understand certain people groups don't want dogs on the trails or to severally restrict access for the following reasons:

1) People are afraid of dogs and/or have been attacked by dogs, or just want to be in a dog-free environment ' As is already the case, almost all trails under GGNRA management are currently off-limits to dogs. There is a plethora of trails available for people who do not want any interaction with dogs to choose from; this is not the case for people who enjoy walking their dogs on the trails. Why make the currently limited number of dog-friendly trails even more restrictive?

The GGNRA's website notes the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was established in 1972 to be set aside and protected for everyone's enjoyment. Everyone is an allencompassing word. There will always be conflicts between the hikers, equestrians, mountain bikers, dog-lovers and those who don't want dogs. Access to the GGNRA land must be equitable, such that all vested parties can enjoy the trail systems. To extraordinarily and unfairly limit access to the people who want to walk their dogs to such a small portion of the trial system in relation to their numbers is not equitable.

2) There are environmentally sensitive areas that need to be protected from dogs. I imagine these same areas need to also be protected from people. We all know it's a difficult balance between protecting the environment and the realities of living in a densely populated urban area. I think those areas that are deemed most sensitive could be restricted to dogs on-leash, or fenced.

3) I understand there is discussion about commercial dog walkers, and their use of the lands. Limiting the access to just seven spots in Marin will make these seven areas much more congested, and any issues that people are noting now will intensify. I agree with the suggestions that commercial dog walkers should be limited to the number of dogs to walker ' whether the number is 3 to one, six to one, or something else, I can't speak to. I would suggest GGNRA look to what other states are doing with regard to this and what works. I do suggest that since these commercial endeavors are being operated on public lands, there should be a permitting fee like any other commercial business that conducts business on public land for private gain.

In my opinion, more trails and areas should be open to off-leash dogs; perhaps restricting these newly identified areas to dogs in the morning and evening hours; however, since that apparently is not an alternative being contemplated at this time, I strongly suggest no change to current policy.

Best Regards,

Scott Miller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6666    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94103-4213  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** San Francisco SPCA Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:** OfficialRep  
**Received:** Feb,12,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** February 10, 2014  
Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Fort Mason, Building 201  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Attn: SEIS  
Dear Mr. Dean:

Re: Opposition to Golden Gate National Recreation Area Dog Management Plan / Draft Environmental Impact Statement

On behalf of the San Francisco SPCA, a local animal welfare organization founded in 1868, I am writing to convey our strong opposition to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Supplemental Dog Management Plan (the "Plan"), which aims to drastically limit dog access in San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo counties. The SF SPCA strongly urges the National Park Service to modify the Plan to allow for greater access to urban recreational opportunities, including off-leash dog walking.

As you are likely aware, the GGNRA is a popular recreation destination located in a major urban area with minimal open space. For many local dog guardians, especially seniors and others who find it difficult exercise their pets while on-leash, the GGNRA is the only place where they can let their dogs

play and release a lot of energy. As the SF SPCA can attest, daily exercise is essential to a dog's proper health and well-being. Exercise affects a dog's behavior, trainability and aggression levels, which are important to properly maintaining public safety in crowded urban environments. Take away off-leash dog areas in the GGNRA, and dog guardians may be unable to meet the physical and mental needs of their pets (also at a detriment to their own healthy, active lifestyles).

Significantly reducing dog access in the GGNRA will adversely impact hundreds of thousands of Bay Area residents and visitors. In San Francisco alone, dogs outnumber children. Yet, the Plan allows only extremely confined areas permitting dogs in the GGNRA that will soon become severely overcrowded, which will result in serious congestion in nearby neighborhood dog parks. San Francisco's dog parks are already limited, and off-leash areas are particularly scarce. If guardians and their dogs are displaced from the GGNRA and forced to relocate to the city's dog parks, this overcrowding will become increasingly problematic and potentially dangerous. These negative impacts will be felt by individuals both with and without pets, as well as the already overburdened City of San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department.

The SF SPCA strongly urges the National Park Service to adopt a different approach to the current Plan - one that addresses the needs of all of the GGNRA's recreational users, including the countless Bay Area residents and visitors who have historically enjoyed access to the GGNRA with their dogs. Several viable alternatives to the current Plan exist, including, for example, a registration system that allows access suspension for irresponsible visitors. Responsible individuals, however, should be permitted to continue to enjoy outdoor visits to the GGNRA with their dogs while peacefully coexisting with wildlife and the environment, as they have done for decades.

In closing, the SF SPCA is strongly opposed to the current draft of the GGNRA Supplemental Dog Management Plan. The Plan should be significantly revised to meaningfully promote continued recreation for all visitors, including individuals who responsibly enjoy the GGNRA with their dogs.

Sincerely,  
Brandy Kuentzel  
Corporate Counsel & Director of Advocacy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6667    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94134  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Park Form  
**Correspondence:** Keep off-eash areas as the are.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6668    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Pacifica, CA 94044  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Jan,29,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** January 24, 2014  
Dear GGNRA,  
I am writing to you in response to your proposed regulations

---



for Fort Funston.

I frequently go to Fort Funston to let my dog play, run, and socialize off leash. It is a joy to see dogs and their owners enjoying each other in such a free environment.

I do understand your concerns about bikers and walkers having access and feeling safe. If you actually go there it is obviously not an ideal place for bikers because of the heavy foot traffic. The walkers seem to enjoy meeting and greeting the dogs around them. Also, bikers and walkers have hundreds of places in the Bay Area where they can bike and walk while dog owner's have very few places to let their dogs run free.

The environment is of concern to me as well. I always pick up after my dog and respect the native vegetation in the area. Ravens and Ice Plant are the major inhabitants at Fort Funston. Even so, I respect whatever is there.

Please, leave a space for dog owners and walkers to enjoy!

Sincerely,

Linda Kuntz

911 Linda Mar Blvd

Pacifica, CA 94044

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6669	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94134 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Park Form				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	To Frank Dean,				

GGNRA, must immediately provide ADA access at Fort Funston. How is it that a Federal Organization cannot comply with federal law. I am a lifelong resident, native, disabled, dog owner. I believe that I am legally entitlad to recreate with my dogs off leash at the SF Beaches as I always have for 50 yrs.

In addition, there is an increasing frequency of violence towards the public, without fear of consequence.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6670	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	El Cerrito, CA 94530 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OffcialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Reply to: 802 Baira Drive ElCerrito,CA 94530 February 16, 2014 Superintendent, Golden Gate National Recreation Area Fort Mason, Building 201 San Francisco, CA 94123				

---

Attn: Dog Management  
Re: GGNRA Dog Management-Supplemental EIS

To Whom It May Concern:

The Sierra Club submits the following comments in regard to the Draft Supplemental EIS for dog management in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). The Sierra Club has participated as a party in the Negotiated Rule Making Process and filed comments to the original Draft EIS. It remains very concerned about the impacts of off leash dog activities both in terms of environmental effects and in terms of effects on other park users. The history of off leash dog use is that in areas where off leash dog use occurs it drives other park users from those areas because of biting incidents, the constant issue of dealing with dog feces that dog owners do not pick up, and the inability of other users to enjoy the park area without the presence of dogs.

The critical element for any successful regulation of off leash dog activity is active enforcement of the rules. Unfortunately, the National Park Service has shown an inability to enforce any rules about off leash dog use. The only effective program is a complete ban on off leash dog walking and in some areas an outright ban on any dogs even on leash because it is clear and enforceable.

The record of little to no enforcement in the past and the failure of the National Park Service to include adequate in its analysis the resources both financial and in terms of staffing for adequate policing of any Regulated Off-Leash Dog Area (ROLAs) in the GGNRA means that the DEIS is inadequate.

The DSEIS states that Alternative D is the Environmentally Preferred Alternative. It should be selected as the Preferred Alternative for the GGNRA because the purpose of the GGNRA is to protect the environment and to provide an environment where people can recreate with minimal adverse impacts to the environment. Thus, by definition this alternative should be preferred above any other.

The Preferred Alternative is inadequate because it clearly assumes that a program of vigorous enforcement of the rules when the record has shown that no such enforcement has occurred in the past and there is no evidence that the financial and staffing resources will be provided to ensure adequate enforcement. This impact analysis impacts from little to no enforcement is lacking in the SEIS, and thus the assumption of adequate enforcement cannot be made for purposes of basing a choice of alternative. It is utterly arbitrary and capricious.

Furthermore, the Draft SEIS does not provide any statement of overriding consideration for choosing the Preferred Alternative over the Environmentally Preferred Alternative. Indeed, there is no evidence or documentation to support a finding of a statement of overriding consideration, and thus the decision to choose the Preferred Alternative as the Preferred Alternative is arbitrary and capricious.

The Draft SEIS does not provide adequate delineation of the ROLAs. Some ROLAs are not fenced. All ROLAs should be fenced off so all park users know where they are and what they can expect.

The Draft SEIS also fails to include the triggers for enforcement actions, a system for analyzing how effective or ineffective different enforcement measures have been, and the effects on other park users from off leash dog walkers either not following the rules.

The Draft SEIS fails to include the only remedy that will ensure that off leash dog users comply with rules for a ROLA which is closure of a ROLA when it is shown that the rules are not followed and that enforcement has not significantly reduced non-compliance with the rules or has resulted in adverse environmental impacts.

The Draft SEIS fails to identify the mitigation measures that will be undertaken, including closure of ROLAs, from adverse environmental impacts. For example, if after a period of monitoring it is determined that off leash walking in a ROLA has caused damage to vegetation or to species in the ROLA, the plan should provide for closure of that ROLA and other measures to restore the habitat and species. The Draft SEIS is inadequate for failing to provide this simple and effective tool for dealing with environmental damage.

In sum, the Draft SEIS is inadequate and cannot be the basis for a decision to choose the Preferred Alternative over the Environmentally Preferred Alternative. The record strongly suggests that the decision to choose the Preferred Alternative was to assuage public opinion from the off leash dog walker advocates, a very vocal special interest group. Bowing to public comments is not a legal basis for choosing an alternative.

Sincerely yours,  
Norman La Force, Legal Chair  
San Francisco Bay Chapter

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6671	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94131-1614 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** Dear Sir,  
Allow dogs in our parks. Fence off an area if you must, but please do not ban dogs.  
My dog is my only joy. Raising taxes, food cost, energy cost, etc. etc. Leave us with one joy - our dogs.  
V. Leishman  
220 Glenview Dr.  
S.F. 94131  
Born in S.F. Here all my life spent 3 ys as an army nurse in Wold War II We fought for our freedom - Let our dogs be free.  
Thanks

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6672	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94123 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				

**Correspondence:** February 10, 2014  
Mr. Frank Dean, Superintendent, GGNRA  
Building 201  
Fort Mason Center  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022  
Dear Mr. Dean:  
GGNRA Dog Management Plan  
I support the GGNRA's plan to ban off-lease dog walking on most of the federal lands. Many dog owners keep their dogs on-lease, however, as a

---

senior and a walker it has been my experience that unrestrained, enthusiastic dogs are a danger to me and greatly lessen the enjoyment of walking.

Sincerely,

ail Lindlow

3400 Laguna St., No. 327

San Francisco, CA 94123

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6673    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94112  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** McLaren Park Collaborative; Friends and Advocates of Crocker Amazon & the Excelsior Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:** Member

**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** February 4, 2014

To Superintendent Dean;

My name is Linda Stark Litehiser and have lived in San Francisco for over 44 years. I am a wife, mother and grandmother as well as an active member of my community, serving a number of neighborhood boards and committees. My husband and I have raised 4 children in San Francisco. We now have 13 grandchildren. We are avid walkers, hikers and nature enthusiasts. We are both active in park volunteer work in the Bay Area and though Camp Mather in the Sierra's. But bar none, our favorite way to enjoy nature is with our dog. Our Emma is the one who gets us up and out of the house, who has such pure joy in nature that it is infectious. We feel the need to savor our off leash opportunities because they are so precious. Our favorite location of all is Fort Funston. The pleasure that this place has given us over the years cannot be measured and a big part of this joy is spending it with Emma and other dogs. We especially appreciate the off leash recreation, where Emma is able to socialize with other dogs, which has made her an even more perfect companion. The feeling we get in this wild place where we can feel the freedom of casual relaxation is such a joy. It has always made me proud that this is part of the San Francisco experience. Fort Funston is such an important place to us. This is where we bring the kids when they visit, where the grandkids can romp on the beach with the dog and drag themselves up and down sand dunes and commune with nature. As we get older we find that our walks with our dog are the moments we feel most connected to nature. We also bring out of town guests who marvel at the experience of being able to see and interact with such a large variety of dogs and their owners. No one else it seems has this type of environment. They love it!

I grew up in Michigan where people had "house" dogs that never interacted with another dog. They were in pens or on the end of a rope and were quite often sad and under exercised. Then there were the hunting dogs, always in pens, but children could not play with them. To see the sheer joy of a small child playing with a dog on the edge of the surf or running up and down a pathway in the park is such a normal and yet rare thing these days. I am so saddened to think this could all go away. Over the years have attended every rally and hearing can find to try to bring these points to the people who will make the final decisions.

strongly oppose the preferred alternative for Fort Funston, Ocean Beach and other areas of the GGNRA, because it is too restrictive. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, site specific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. Both the DEIS and SEIS fail to prove negative impacts are occurring now but that dogs are causing them. We want real science not anecdotes. My husband has spent his life as a working scientist and he is appalled at the conclusions to restrict dog use in the GGNRA. He has written his own letter to address these issues.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future. I was part of the original focus groups in the early 70's when the plans for GGNRA were being set up. We all agreed that this is a unique URBAN park it needs to address the needs of a crowded city where all types of recreation are going to be shared and enjoyed by as many as possible.

Much of what is now GGNRA was used by the military for decades. These uses did not take into account any appreciation of nature or stewardship of the land. It has come through this use unscathed'save some large rusting armaments- - which are now an interesting bit of history. Now we are treating this same land and beaches as if they were extremely fragile and unable to survive the playful behavior of dogs. I find no logic in this position.

I have spent most of my adult life advocating for our parks and recreation. As a member of many committees and boards, I have learned how shared use of property can work and compromise can allow more people to enjoy the same precious open space. Our city parks are constantly working on such solutions but they will be completely overloaded if the currently presented plan goes into effect.

I can't believe that we have to fight this battle again to hold on to such a small amount of off play area. My first letter to the GGNRA on this topic was two dogs ago. Please listen to the people of San Francisco, Mann and San Mateo...please listen to our public officials who are asking you to look at the big picture of urban recreation. We have something very special in the GGNRA but it is a park not like any other park in the federal system and as such needs to be treated in unique ways.

Best Regards,

Lind Stark Litehiser, 78 Havelock St. San Francisco, CA 94112 linda.litehi@gmail.com

Member of: McLaren Park Collaborative; Friends and Advocates of Crocker Amazon & the Excelsior; Friends of the AMP (Amphitheater in McLaren Park); District 11 Council; SF Parks Alliance, Park Policy Council; Friends of Camp Mather; New Mission Terrace Improvement Association.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6674	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Burlingame, CA 94010 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Mr. Frank Dean				

This letter is in regards to the dogwalking issue in the Rancho Corral de Tierra GGNRA area. I strongly protest, and find unreasonable, the restrictions that you and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area are planning to impose on this area. This new plan negatively affects the residents of Montara, Moss Beach and El Granada.

I am a former School Counselor and Spanish Teacher from the Hilisborough City School District. I have been a home owner on the Coast since 1976, and have owned three dogs in my life there. In my long experience of living on the Coast, I never experienced an incident of irresponsible dog-walking. I never heard or read about it in the local paper, The Half Moon Bay Review, which would be the first to print such story, and I never encountered anyone who was unruly or irresponsible. I walked my dogs in Moss Beach, Montara, and El Granada.

This activity served to bring together a wonderful community of neighbors, who support each other and have a friendly bond as they and their dogs enjoy the beautiful open space. It is a place for rest, relaxation, and comradship. There have been dogs walked, on and

off leash, and non dog-walkers who have co-existed for decades, and we all take care of each other and each others' dogs. We are happy that the space has remained open for us to enjoy, however we urge you to consider the "No Action Alternative" and let us continue to enjoy that which keeps us healthy and happy, which is so very important in our lives today in this stressful world.

Very sincerely,  
Sherry Lynes  
Homeowner:  
121 Bridgeport Drive  
El Granada  
Mailing:  
7 Castro Court  
Burlingame, CA. 94010

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6675    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94118  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,26,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent

Building 201, Ft.Mason

San Francisco, CA 94123

February 13, 2014

Dear Superintendent Dean,

My name is Arnanda Bryan and I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. One of the highlights of my life is walking my dog daily in areas such as Crissy Field, the Presidio, and Baker Beach. I walk in these areas precisely because it is located near my home in an urban environment that is used by many for all types of recreation.

I have always been sensitive to preserving natural environments and have been on the board of or donated to many organizations including: NRDC, Sierra Club, League to Save Lake Tahoe (board), Friends of the River, Truckee-Donner Land Trust, Alpine Winter Foundation (board), and Greenbelt Alliance.

I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dog in the near future. It is evident that the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not reasonable and deeply flawed.

Because dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years for come. And I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique national recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed to different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on GGNRA lands in ALL three counties.

Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash). Crissy Field is a perfect example. When Crissy field was created, one of the purposes stated was to create MORE space for off leash recreation because of anticipated growth in the number of visitors with dogs. The proposed reduction in off-leash recreation area at Crissy Field is a reversal of course without a basis especially where the impact on all park visitors will be increased concentration of dogs in smaller areas. THIS MAKES NO SENSE and is setting the dog management plan up for failure.

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated ' it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.

The most recent data released by the Park Service shows that in the last year out of hundreds of thousands of visits by people with dogs there have only been: 6 dog bites, 5 dogs fighting, 2 cliff rescues, 2 complaints where people were scared, 1 wildlife killing and 1 horse bite incident. The data does not support the need for change!

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

It's notable, that the board of Supervisors in three counties, San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo have all voted AGAINST your Dog Management Plan.

I propose that the GGNRA institute a "green tag" system which certifies dogs and their owners to use the area. It is a VERY successful program in Boulder and FAIR to dog owners by penalizing only the offenders.

I'm horrified that the GGNRA's Preferred Alternative shows a lack of understanding that the GGNRA lands must serve an urban population. I pay a lot in California and Federal taxes to support the GGNRA lands and DEEPLY resent being unable to walk with my dog in the very land I financially support.

I ask that the GGNRA take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

Sincerely,  
Amanda Bryan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6676	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Muir Beach, CA 94965				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,25,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** February 16, 2014

RE: 2013 SEIS, Draft Don Management Plan

Dear Superintendent Frank Dean,

I have been a resident of Muir Beach for over 14 years. Our house sits directly above the beach on which our off-leash and supervised dogs run or swim everyday. In addition, we regularly run or hike with our dogs on many of the Mann Headlands Trails mainly on the Coastal, Miwok, Homestead & 4-Corners trails as well as fire roads.

I am writing to share my comments for the 2013 SEIS specifically pertaining to Muir Beach and the Mann Headlands Trails (Coastal Trail/fire road to Hill 88). While I applaud the efforts to produce this plan I am deeply concerned that the preferred alternative F will have devastating impact on the residents of Muir Beach and my family as we rely on the open space of the GGNRA everyday for exercise in the natural environment as this is literally both our front and backyard! My comments to the 2011 DEIS were not adequately addressed and most criticisms and concerns expressed in all comments filed in 2011 ran 3:1 AGAINST the plan.

Our isolated Muir Beach community of some 150 houses is home to about 60 dogs, and is completely surrounded by the GGNRA with the nearest town a 20-minute drive on the twisty rural 2-lane coastal highway 1.

Muir Beach is listed on the GGNRA website as a a quiet cove, beach and lagoon favored by locals. Reviews on popular social networks, Trip Advisor and Yelp describe Muir Beach: Not usually crowded, low-key, folks playing fetch with their dogs and everyone just chills.

Love Muir Beach - Great for kids, kites, dogs BBQ 's.

I found it to be veiy dog friendly which is good because

I brought my doggie here and she loved it.

Its a dog beach (where the heck do I find a cat beach?) - So there are pets about - but generally its a very good crowd of people in this area, it is Mann after all, and I have yet to see any problems with loose dogs.

Nice beach. Dog friendly.

The beach was perfect and lovely! Its dog and beer friendly...

Great place to have a picnic and bring family and friends. Also a dog if you have one.

People watching is also fun with folks grilling, chilling, surfing, kite flying and romping with dogs.

#### OVERALL COMMENT

I strongly oppose the GGNRA's preferred alternative F for Muir Beach and The Mann Headlands. I support Alternative A, the no-action alternative, or a revision to provide more access to GGNRA for people with dogs in Mann County. The current plan alternatives are too restrictive on dog walking in the areas that affect our small community and it does not protect and preserve the fundamental values for which the GGNRA was established in terms of recreational values. This plan ought to be about stewardship of a park that is situated within an urban environment. The SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies or vital monitoring as required by law to initiate such a dramatic change to the publics use of their public lands.

It is key note that the both the Mann County Board of Supervisors as well as our own Muir Beach Community Services District have passed resolutions opposing and recommending modifications to the GGNRA's SEIS, as they recognize that these lands are intertwined with vibrant communities such as Muir Beach.

#### SPECIFIC CONCERNS

Address the needs of communities whose backyard is the GGNRA

Page 1104, 'Limiting dog walking areas would reduce these (Muir Beach residents) visitors enjoyment of this site. Some visitors in this user group may prefer to find a different park in which



to exercise their dogs off leash.

The plan reduces Mann Headlands Trails by 14.73 miles, specifically it proposes to REMOVE ALL trails leading out of Muir Beach for dogs. This will force our community into their cars to drive a minimum of 20 minutes to access this experience. The highway to Muir Beach is already choked and congested on weekends, holidays and sunny days with traffic and tour buses to/from Muir Woods National Monument and the GGNRA. Since the new parking lot opened this year, a large portion of that traffic and user group is now descending upon Muir Beach. The plan further suggests that those who want an off-leash beach experience for their dog can go to Rodeo Beach. This change would force Muir Beach residents into cars to drive 45 minutes on the congested 2-lane highway, then the freeway and then another 2-lane rural road for an off-leash experience that currently exists literally steps in front of their homes. The 45 minute drive is assuming that there is no traffic congestion. On a crowded day when visitorship to Muir Woods tops 5,000 people, it takes residents nearly double the time to travel out of the community. It will be devastating to our community of 60 dogs and the environment!

On Page 114, the document calls out for visitors to use the adjacent small beach north of the GGNRA as an off-leash area. This is unacceptable, as there have been no studies as to how this would impact the environment on that beach, the wetlands, dunes, birds, tidal pools or the community. In addition, dogs and their owners would need to enter the off-limits creek to get to this beach. There is no parking on the roads. All roads are fire roads. There are no bathroom facilities or waste receptacles. In addition, this beach is tidal and seasonal.

#### Need to Substantiate Claims with Scientific Analysis

There are not any single peer-reviewed, site-specific studies (as required by law) included in the plan that support such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas. The GGNRA has the burden of proof to justify this drastic reduction in access to public land before making it legislation.

These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. The estimated 60,000 dogs will have to go somewhere - overcrowding the few dog parks available. That will create more dog-related problems than the GGNRA proposal allegedly solves - it passes the buck to towns, cities and the county.

The failure of the plan to distinguish between impacts on the GGNRA resources by people, or dogs, or by other causes is lacking in the document. Site specific observations such as 'high foot traffic (both people and dogs) needs to be analyzed to determine whether off-leash areas differ from other areas of high traffic: and, where people need to be prohibited from these areas to protect natural resources. Yet the very area the GGNRA is trying to protect in Muir Beach - dunes riparian forest, lagoon - is abused by people every day! In fact as I write this letter, there are 7 people wondering around the dunes!

Regarding Visitor Use and Experience, on pages 1090 -1091 it states that 'The practice by local residents of allowing their dogs to roam the beach unsupervised would be addressed by law enforcement staff, allowing a dog to be off-leash would be citable. Adverse impacts would be expected for visitors and local residents who enjoy seeing and playing with dogs off leash. Dog owners may also feel that their pets are not receiving adequate exercise when restrained on a 6-foot leash. In addition, it would be difficult for some visitors, particularly those that are disabled or elderly with mobility issues, to adequately control their dogs on-leash. Having dogs on-leash also limits the exercise dogs can obtain to the exercise abilities of their owners, which may not be sufficient. Some visitors in this user group may find a different park to exercise their dogs off leash.

This misleading paragraph implies that all local residents allow their dogs to roam the beach unsupervised. This is a false and unsupported statement. Residents legally allow their dogs offleash, and these dogs are supervised. Off-leash does not mean unsupervised.

In addition, we are home to several elderly residents, most of whom own dogs and walk them on the Beach. The requirement to have a dog on-leash may diminish their ability to adequately exercise their pets and themselves. This is unjust.

On page 113 there is discussion regarding the planned changes to Muir Beach including the new footpath to the beach and fencing along the dunes. These have been installed. It is interesting to note that the report states that "The fencing would act as a visible barrier, but would not completely exclude dogs from the area, as this type of fencing would be inappropriate at Muir Beach and not sustainable due to tidal action. Allowing on leash dog walking on the beach and installing visual barriers would enable the park to manage the area in order to restore, protect, and sustain the wetlands, creeks, dunes and lagoon. Allowing 'on-leash dog walking on the beach would protect visitor experience and enhance visitor safety.

The dune fences have been installed and block access to the dunes and wetland area for dogs, unless the dog enters the creek to cross to the county beach on the other side (as the SEIS directs dog owners to do (page 114), or an owner is in the area with their dog. On most days, I watch from my living room window as people without dogs disregard the fence and signage and enter the areas behind the fence anyway.

Regarding safety, the plan states that the cumulative impacts for Alternative A are the same as for Alternative F: Negligible. Page 315, Table 14 indicates a total of only 24 dog-related incidents in Muir Beach over a 4-year period from 2008 - 2011. We have hundreds of visitors visiting the beach each weekend. On holidays and warm days the beach is packed and cars park along the highway and along community roads. On page 1253, Muir Beach Alternative A, Conclusion Table the language states "Therefore, the cumulative impacts to the health and safety of park staff and visitors under this alternative are expected to be negligible.

To conclude, page 1085, "Muir Beach receives heavy visitation by beachgoers and walkers on the weekends and moderate to high use on the weekdays. Overall, the number of leash law violations is low for this site, with only nine occurring in 2008 through 2011; no dog bites or attacks were reported during this period (table 9).

So why the concern over safety?

I have concern over being on trails without my dogs and feeling unsafe due to predators, both animal and human.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Educational signage and enforcement be used to change behavior with respect to sensitive habitat, refuse and visitor and staff interaction.

The plan calls out a budget to educate and enforce. Why not utilize this budget to educate and enforce the current rules and regulations that are currently not adequately enforced.

I watch each day as people traipse through the newly restored and fenced delicate dune and riparian areas. Children play in the lagoon and creek. Bonfires burn after hours. People camp in the dunes. Litter is strewn across the beach and left at the bridge entrance on the beach. I carry home an armful of trash each morning when I walk the dog. Where is the park maintenance staff to clean up the litter every day? The dispenser by the footbridge should have signage notifying owners and be filled with plastic bags, and in addition a disposal bin could be placed for pet waste.

Trail Fire road access from Muir Beach to nearest town

Residents and their dogs need access on foot out of Muir Beach to Mill Valley (the nearest town) for recreation and safety. Two trail suggestions:

A) Muir Beach - Coastal trail & Coastal Fire Road - Coyote Ridge  
Fire Road - Miwok Fire Road.

B) Muir Beach - Diaz Ridge - Miwok Fire Road.

Both would connect to Homestead trails and allow access to Mill Valley.

Create On-leash Loop Trail

Provide a loop trail as opposed to dead end trails to allow for a recreational experience for the user. We desperately need a loop from Muir Beach and a suggested loop is:

Muir Beach - Coastal - Coyote Ridge - Middle Green Gulch or  
Green Gulch Fire Road - Muir Beach

This loop is about 3 miles and would provide excellent exercise for both owner and dogs. Green Gulch fire road or middle Green Gulch trail would be the link required to make the loop.

#### Fire Road Access

The GGNRA fire roads are on average 12 feet wide allowing for a variety of users, including those with dogs, to safely share the road and are accessible from many neighborhoods and locations outside the GGNRA, encouraging people to walk directly into the recreation area instead of driving to the GGNRA or to other park spaces.

#### IN CONCLUSION

Dogs are already off-limits on over 99% of the GGNRA. There are many trails and areas that currently do not allow dogs. These are areas that users who would like a dog-free experience can access. There isn't any compelling reason to eliminate or further restrict the remaining 1%.

GGNRA SEIS does not include any peer-reviewed, site-specific studies that support such dramatic restrictions of the public's use of our public lands. To remove recreational access to these lands is not substantiated.

The GGNRA was established by involving communities, communities such as Muir Beach, to provide recreational activities for residents in the densely populated Bay area. This is not a pristine wilderness area like Yellowstone or Yosemite. It is a designed landscape with many constructed environments including the new parking lot in Muir Beach and the reconstructed wetlands. The GGNRA requires a different management strategy than a traditional National Park. While a keystone objective for the GGNRA is 'recreation, it does not appear at all in the plans objectives, nor is it referred to as one of the park's resources and values.

The GGNRA is unique. There is not other National Park quite like it. Its mandate states that the Park possesses 'outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning. This dog plan should support these values and not diminish them.

Mann residents rely upon this open space to enjoy a balance in their lifestyle. It is the very essence of Mann. Access for all users, including people and their dogs was a cornerstone of the original charter as detailed in the 1979 pet policy. That policy still works today and should be retained.

As a Yelp reviewer described Muir Beach:

Muir Beach is surrounded by mountains, dogs are playing in the sand, and artists painting. It's a true sight to behold.

Coleen Curry and Paul Brunner

Pacific Way

Muir Beach

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6677	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Millbrae, CA 94030-0669 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Berberian & Sagatelyan, Inc., A Law Corporation Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	Member				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	700 El Camino Real Millbrae, CA 94030-0669 Phone: (650) 871-5666 Fax: (650) 952-1623 February 12, 2014 Frank Dean, General Superintendent Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Fort Mason, Bldg. 201				

---

San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Dear Superintendent Dean:

Having had the privilege starting in 2006 to serve as a member of the Rules Making Sub Committee on Dog Management as a resident representative of Muir Beach I had hoped that when the totality of circumstances were fairly viewed there would be no retraction of the already limited spaces in San Mateo, Mann and San Francisco counties for regulated off leash recreation for people and dogs. The GGNRA Supplemental Dog Management Plan and SEIS fails miserably the citizens ostensibly the GGNRA services.

Recreational activities including recreating off leash with one's dog was the spirit and letter of the law by which the referenced counties transferred these precious lands to the Federal Government. You know how small a percentage is used for regulated off leash recreation. If anything without any damage or harm more space could be allocated and is deeply needed. It is Superintendent not about Dog people versus Environmental people versus Children's Safety people etc.'this is the mask of great deception and a small group of highly selfish and misguided groups and individuals with irrational motives.

The facts, the science and legal arguments in honest opposition to the GGNRA's proposed rules are overwhelming and need not be restated in this letter. I do by enclosure hope you read again the powerful letter submitted to you by the Mann Humane Society.

As a native San Franciscan, a lawyer with my practice of over 35 years in San Mateo County and now a long time resident of Muir Beach I implore you and those you work with and for to reconsider in total your proposal(s) for all three counties where people and their dogs have recreated in harmony for decades. The alternative will be costly economically, legally and socially.

Respectfully yours,

Levon Sagatelyan

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6678	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94103 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Wild Equity Institute Non-Governmental				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 18. 2014				

COMMENTS ON THE SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR PET MANAGEMENT AT THE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Dear Superintendent Dean:

We submit the following comments on the National Park Services (Pat-k Service) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for Pet Management at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA or Park).

We do not support the Park Services preferred alternative in the SEIS because it does not adequately address the cleat- environmental threats and visitor impacts caused by the presence of off-leash dogs in the GGNRA. The Park Service has presented several objectives, including providing a clear, enforceable dog management policy; preserving and protecting natural and cultural resources and natural processes; improving visitor safety; and reducing user conflicts.(1) However, the SEIS still does not achieve the level of management necessary for the Park Service to meet its stated objectives.

The evidence is clear that off-leash dogs must be heavily regulated in the Park, and that areas where off-leash dogs are allowed must be fully enclosed by a fence or natural boundary. This comment letter analyze the issues associated with off-leash dogs in the GGNRA, including wildlife disturbances, visitor impacts, and safety, and highlights areas where the SEIS is inadequate.

Unless the Pat-k Set-vice makes the necessary changes to the preferred alternative in the SEIS, it will fail to fulfill its fundamental purpose to conserve park resources and values, and will not be in compliance with its mandate prohibiting impairment of park resources and values.

#### SEIS Does Not Adequately Assess Impacts on Park Users.

It is well documented that off-leash dogs create problems for various park users including people with guide dogs, ethnic minority groups, children, picnickers, and on-leash dog walkers, among others. Over the last few years there have been numerous accounts of dogs negatively impacting visitor experiences. A woman visiting Crissy Field reported that her five year old son was attacked by a dog, which also gouged the leg of another child, and complained that other dogs were harassing small children in the area(2); a park visitor at Ocean Beach reported a dog being attacked by three off leash dogs(3); a hang glider at Fort Funston was bitten by an off-leash dog (4); and an offleash

dog harassed a guard on horse patrol to the point of having to be pepper sprayed(5). These are just a few examples of the conflicts that can occur with off-leash dogs.

Off-leash dogs pose a particularly significant challenge to individuals who rely on service animals to help them enjoy the GGNRA. As stated in previous comments to the Park Service on this issue, a 2003 survey conducted by a national guide dog user group indicated that 89% of individuals with service animals had their guide dogs interfered with by off-leash dogs, and 42% of graduates of the groups training programs had their guide dogs attacked by off-leash dogs(6).

Thus, the failure to enforce the leash law in the GGNRA has exposed those with service animals to a high-risk of interference or attack, and in most cases has precluded these individuals from enjoying the park altogether. This is a disproportionate impact on accessibility for individuals who rely on guide dogs to traverse the park: and since dog management and accessibility planning will impact many of the same locations within the GGNRA, if this disproportionate impact isnt addressed the GGNRA may unwittingly exclude guide dog users from the very places that it is trying to make accessible.

Off-leash dogs and dog waste also create barriers for ethnic minorities who want to use the park. There are already disproportionate rates of general park use between white and ethnic minority users, as GGNRA visitors are still much more likely to be white than city or state residents. 7In addition, recreational opportunities for those with lower incomes have become increasingly more difficult as income inequality rises and income gaps between White citizens and Black and Latino citizens have also continued to increase(8). These economic constraints create even further barriers for ethnic minorities to use public parkland. Although some have argued, as noted in the SEIS, that park use by ethnic minority populations would increase with more available off-leash areas, several reports and studies show the opposite is true. (SEIS pg. 330). A 2007 study conducted by Nina Roberts of San Francisco State University found that Asian and Latino park users consider uncontrolled dogs and dog waste to be a barrier to visiting the Park(9). The Park Service acknowledged those findings in the SEIS; however, the Park Service also cited to a 2002 Northern Arizona University study(10) in an apparent effort to discount or downplay those findings(11). But a review of the 2002 studys relevant data in fact confirms the concerns regarding off-leash dogs discussed in this letter, and the Final EIS must reflect this.

The Park Service stated that the 2002 study found that Hispanic and non-Hispanic populations supported off-leash dog walking by almost the same percentages; however, the fact remains that the Hispanic community is already underrepresented in the Park(12). Thus, it is inappropriate for the Park Service to compare the response rates of the two groups in light of the later 2007 findings, and importantly, in light of the fact that the 2002 survey was conducted only in English with no available Spanish translation(13). Moreover, the 2002 findings show overwhelmingly that ethnic minorities oppose off-leash dog walking in the Park, particularly in light of the Park Services mission, and support regulations that prohibit off-leash dog walking(14).

Three relevant questions that were asked in the 2002 survey include questions 11, 13, and 17.

Question 11 asked [c]urrent regulations allow for walking dogs on-leash at most GGNRA sites and

prohibit any off-leash dog walking. Do you support or oppose this current regulation? 70.5% of respondents of Hispanic origin, 69.3% of Asian Americans, and 71.8% of African Americans responded that they either strongly or somewhat supported current regulations(15). Question 13 asked [d]o you support or oppose allowing off-leash dog walking in GGNRA sites? 52% of respondents of Hispanic origin, 49.2% of Asian Americans, and 49.6% of African Americans responded that they either strongly or somewhat opposed allowing off-leash dog walking(16). Question 17 asked the same as question 13, but explained the mission of the GGNRA beforehand. Knowing the GGNRA's mission, 56.6% of respondents of Hispanic origin, 59.7% of Asian Americans, and 67.5% of African Americans responded that they either strongly or somewhat opposed allowing off-leash dog walking in the Park(17).

The SEIS does not provide enough consideration for the negative experiences park users have when confronted with an off-leash dog. Even on-leash dog walkers have expressed discomfort with off-leash dogs. In 2005, Congresswoman Jackie Speier stated, after having worked with dog owner organizations and GGNRA officials regarding off-leash behavior for years, that:

Off-leash activity should be in areas that do not involve interaction with leashed dogs, or a fragile environment; i.e., the area should be fenced and properly noticed as to its use. For example, according to dog park experts, canine dominance factors preclude the placement of tables in dog parks-dogs jump on tables to be dominant-and problems will arise when a leashed dog is confronted by a free dog(18).

Recently, at a meeting organized by Congresswoman Speier, she stated that her position on this issue had not changed(19). It is clear that in order to accommodate all park users, off-leash dogs must not be able to roam free and bother, harass, and even injure other visitors and their dogs. Enclosing all off-leash dog areas is the only way to sufficiently deal with this issue, as discussed below.

#### Wildlife Disturbance.

It has become abundantly clear throughout this environmental review process that the presence of dogs in the GGNRA negatively impacts wildlife, including federally protected species. Wild Equity and others have previously submitted substantive comments and provided evidence on the issue, and the Park Service has acknowledged this. Plovers and other birds are often disturbed by dogs, which they see as natural predators, and disturbance triggers reactions that can lead to death of these birds. Disturbance of wildlife by dogs has been recorded within the GGNRA and documented in several published studies and reports.

For instance, incident reports show that dogs often chase, and sometimes kill, birds and other wildlife. One incident report states that three different dogs chased shorebirds at Ocean, and in two cases dogs chased the federally protected Snowy Plover(20). At Crissy Field, a ranger witnessed a dog kill a western grebe(21). In another incident at the Mann Headlands, a ranger witnessed a dog chasing a herd of deer in a wildlife protection area(22).

These are just a few examples of the problems that occur for wildlife in the GGNRA. The Park Service has provided no evidence that off-leash dogs respond to voice control, and the difficulty of controlling a dog in the presence of wildlife is insurmountable. To account for this problem, off-leash dogs must only be allowed in an area that is fully enclosed, either by a fence or natural boundary.

#### Failure To Consider Alternative of Enclosing All Regulated Off-Leash Areas Is Arbitrary.

If off-leash dogs are to be allowed in the GGNRA at all, the Park Service must implement a plan that more adequately addresses the growing number of conflicts between off-leash dogs and wildlife or other park users. Such a plan necessitates that off-leash dog play areas be fully enclosed with a physical barrier-with all entry and exit points double-gated-to ensure the safety of park users and protect park resources(23). Fully enclosed dog parks are standard and even recommended by dog safety advocates(24). Wild Equity and other commenters provided valid arguments as to why all ROLAs should be enclosed by physical boundaries during the DEIS comment period. However, the

preferred alternative in the SEIS still does not propose to fully enclose all ROLAs. Enclosing ROLAs will not unreasonably restrict dog use in the GGNRA, but failing to enclose them will result in more user conflicts and will create more risk for off-leash dogs. If the Park Service feels that it is not appropriate for a

ROLA to be enclosed, then the ROLA should not be proposed for that particular area.

Hundreds of dogs have been lost, injured, or killed, while roaming the GGNRA off-leash. This is because voice control is not an effective means to protect pets from getting lost or hit by cars. Enclosed off-leash dog play areas ensure that our dogs do not fall off cliffs, run into traffic, or are lost while visiting the GGNRA and they ensure, when properly located, that wildlife will not be harmed or harassed by dogs.

Furthermore, enclosing ROLAs would empower park visitors, giving them the ability to choose if and when to have off-leash dog experiences by entering an enclosed area, rather than having the experience imposed upon them whenever they visit the GGNRA. The Park Service acknowledges in the SEIS that dog walking under voice control may be more of an 'exclusive than a shared use... [for reasons that include] visitor safety and experience. (SEIS pg. 19). Although the Park Service suggests this is a debatable point, it is clear that when dogs are allowed to roam free, other uses are severely limited as evidenced by visitor complaints of dogs interrupting picnics and other activities(25). In the minds of park visitors, off-leash areas are already characterized as exclusive use zones, and consequently an argument that incorporating physical boundaries creates an exclusive use zone on its own is unacceptable.

Enclosed ROLAs would also increase compliance of regulations, as visible fencing details clearly identifiable boundaries and reduces public confusion on where a ROLA begins and ends. This also benefits GGNRA operations, as the Park Service can reduce spending its limited staff and financial resources on addressing matters such as illegal off leash dog-walking and visitor conflicts caused by off leash dogs.

In addition, enclosed areas are solidly grounded in the non-impairment mandate that governs the National Park System. An enclosure, like seat belts, bicycle helmets, safety goggles, and other safety devices, allow us all to participate in activities that are inherently risky while reducing the probability that drastic consequences from those risks materialize. The Park Service promotes the goal of ensuring that todays activities do not degrade existing resources or future recreational opportunities, and, accordingly, it should not permit risky activities without adequate safeguards in place.

As Wild Equity and other commenters have stated previously, this design principle has been adopted by animal welfare organizations and park managers around the country. The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals urged dog owners to [k]eep your dog on a leash when you are outside, unless you are in a secured, fenced-in area (26) and recommends fenced-in dog parks because even if your dog reliably comes when called, its safest to take her to a securely enclosed area to play off leash.(27) The State of California concluded during a dog management study in 2001 that off-leash dog parks should [b]e enclosed, unless located in areas where there is clear and functional topographical or other significant boundaries.(28) The San Francisco Recreation and Parks Departments [RPD] dog park policy states that off-leash dog parks require adequate delineation, natural or man-made, to protect dogs from vehicles, steep cliffs, and other hazards as well as to prevent conflicts with other park users.Z 9

The Park Service has stated that enclosures are undesirable because of aesthetic concerns and because an enclosure of sufficient construction would hinder or prevent wildlife movement. (SEIS pg. 95). The justification by the Park Service is arbitrary and should not preclude an alternative for enclosing all ROLAs from consideration under the SEIS alternatives section. Offleash dog parks can have a variety of physical barriers, including features from the natural environment. Many of these can be designed in such as way that allows the movement of small wildlife through those areas. In addition, the aesthetic issues can be addressed simply by being

creative. For example, a fully enclosed off-leash dog park proposal for Lake Merritt included butterfly garden draped around the enclosure. Furthermore, the San Francisco RPD dealt with aesthetic concerns over physical boundaries by promising that all barriers will strive to be aesthetically pleasing using landscape features such as shrubs and vines.<sup>30</sup>

If the Park Service still feels that physical barriers are not acceptable, then it should revert to the National Park Services leash law as the preferred alternative, because the Park Service has failed to demonstrate in the SEIS that voice control is sufficient to keep dogs from encountering dangerous situations and impacting wildlife and visitor experience.

**SEIS Does Not Have Adequate Enforcement Mechanisms.**

The SEIS incorporates a monitoring-based management strategy that allows Park Service staff to monitor noncompliance and impacts to natural resources, rather than the initial automatic triggers that were originally proposed. This strategy allows management actions to be implemented when the level of compliance is deemed unacceptable based on violations and/or impacts to resources.

However, this leaves the door open for limited enforcement by the Park Service. There must be some kind of demonstrable commitment of enforcement from the Park Service, rather than simply a wait-and-see approach. If the Park Service must use adaptive management, it still needs accountability mechanisms in place that guarantee effective management of the GGNRA.

One change that should be made is a lower percentage of compliance triggering further review for an area. The Park Service previously admitted that it was only striving for 75% compliance, and now it does not even have a specific threshold at all, only what will be deemed unacceptable.

Even if there are no measures that apply automatically, there should still be a clearly defined compliance rate in place that triggers further review. The SEIS states a 75 percent threshold could trigger restrictions in some areas by only one hundred violations, while other sites might require several thousand violations before a

change was implemented, despite greater impacts to resources and values in the latter case. (SEIS pg. 64).

The same amount of review that would be required to determine what is unacceptable for a site could be done during the current planning phase. This would promote transparency and allow for public review of the Park Services plan to address non-compliance in each area. The environmental review process is intended to be comprehensive and failing to set specific goals thresholds does nothing but further delay the inevitable.

**The SEIS Does Not Adequately Justify Commercial Dog Walking.**

One of the established objectives of the SEIS is to evaluate commercial dog walking (SEIS pg. 2).

Though the SEIS does provide some information pertaining to commercial dog walking, the evaluation is lacking and it is unclear how conclusions were drawn that justify the inclusion of commercial dog walking as a component of the Preferred Alternative.

Evaluation shortcomings include the following:

The SEIS fails to adequately describe the existing condition or reference point baseline condition for commercial dog walking within the GGNRA. While the SEIS states, Under current management, commercial dog walking occurs, but is not an authorized use (SEIS pg. 8), it fails to disclose that this unpermitted commercial activity is prohibited under 36 CFR 5.3.

The SEIS fails to make clear that the 1979 Pet Policy pertains to dogs that are being managed by their owners and makes no provision for commercial dog walking.

The SEIS fails to disclose that commercial dog walking does not meet the criteria to qualify for Commercial Use Authorization (16 USC 5966).

The SEIS fails to include 36 CFR 1.6 and 36 CFR 5.3 on the list of relevant sections of the Code of Federal Regulations. (SEIS pg. 47)

The SEIS fails to include Directors Order 4\*53 on the list of relevant National Park Service Directors Orders. (SEIS pg. 48)

The SEIS fails to evaluate the range and types of activities for which Special Use Permits are



typically issued throughout the National Park system.

The SEIS fails to evaluate the precedent setting potential of issuing Special Use Permits for commercial dog walking within the National Park system.

The SEIS fails to evaluate the impacts that are specific to commercial dog walking including: impacts to visitor experience, impacts to recreational activities, impacts to parking availability, impacts to management resources, impacts to aesthetic qualities, and impacts to Park Service values. These omissions of fact and failures of evaluation leave the SEIS lacking as a properly transparent and adequately informative document.

As a decision document, the SEIS fails to articulate a rational connection between the facts and the final decision. As commercial dog walking has never been legally permitted within the GGNRA, it must be clearly demonstrated that all Park Service criteria will be met prior to sanction as a valid activity. However, this is not the case.

The SEIS does not demonstrate that commercial dog walking is an appropriate activity for national parklands, meeting qualifications under the Organic Act. The Organic Act clearly indicates that the granting of use permits shall be for the accommodation of visitors. The SEIS proposes to grant use permits not for the accommodation of visitors, but rather for the accommodation of the commercial dog walking industry.

The SEIS does not demonstrate that commercial dog walking is an appropriate activity for the GGNRA, meeting qualifications under the GGNRA enabling legislation. The enabling legislation provides for public use of the Park for recreational and educational purposes and makes no provision for commercial uses that do not support or enhance the established park resources and values.

The SEIS does not demonstrate that commercial dog walking meets the criteria to qualify for Special Use Permitting under NPS Directors Order #53. Commercial dog walking will not support the mission of the Park Service, will not add to the public understanding and enjoyment of the GGNRA, will not promote a sense of ownership and stewardship for the Park and its resources, will not enhance the protection of park resources and values, and will not provide for an increased level of visitor safety. Furthermore, commercial dog walking is contrary to the purpose for which the park was established, may create impacts on park resources and values, may disrupt the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, may create an unsafe environment for other visitors, and may result in conflict with other existing uses.

These points of reason demonstrate how the SEIS has not achieved the objective of properly evaluating commercial dog walking, and therefore, commercial dog walking should not be included as a component of the Preferred Alternative.

Conclusion.

The preferred alternative for the Plan in the SEIS is more accommodating to dogs than any other park in the National Park system, offering extensive on- and off-leash dog recreation in the GGNRA. Moreover, San Francisco's city park system has ample space for off-leash dogs, with 28 off-leash dog parks in 47 square miles for over 800,000 residents.<sup>3</sup> There is no evidence that dog owners or dogs will lack for open space to recreate, yet off-leash advocates continue to push for more space. However, off-leash dogs should not be given precedence over safety, visitor experience, and environmental concerns.

For all the reasons stated above, we urge the National Park Service to revise the preferred alternative in the SEIS on the issues of ROLAs, enforcement, and commercial dog walking to better accommodate park visitors and protect natural resources in the GGNRA. In addition, we refer the Park Service to previous comments submitted by the undersigned groups during the DEIS process and by Charles Pfister for both the DEIS and the SEIS, and to comments submitted by the Wild Equity Institute and the Center for Biological Diversity during the ANPR process, the NEPA scoping process, and the numerous other hearings that have occurred on this issue over the past decade, and incorporates those documents here by reference.

Sincerely,

Laura Horton

Signed by:

Wild Equity Institute

Neal Desai, Pacific Region Field Director, National Parks Conservation Association

Matthew Ziatunich, San Francisco Resident

Bob Planthold, Member of GGNRA Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, Disability Access Advocate

David Robinson, Stakeholder Representative to GGNRA Negotiated Rulemaking Committee,

Coleman Advocates, Representing Children, Youth and Family GGNRA Users

Jan Blum, Community Volunteer

Charles Pfister

Arlene Gemmill

- (1) GGNRA Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), i (2013).
- (2) GGNRA Incident Report, Case No. 093278, March 31, 2009.
- (3) GGNRA Incident Report, Case No. 006549, June 21, 2009.
- (4) GGNRA Incident Report, Case No. 009837, September 4, 2009.
- (5) GGNRA Incident Report, Case No. 012408, November 7, 2009.
- (6) Guide Dogs for the Blind, Letter to GGNRA, Attachment A.
- (7) Patrick Tierney, et al., Summer-Fall 2008 Phase I Visitor Survey and Counts, At Crissy Field, Presidio and Ocean Beach Sites; Golden Gate National Recreation Area, iii (November 2009).
- (8) David Scott, Economic Inequality, Poverty, and Park and Recreation Delivery, 31 Journal of Park and Recreation Administration 1-11 (Winter 2013).
- (9) See Nina Roberts, Visitor/Non-Visitor Use Constraints: Exploring Ethnic Minority Experiences and Perspectives (2007).
- (10) See Frederic I. Solop, et al., Public Opinion Research Telephone Survey Regarding Golden Gate National Recreation Area Pet Management Issues Technical Report (December 2002).
- (11) 39.4 percent of respondents of Hispanic origin supported (strongly and somewhat) off-leash dog walking and 39.9 percent of respondents of non-Hispanic origin supported (strongly and somewhat) off-leash dog walking [citation omitted]. SEIS pg. 37.
- (12) Hispanics make up 7 percent of the Phase 2 population and 8 percent of the Phase 1 population. This proportion is lower than the 22 percent of Bay Area residents that identify as Hispanic. Monique Nakagawa, et al., Golden Gate National Recreation Area Follow-Up Visitor Survey (2009).
- (13) Solop, et al., 6.
- (14) Id
- (15) Id. at 85.
- (16) Id. at 92-93.
- (17) Id. at 118-119.
- (18) December 2, 2005 Letter from Congresswoman Jackie Speier to Brent Plater, Attachment B.
- (19) Personal observation by several of the undersigned.
- (20) SNPL Outreach Program Activity Log, Volunteer Witness Dan Murphy, July 30, 2010.
- (21) January 15, 2010 email to Bill Merkle, GGNRA.
- (22) GGNRA Incident Report, Case No. 013103, November 25, 2009.
- (23) See Attachment C, for examples of dog park design found in San Francisco.
- (24) See Edwin Gomez, Dog Parks: Benefits, Conflicts, and Suggestions, 31 Journal of Park and Recreation Administration 79; ASPCA, <http://www.aspc.org/pet-care/virtual-pet-behaviorist/dog-behavior/dog-parks>.
- 25 Every time we go to picnic the dogs come and eat our food, they wander around and the owners don't do anything.
- The same with their bowel movements! The owners don't clean after them. Roberts, et al., 34.
- 26 ASPCA, Pet Care, <http://www.aspc.org/pet-care/dog-care/general-dog-care>.
- 27 ASPCA, Pet Care, Dog Parks, <http://www.aspc.org/pet-care/virtual-pet-behaviorist/dog->

behavior/dog-parks.

28 California Department of Parks and Recreation Pilot Program for Unleashed Dog Areas 2 (2001), [http://wwwvp.parks.ca.gov/pages/79S/files/dog.park.pilot\\_program.pdf](http://wwwvp.parks.ca.gov/pages/79S/files/dog.park.pilot_program.pdf).

29 San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, Final Dog Policy 3.3 (May 8, 2002), [http://sfrecpark.org/wp-content/uploads/Final\\_Dog..Policy\\_2002.pdf](http://sfrecpark.org/wp-content/uploads/Final_Dog..Policy_2002.pdf).

30 Id.

31 San Francisco Recreation and Parks, Dog Play Areas Program, <http://sfrecpark.org/parks-open-spaces/dog-play-areas-program/>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6679	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	na, UN na United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 14, 2014				

TO: GGNRA

I'm writing because I don't like the new law because a dog that not exercise might misbehave. Dogs and dogwalkers keep parks safe. Not all dog owners are irresponsible. How do you know that it's the dogs? Their is no proof. It could be homeless. It's bad to blame dog's it's not their falt.

Thank you for your time,

Mariana

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6680	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	San Francisco, CA 94127 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,07,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 5, 2014				

Dear Superintendent,

I live in San Francisco and I walk my dog at Fort Funston daily.

Please leave the off-leash area the way it is.

This is extremely important to me.

Sincerely

J. Malone

406 Myra Way  
SF 94127

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6681    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94127  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Frank Dean

General Superintendent  
GGNRA  
Bldg. 201  
Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Re: Draft Dog Management Plan / Supplemental EIS

Dear Superintendent Dean,

The following comments relate to the Supplemental EIS and Fort Funston.

1. I object to any change in the current 1979 Pet Policy as to Fort Funston.
2. The EIS and Supplemental EIS both failed to provide well documented, scientific based facts in support of the conclusions.
3. Dogs are an insignificant issue related to the Bank Swallows (page 276). Currently the crows/ravens are a menace to any small bird in the Fort Funston vicinity. The EIS/SEIS refers to a report by Black 1996 (page 325). Black's report predates the invasion of Fort Funston by the crows/ravens.
4. The EIS/SEIS fails to establish that Lessingia ever populated Fort Funston. In fact, the EIS/SEIS relates to Lessingia previously having been located in the Lake Merced area (page 986) but admits that there is no documentation that Lessingia ever populated Fort Funston. There are numerous differences in the natural conditions between Lake Merced and Fort Funston and the EIS/SEIS fails to establish any basis for Lessingia ever having been present at Fort Funston.
5. The EIS/SEIS both failed to establish the number of visitors to Fort Funston. As a result of the failure to establish the number of visitors per year to Fort Funston, the reports of problems with dogs (or people) cannot be evaluated. Per the SEIS, the GGNRA has between 13 million and 15 million visitors per year, yet the overall "dog related" incidents for the years 2008 through 2011 were only 2,775. 2,775 incidents versus a minimum of 52 million visitors (13 million multiplied by 4 years) is statistically insignificant. While I am sure the NPS knows the approximate number of yearly visitors to Fort Funston, it has conveniently chosen not to include this very important information in the SEIS which prevents an accurate discussion of the impact of dog walking at Fort Funston. The 172 "dog related" incidents between 2008-2011 at Fort Funston have not been evaluated in relationship to the number of visitors to Fort Funston between 2008-2011. Therefore, the conclusion on page 221 that there are a high number of dog related incidents and conflicts affecting Human Safety has not been established.
6. The proposed ROLO areas described in the SEIS are prejudicial to senior citizens and the disabled. It is very dangerous to attempt to navigate the paths to the beach

with a dog on a leash in the event the owner falls/slips. The proposed ROLO areas will deny disabled people the ability to have their dogs off leash as much of the proposed ROLO areas will not be accessible as the dogs will not be within visual range of persons who must stay on the paved paths due to disability.

7. Monitoring Based Management Strategy contains no identifiable standards upon which the NPS is to proceed in its power to close off any or all dog walking areas within the GGNRA as it will be implemented when "the level of compliance is deemed unacceptable based on violations". This provides the NPS with unchecked authority to close any and all parts fo the GGNRA to dogs without any public hearing or notice, and does not prevent arbitrary and capricious closures by the NPS.

8. 2012 NPS Dog Walking Survey - While I did respond to the survey, the survey was poorly constructed as it was set-up only to support the previous conclusions of the NPS.

The EIS/SEIS have not addressed the toxic conditions at Fort Funston; the ever changing erosion due to nature; the lack of any concerted effort by the GGNRA/NPS to preserve the fortifications from WW II; the lack of any attempt to remediate the conditions left by usage of the property as a Nike missile site; and also fails to address the damage done by people to Fort Funston (its not those dogs leaving graffitti and beer bottles); nor has either report addressed the contamination from waste water that flows beneath Fort Funston and the sewage discharges made in the vicinity by both Daly City and San Francisco.

Also, it should be noted that the GGNRA is a National Recreation Area, not a National Park. It is shameful that the NPS has established a policy to banish the long-time recreational users of Fort Funston.

Very truly yours,

Joanne Mahoney

cc: Senator Diane Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
Congresswoman Jackie Speier

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6682	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Address:</b>	private, Montara, CA 94037 United States of America						
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual						
<b>Affiliation:</b>							
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Michael Madden Montara, CA 94037 February 16, 2014						

Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
US National Park Service  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Attn: SEIS  
Fort Mason Bldg. 201

San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent Dean:

The following comments are in response to the supplementary dog plan for the GGNRA. My comments are largely duplicates of comments I have made earlier, but lack of response can easily be interpreted as a lack of Interest, so I will repeat them here. My comments focus on the Rancho Corral de Tierra in Montara and Moss Beach.

The basic problem is what constitutes a recreation area vs. a wildlife refuge, national park, or similar entity. I think the overall plan for the GGNRA does not emphasize its use for recreation nearly enough. As a Sierra Club member for over 40 years, I appreciate the need for wilderness and wildlife protection, but I also feel the area needs recreation areas. I feel off-leash dog walking is a valid use for such areas. We have responsibly used Rancho Corral de Tierra for offleash dog walking the last 30 years without serious incident. Only one proposal for Rancho Corral de Tierra allows for dogs at all, and then in only a restricted area. We want to walk dogs on the trails, off leash, as we have in the past. The SEIS provides no significant documentation that this will have any serious effect on the environment or wildlife. I find none of the proposed alternatives acceptable. "Alternative A" is the least offensive, but would need to have additional off-leash areas added.

Sincerely,

Michael Madden  
Member, Montara Dog Group

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6683	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	Novato, CA 94949 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Marin Humane Scociety Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>	OfficialRep				
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,11,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	February 6, 2014				

Mr. Frank Dean, General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Dear Superintendent Dean,

On behalf of the Mann Humane Society we are writing to share our comments regarding the GGNRA Supplemental Dog Management Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). While we applaud the work in getting this plan out for comment, we regret that we remain deeply concerned with the overall restrictive nature of the suggested alternatives. Having been an active participant in this plan from the beginning of the negotiated rulemaking process, it appears clear that providing enough space to recreate off-leash with dogs in Mann County isn't a priority for the GGNRA. We believe that we represent many dog guardians throughout Mann, as well as the Bay Area who support our concerns.

As the enforcement entity for all animal services ordinances in Mann County and its cities, we feel

our expertise excels in the dynamics of gaining compliance in animal-friendly urban areas, such as the areas outlined in the current SEIS. In our experience successful compliance is only generated through working with users sharing standards of their community. Dog guardians in Mann are highly educated and endorse responsible guardianship standards throughout the areas they recreate. In fact, we find they routinely assist our agencies with a deeper sense of parkland stewardship, whether it is to contact us for wildlife that need assistance or picking up litter they come across on a trail. Their involvement in providing feedback on dog-friendly spaces should be valued and not ignored.

Our organization has had a long history not only as a local expert on animal issues, but we are often sought for our opinion on national animal issues as well. It is with this expertise we urge you to embrace our previous comments from the DEIS involving the Mann locations. Mann's limited areas for dog use in the GGNRA is a sad reminder of how many of our dog-loving members feel they are and continue to be, kicked out of areas that many generations have enjoyed. The other land use agencies in our county take pride in working with the public to find a balance which creates recreation to all users, including those with dogs.

Responsible off-leash controlled dogs should be continued to be permitted in as many areas of the GGNRA as possible. The GGNRA 1979 Pet Policy is a document we should all take great pride in as it was visionary in its sense of seeing the importance of the human-animal bond in ways which benefit our community and our park users. It is regrettable this same vision seems to have been lost along the way in order to fit the parameters of just another National Park. We feel strongly that after so much public comment, meetings, coalitions and groups incorporated just to save their abilities to recreate with dogs on public lands, the SEIS would extend the original scope of the Pet Policy and save the small remaining areas to not only be off-leash but to also be available to dogs and their guardians. The current document only further restricts the small remaining areas to dogs and we strongly support these areas be re-examined.

The areas identified by the SEIS for Mann include the following:

â€ Homestead Valley ' We recommend the current status of this site be maintained and we support Alternative A. There are adjoining neighborhoods in the surrounding borders that enjoy recreating with their dogs under voice control in this area. Most of the trails in this area are filled with dense vegetation, forcing most dogs and their guardians to stay on the trails.

â€ Alta Trail/Orchard Fire Road/Pacheco Fire Road- We recommend the current status of this site be maintained and we support Alternative A. This site continues to be a favorite area among many of the GGNRA sites for those seeking voice-control with their dog companions. This area is very popular as a hiking destination and is often utilized in conjunction with the Oakwood Valley Fire Rd. as a looping trail. There are areas of this trail that are very steep with lush thick vegetation. These conditions do not make it favorable for dogs (and their guardians) to go off of the designated trails. To see these areas now identified as leash-only areas is a definite step backwards, as fire roads are ideal for controlled off-leash use.

â€ Oakwood Valley- We continue to urge you to adopt the Alternative A and allow this area to be off-leash under voice control. This site is a popular area for local neighbors on the Mill Valley side as well as the Mann City side to recreate with their dogs under voice control. It is commonly used as a loop trail that joins the Alta Trail. We believe trail users at this site respect the dog control laws as well as keeping their dogs on the designated trail. The new plan completely removes the ability to use this area as an off-leash area and proposes to ban dogs entirely on the trail.

â€ Stinson Beach- We recommend the current status of this site be maintained and we support Alternative A. This area has a long history of being very dog-friendly and environmentally savvy. Many animal advocates in the neighboring community are very involved with providing their dogs with controlled off-leash recreation on the adjoining beach in unincorporated Mann County. It is rare for us to have enforcement issues on this beach.

â€ Muir Beach- We recommend the current status of this site be maintained and we strongly support Alternative A. This area has a long history of responsible off-leash dog users. It has been, and continues to be, a very popular area with local residents. Historically and politically, this is an area in which the local community has played a vital role in accepting a stewardship for the special lands and treasured species. While the plan goes into extensive detail about the negative impacts dogs "may" have on this site, we believe the evidence of proper coexistence has been demonstrated with the ability of this site to host special species, while providing responsible voice control dog recreation. Severe limitations to dogs in this area will be devastating to the local community and others.

â€ Rodeo Beach/South Rodeo Beach- We recommend the current status of this site be maintained and we support Alternative A. This site is heavily used by many dog guardians throughout the Bay Area and it offers a unique experience to its users. Further drastic limitations of this area to dogs will have a negative effect on our local users. In addition, the current plan now eliminates dog walking (even leashed) to other trails that border this area. We are concerned the small area (the only area in Mann) on this site doesn't begin to serve our population since all of the other areas are proposed to being removed for off-leash use.

â€ Mann Headlands Trail- We recommend the current status of this site be maintained and we support Alternative A. We would like to see on-leash access considered on the Tennessee Valley Trail.

â€ Fort Baker- We recommend the current status of this site be maintained and we support Alternative A. We would like to see segments of voice control on the northern section of East Road as well as a segment of the Drown Fire Road. Many residents of Sausalito can easily access this area on connecting trails. There is a need to be consistent with neighboring regulations in this area.

It seems very clear the GGNRA has no intention of making trail usage dog-friendly. As animal shelters across the country work to save animal lives and create homes for thousands of homeless animals, what a shame that now responsible dog guardians will be scrambling to find a proper place to spend off-leash time with their animal companions on our public land. Mann County residents are proud of their political leaders who understand this important factor in helping to address responsible dog guardianship beyond just a simple dog park. The GGNRA spaces in Mann aren't just places to congregate, they are places to be active by hiking, walking, enjoying the beauty of our natural spaces and spending quality time with our animal companions who share the same enjoyment when they are with us.

Our organization will continue to offer assistance to you, including the trends we see in dealing with animal guardians and the amazing recreational opportunities we advocate for people to participate in with their dogs. People who enjoy the company of dogs certainly aren't a dying fad, but a growing group getting a louder voice. Your ongoing attention to this very important issue is appreciated.

Sincerely,



Captain Cindy Machado, CAWA Nancy McKenney, MNPL, CAWA  
Director of Animal Services Chief Executive Officer  
(415)506-6209 (415)506-6200

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6684    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94109  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,05,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** January 27, 2014

Frank Dean, GGNRA Superintendent  
Building 201, Ft. Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Superintendent Dean,

I have been a resident of San Francisco and Marin County all of my life. We now live in the city where we walk regularly on Crissy Field. We walk our two dogs on the hills and streets as well but their, (and our) favorite walks are at Crissy Field, by the beach with the Golden Gate Bridge and the Bay as the backdrop. Our kids both graduated from the Bay School of San Francisco so we have been using the Presidio for years as a recreational area. It is wonderful to get to Marin, but when we don't have the time, being able to enjoy the waterfront with our dogs is of utmost importance.

I am writing today to express my opposition to the GGNRA's preferred alternative that would greatly limit where I would be able to recreate with my dogs in the near future. Additionally, the conclusions reached in the Supplemental Dog Management Plan/SEIS are not fair and deeply flawed.

Because the dog walking was specifically referred to as a long-standing use for the newly created GGNRA in 1972, this specific recreational use should continue for years to come. I support preserving the GGNRA's 1979 Pet Policy. This is not a National Park with pristine wilderness, but rather a unique recreational area in an urban environment. It deserves to be managed by different standards to achieve its fullest potential.

The proposed restrictions in the current plan seriously restrict dog walking: only 7 of the 22 areas in the SEIS allow off leash dog walking access on the GGNRA lands in ALL three counties. Additionally, this SEIS allows even more restrictions in the future, but won't allow for new areas to be opened up to dog walking (either on- or off-leash).

Regarding the process, the studies and information the GGNRA is relying on in its latest supplemental environmental impact statement are outdated - it hasn't updated the enforcement data since the last draft EIS was released. Additionally, a significant number of comments submitted for the GGNRA's Draft EIS in 2011 were not considered or addressed in the GGNRA's Supplemental EIS leading the public to believe that this process is only for show and has no substance.

Additionally, the SEIS has many assumptions that are not documented, and the SEIS has failed to respond to all comments submitted by the US EPA, which found the last draft insufficient in its analysis.

Our family asks that the GGNRA to take a balanced, fact-based approach to its environmental analysis

that will result in the preservation of important dog walking recreation in the GGNRA for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Erin Tom Nowell & family

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6685	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	NA, UN NA United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Comments on the GGNRA Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement				
Authored and Sponsored by:					
Stephen R, Golub					
February 9, 2014					
Introduction					

The legacy of Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) management is one of duplicity, broken promises, and broken laws. This SEIS as a means to modify recreational usage is no exception. This SEIS is not a good faith effort by the NPS/GGNRA to resolve conflict, but a thinly veiled ploy to eliminate off-leash recreation from the GGNRA entirely. The conflict is actually one of legislative intent: the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI desire to manage this Golden Gate National Recreation Area as a National Park, while the enabling legislation and the will of the people assert the management should reflect the unique requirement we have for recreational access (as mandated by Congress) here in the GGNRA. To further document this conflict- -in the FAQs for the SEIS (<http://www.nps.gov/goga/upload/SEIS-FAQs.pdt>) is the following item:

#21: GGNRA is a national recreation area. Do national recreation areas have different management policies than national parks?

Answer: No. All units of the national park system are guided by the same NP S Management Policies, regardless of the park's designation as a national park, national recreation area, national historic site, national lakeshore or other (there are 35 types of national park units). Congress amended the 1916 NPS Organic Act in 1970 to make clear that the NPS must manage all units of the national park system to the same preservation standard.

Citizens who voted in 1972 to include SF City and County properties in the GGNRA or have studied the history of the GGNRA remember a very different explanation from the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI: "the transfer of these lands is a technical resolution allowing the City and County of San Francisco to transfer city lands to the Golden Gate National Recreation area...a national urban park established in 1972 by Congress to preserve 34,000 acres of land and water in San Francisco and Marin for recreational use by all citizens." Additionally, the first GGNRA Superintendent William J. Whalen made specific promises to San Francisco voters that the new NRA would retain historical recreational access (including off-leash recreation) should they vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA.

In the SEIS, the GGNRA/ NPS/ DOI acknowledges the language in the agreement: The 1975 agreement for the lands transfer from the City of San Francisco to the NPS states that "The National Park Service, acting through the General Superintendent, agrees to utilize the resources of GGNRA in a manner that

will provide for recreational and educational opportunities consistent with sound principals of land use, planning and management, to preserve the GGNRA in its natural setting and protect it from development and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and natural character of the area, and to maintain the transferred premises in a good and sightly condition." The GGNRA/ NPS/ DOI further assert in the SEIS: "There is no additional specificity as to what uses constituted "recreational opportunities." The deeds for the transferred lands state that: "To hold only so long as said real property is preserved and used for recreation and park purposes, "also with no additional specificity as to what uses constituted recreation." [emphasis added] The GGNRA/ NPS/DOI consider the conflict resolved.

This is a long-standing battle we have waged: the GGNRA takes away recreational access, and the citizens turn to the Federal Court to have access reinstated. It has been a colossal waste of time and money, and a hardship for the citizens because not only are we battling for our right to access, we are also paying for both sides of the debate. It was at the conclusion of the latest legal battle wherein Federal Judge William Alsup reinstated the 1979 Pet Policy, over the objections of the GGNRA/ NPS/ DOI, that a statement was made by the Judge that became the impetus for initiation of the planned changes in Dog Management in 2006. The June 2, 2005 decision by Judge Alsup cited in this SEIS noted that the court's action "in no way restricts the authority of the Superintendent to 'protect the resource,' including the protection of endangered and threatened species." There is no mention in the SEIS of the judge's additional admonition that "Congress has committed the proper balance of resource protections and recreation to the park professionals. Their judgments should be respected by the courts absent a violation of the law ." [emphasis added] The GGNRA/ NPS/ DOI asserts that the change in Dog Management Policy (DMP) in this SEIS is intended to protect the resources of the GGNRA. However they have violated the law by ignoring the fundamental legal underpinnings provided by the enabling legislation, NPS Laws, Rules, Regulations and Policy as well as additional Federal Law which prohibits agency actions which are arbitrary, capricious and an abuse of discretion. In this Comment we intend to review the objectives and content of this SEIS and the history of the management of the GGNRA. At its conclusion, we believe you will agree there are only four possible resolutions to this situation:

1. San Francisco City and County will be required to formally take back those properties they can legally revert.
2. Congress will be required to implement a Section Seven Special Regulation- -the 1979 Pet Policy with provisions for new lands (over the objections of DOI/ NPS/GGNRA) to ensure recreational access as was originally intended when this National Recreation Area was created. This option would also require subsequent strict oversight by Congress to ensure sound principles of land use planning and management are implemented permanently as they have not been implemented up until now.
3. Transfer the GGNRA to another Federal agency, such as the Forest Service (who manage the Rattlesnake National Recreation Area and Wilderness and Sawtooth National Recreation Area) where sound principles of land use and planning are actually implemented as a part of their management policy.
4. Citizens file suit in Federal Court to force the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI to withdraw this proposal entirely, and revert back to the Original 1979 Pet Policy as established by the Court in 2005.

This Agency Action Is Unlawful

Vital Monitoring

Before examining the contents of this DEIS/SEIS, we must make the fundamental point that the decision to proceed with this DEIS/SEIS itself is unlawful. The enabling legislation requires the GGNRA to utilize sound principles of land use planning and management. Accepted practice would be illustrated by the Rattlesnake National Recreation Area and Wilderness (RNRAW) which produces an annual monitoring report. The report assesses current recreation trends, needs, and impacts, and thereby serves as a tool for long-term management of the RNRWA. The following is taken from the Introduction of the Report for 2009:

"This is the seventeenth annual monitoring report for the Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) based Management Direction for the Rattlesnake National Recreation Area (NRA) and Wilderness (RNRAW), which was approved in December 1992. Monitoring is the final step in the LAC planning system. It is an ongoing, continuous process and is instrumental for evaluating management effectiveness and sustainability of resource values and conditions.

The LAC process recognizes that wilderness conditions change. Wilderness areas are dynamic systems with many forces continually affecting the landscape. These forces of change include people and their impacts, fire, insects and disease, invasive species and many others. It defines what conditions are desirable and how to achieve or maintain those conditions. Based on citizen involvement, laws and regulation, it identifies what changes are acceptable rather than attempting to prevent change.

Monitoring is based upon the indicators and standards outlined in the LAC direction. The indicators and their specific standards provide methods of measurement to effectively monitor factors and area wide issues. Refer to the December, 1992 Limits of Acceptable Change Based Management Direction for the RNRAW for a more complete discussion of the LAC process.

The factors monitored during the 2009 field season include: education, use and users, trails and roads, Wilderness characteristics, vegetation, vandalism, wildlife, fire, goals and policies. Refer to Table 1 for a complete description of the factors, indicators and standards for each opportunity class (OC). "

In contrast, in 2006 when the plan to change the Dog Management Policy(DMP)/DEIS was announced on the Federal Register, Dr. Suzanne Valente made a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to provide the data, documents, and/or Staff Report which substantiated the GGNRA's claim that there was controversy over the dog policy, compromised visitor and employee safety and resource degradation which warranted the change in DMP and DEIS. The GGNRA's response merely stated: "The Staff Report and other documents you seek do not exist at this time". [emphasis added] An appeal from Dr. Valente to the Department of the Interior regarding this FOIA request elicited the following response (after several correspondences from Dr. Valente): "Since the Department has not made a determination on your appeal within the time limits set in the FOIA, you may seek judicial review under 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(4)(B). However, we hope that you will delay filing the lawsuit so that the Department can thoroughly review the issues in your appeal and make a determination. We appreciate your patience to this point and the Department will make every effort to reach a decision on your appeal as soon as possible." This letter is dated August 8, 2006. A written response to the appeal was received by Dr. Valente almost five years from the date of the original request. The Department of Interior again confirmed there were no documents to substantiate the need for a change in the DMP and this DEIS/SEIS.

The lack of data or any documentation to support the assertions used as justification to proceed with this Environmental Review violates Federal Law as it renders this agency action arbitrary, capricious and an abuse of discretion. Accordingly, this agency action, findings and conclusions should be set aside as prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 706 (2)A.

Why is it significant that other Recreation Areas perform annual monitoring of resources and the GGNRA does not? Why is monitoring so important? As stated in an NPS publication, "Monitoring the Condition of Natural Resources in US National Parks" ([http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/docs/Monitoring\\_Park\\_Condition.pdf](http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/docs/Monitoring_Park_Condition.pdf)) the purpose of monitoring is as follows:

"The overall purpose of natural resource monitoring in parks is to develop scientifically sound information on the current status and long term trends in the composition, structure, and function of park

ecosystems, and to determine how well current management practices are sustaining those ecosystems. Use of monitoring information will increase confidence in manager's decisions and improve their ability to manage park resources, and will allow managers to confront and mitigate threats to the park and operate more effectively in legal and political arenas. "

Additionally, a review of NPS online resources reveals that there is an entire infrastructure set up to guide and facilitate NPS properties in their monitoring duties, "Vital Signs Monitoring" (<http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/index.cfm>)

A subsection of the aforementioned web site (Program Goals) discusses the goals of park monitoring:

"Natural resource monitoring provides site-specific information needed to understand and identify change in complex, variable, and imperfectly understood natural systems and to determine whether observed changes are within natural levels of variability or may be indicators of unwanted human influences. Thus, monitoring provides a basis for understanding and identifying meaningful change in natural systems characterized by complexity, variability, and surprises.

Monitoring data help to define the normal limits of natural variation in park resources and provide a basis for understanding observed changes; monitoring results may also be used to determine what constitutes impairment and to identify the need to initiate or change management practices. "[emphasis added]

Further exploration of the NPS "Vital Signs Monitoring" Resources Online (see <http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/ProgramGoals.cfm>) reveals that National Park managers are directed by federal law and National Park Service policies and guidance to know the status and trends in the condition of natural resources under their stewardship in order to fulfill the NPS mission of conserving parks unimpaired (see "Summary of Laws, Policies and Guidance" at <http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/LawsPolicy.cfm>).

More recently, the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 established the framework for fully integrating natural resource monitoring and other science activities into the management processes of the National Park System. The Act charges the Secretary of the Interior to "continually improve the ability of the National Park Service to provide state-of-the art management, protection, and interpretation of and research on the resources of the National Park System" , and to "assure the full and proper utilization of the results of scientific studies for park management decisions. " Section 5934 of the Act requires the Secretary of the Interior to develop a program of "inventory and monitoring of National Park System resources to establish baseline information and to provide information on the long -term trends in the condition of National Park System resources."

Clearly, the failure of GGNRA management to conduct any consistent monitoring of the resources of the GGNRA is a violation of Federal law. The more fundamental problem this SEIS highlights is the fact that GGNRA management is in persistent violation of the enabling legislation for this park property. GGNRA management can provide no monitoring report to substantiate visitor use patterns or conflicts, no documentation of degradation of the Recreation Area resources, as well as no documentation as to whether resource degradation is inevitable or under the control of management prior to proposing these management changes. It seems impossible that GGNRA management would undertake a Dog Management Policy change as proposed in this SEIS without any evidence of monitoring or site specific studies as a means to identify the alleged impairment.

Consider, for example, the issue of Water Quality. In the DEIS, it was asserted dog feces are a significant component in water bacterial contamination. The DEIS refers to a substudy of the San Francisco Sewage Master Plan which determined that bacterial contamination of waters off Ocean Beach was significant due to dog fecal matter deposited along the shoreline (NPS 1999, 21). The difficulty with this reference is that

it cannot be located. The cited study simply does not exist.

The Ocean Beach DOG comment on the DEIS pointed to a more relevant reference: the Annual Report by Heal the Bay. The 2011 report had just come out and Ocean Beach received an A ranking at Balboa Avenue year-round excepting a B ranking during wet weather. At Lincoln Way there was an A or A ranking year-round excepting a B ranking during wet weather. At Sloat Blvd., the ranking is an A or A all year-round in wet or dry weather. Our response opined dog feces are not creating a problem at Ocean Beach. Further, the 2010 Heal the Bay report acknowledged that in the summer nearly all beaches had a clean bill of health. But in the winter, when heavy rains cause untreated sewage to flow into the bay and ocean, bacteria hit perilous levels in some areas. Deb Self, Director of San Francisco Baykeeper stated, "We have a massive, rampant problem with human waste." [emphasis added] Among the worst offenders is Baker Beach, where raw sewage leaking from old pipes and overflowing storm drains flows into Lobos Creek and forms a pool at the south end of the beach.

Our conclusion was that most dog guardians are picking up their dogs' feces, and the relatively few instances where people fail to pick up after their dog, while not excused, do not constitute a threat to our water quality.

The salient point here is that the assertions that dogs negatively affect water quality in the GGNRA have been omitted in the SEIS with the following explanation on page 28:

"Although water quality monitoring currently occurs at GGNRA, no site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at the GGNRA sites to document impacts to water quality specifically from dogs. It is also difficult to discern what is causing an impact to water quality, especially in a large metropolitan area where water quality may already be degraded. The literature review found very few investigations or peer-reviewed, scientific studies that document the isolated effects dogs have on water quality in recreational settings. Water quality has therefore been dismissed as a resource topic in this document due to lack of literature."

Further, the SEIS on pages 373 and 376, admits the following:

"Site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have not been conducted at the GGNRA sites for the sole purpose of documenting impacts to vegetation or soils from dogs.... Very few site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at GGNRA for the purpose of documenting impacts to wildlife as a result of dogs."

Absent the existence of any peer reviewed, site specific studies regarding dogs and vegetation, soil, or wildlife, the GGNRA is left to discuss potential disturbance to the resources. Absent reliable site-specific data, or peer review of that data, by law the SEIS should have also dismissed soils, vegetation, and wildlife as resource topics- as they did with water quality. Clearly the SEIS did not do so as it would have left the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI no legitimate basis to pursue a change in the DMP. Consequently, in the current SEIS, site-specific allegations of user conflict or resource degradation are generally supported by anecdotal comments submitted to the GGNRA in response to the DEIS.

This is a wholesale violation of Federal law; the mismanagement so sweeping and the lawlessness so brazen that it rises to a level which demands accountability. We will explore in the "Peer Review" section of this Comment the vast legal framework requiring peer review as a means to ensure the public that the Code of Scientific and Scholarly Conduct has been adhered to. Further, this DMP flirts with violation of the Federal Policy on Research Misconduct, as well as the fundamental requirement to base decisions on fact, not opinion.

As a practical matter, the GGNRA has failed to monitor the resources; consequently, there have been no

mitigations to address problems as they arise. In truth, were the GGNRA's claims of degradation of resources even valid (we contend they are not), a case could be made that any degradation of the GGNRA property is due to GGNRA management's failure to adhere to accepted practice regarding land use planning and management. How is it equitable for the GGNRA to abolish recreational access as a remedy to a problem they cannot document and when they have demonstrably violated the principles of sound land use planning and management as well as numerous Federal laws designed to ensure the reliability of scientific evidence utilized to make management decisions?

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6686	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	N/A, UN N/A United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Peer Review				

The law requires findings or conclusions that represent the official position of one or more agencies of the Federal government with regards to scientific matters shall be peer-reviewed before dissemination.

On December 16, 2004, Joshua Bolten, Director of the Executive Office of the President of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in Washington, D.C., published and circulated a "Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies" about the issuance of the OMB's "Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review". This bulletin was subsequently published in the Federal Register (2664 Federal Register / Vol. 70, No. 10/ Friday, January 14,2005 / Notices; see [http:// www.nrc.gov/public-involve/zofr2664.pdf](http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/zofr2664.pdf))

Following are direct excerpts from the aforementioned memorandum and bulletin which are applicable to our situation here in the GGNRA:

AGENCY: Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President

SUMMARY: On December 16, 2004, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), in consultation with the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), issued its Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review to the heads of departments and agencies (available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/fy2005/m003.htm> . This new guidance is designed to realize the benefits of meaningful peer review of the most important science disseminated by the Federal Government. It is part of an ongoing effort to improve the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information disseminated by the Federal Government to the public.

This Bulletin establishes that important scientific information shall be peer reviewed by qualified specialists before it is disseminated by the Federal government. The term "influential scientific information" means scientific information the agency reasonably can determine will have or does have a clear and substantial impact on important public policies or private sector decisions. To the extent permitted by law, each agency shall conduct a peer review on all influential scientific information that the agency intends to disseminate. [Emphasis added]

This Bulletin addresses peer review of scientific information disseminations that contain findings or conclusions that represent the official position of one or more agencies of the Federal government.

DATES: The requirements of this Bulletin, with the exception of those in Section V (Peer Review Planning), apply to information disseminated on or after June 16, 2005. -

Peer review is one of the important procedures used to ensure that the quality of published information meets the standards of the scientific and technical community....Peer review is the review of a draft product for quality by specialists in the field who were not involved in producing the draft.

---

The peer reviewer's report is an evaluation or critique that is used by the authors of the draft to improve the product. Peer review typically evaluates the clarity of hypotheses, the validity of the research design, the quality of data collection procedures, the robustness of the methods employed, the appropriateness of the methods for the hypotheses being tested, the extent to which the conclusions follow from the analysis, and the strengths and limitations of the overall product.

In some cases, reviewers might recommend major changes to the draft, such as refinement of hypotheses, reconsideration of research design, modifications of data collection or analysis methods, or alternative conclusions.

This Bulletin establishes minimum standards for when peer review is required for scientific information and the types of peer review that should be considered by agencies in different circumstances. It also establishes a transparent process for public disclosure of peer review planning, including a web-accessible description of the peer review plan that the agency has developed for each of its forthcoming influential scientific disseminations. <http://www.nps.gov/policy/peerreview.htm>

Regardless of the peer review mechanism chosen, agencies should strive to ensure that their peer review practices are characterized by both scientific integrity and process integrity. "Scientific integrity," in the context of peer review, refers to such issues as "expertise and balance of the panel members; the identification of the scientific issues and clarity of the charge to the panel; the quality, focus and depth of the discussion of the issues by the panel; the rationale and supportability of the panel's findings; and the accuracy and clarity of the panel report." "Process integrity" includes such issues as "transparency and openness, avoidance of real or perceived conflicts of interest, a workable process for public comment and involvement," and adherence to defined procedures.

When an information product is a critical component of rule-making, it is important to obtain peer review before the agency announces its regulatory options so that any technical corrections can be made before the agency becomes invested in a specific approach or the positions of interest groups have hardened. If review occurs too late, it is unlikely to contribute to the course of a rulemaking. Furthermore, investing in a more rigorous peer review early in the process "may provide net benefit by reducing the prospect of challenges to a regulation that later may trigger time consuming and resource-draining litigation." The peer review report shall be discussed in the preamble to any related rulemaking and included in the administrative record for any related agency action. [Emphasis added]

Peer review should not be confused with public comment and other stakeholder processes. The selection of participants in a peer review is based on expertise, with due consideration of independence and conflict of interest.

Furthermore, notice-and-comment procedures for agency rulemaking do not provide an adequate substitute for peer review, as some experts - - especially those most knowledgeable in a field - - may not file public comments with federal agencies.

#### Legal Authority for the Bulletin

This Bulletin is issued under the Information Quality Act and OMB's general authorities to oversee the quality of agency information, analyses, and regulatory actions. In the Information Quality Act, Congress directed OMB to issue guidelines to "provide policy and procedural guidance to Federal agencies for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility and integrity of information" disseminated by Federal agencies. Public Law No. 106-554,

515(a). The Information Quality Act was developed as a supplement to the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq., which requires OMB, among other things, to "develop and oversee the implementation of policies, principles, standards, and guidelines to . . . apply to Federal agency dissemination of public information." In addition, Executive Order 12866, 58 Fed. Reg. 51,735 (Oct. 4, 1993), establishes that CIRA is "the repository of expertise concerning regulatory issues," and it directs OMB to provide guidance to the agencies on regulatory planning. E.O. 12866, 2(b). The Order also requires that "[e]ach agency shall base its decisions on the best reasonably obtainable scientific, technical, economic, or other information." E.O. 12866, 1(b)(7). Finally, OMB has authority in certain circumstances to manage the agencies under the purview of the President's Constitutional authority to supervise the unitary Executive Branch. All of these authorities support this Bulletin.



In response to the Bulletin, on January 31, 2008 Herbert C. Frost, as Acting Associate Director of Natural Resource Stewardship and Science for the NPS, published the "Interim Guidance Document Governing Code of Conduct, Peer Review, and Information Quality Correction for National Park Service Cultural and Natural Resource Disciplines". Following are excerpts from this document:

Sound management and interpretation of National Park System resources and National Park Service technical assistance programs depend on authoritative information from scientific and scholarly activities. Peer review provides the appropriate process for ensuring technical quality and accuracy of these activities, which include inventory, monitoring, research, assessment, and management projects. This peer review must be applied appropriately at all stages, which may include proposals at the funding decision point, detailed proposals or plans of action at the point of initiating an activity, progress of an activity at key points during its duration, and results and draft reports of accomplishments of the activity.

The scientific and scholarly guidance presented in this document ensures that the review requirement is met using a consistent, conscientious, and appropriate level of effort. Such technical peer review is essential to demonstrate the professional stature and ensure the accountability of the National Park Service's acquisition and application of scientific and scholarly information. Such scientific peer review complements, and is part of, administrative review.

#### I.b. Purpose

NPS issues this guidance to ensure that NPS scientific and scholarly activities comply with the OMB Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review (70 FR 2664-2677), the Department of the Interior draft 305 DM 4 Peer Review, NPS Director's Order 11B: Ensuring Quality of Information Disseminated by the National Park Service, and the Secretary of the Interior's December 21, 2007 memorandum "Ensuring Integrity in Scientific Activities". This guidance is expected to:

A. Enhance the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of scientific and scholarly information generated or supported by the NPS;

B. Increase the credibility of decisions to which these and other scientific information contributes; and

C. Extend application of the concepts of the OMB Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review (70 FR 2664- 2677), henceforth referred to as the OMB Peer Review Bulletin, to information disseminated by the Service that is neither a highly influential scientific assessment nor influential scientific information.

The NPS shall ensure appropriate peer review of all scientific and scholarly information prior to use in decision making, regulatory processes, or dissemination to the public and regardless of media (i.e., print, digital, audiovisual, or Web). Any information that the NPS determines to be either "influential scientific information" and/or "highly influential scientific assessment" will require more specific, independent peer review consistent with the OMB Peer Review Bulletin. NPS will place these guidelines, its peer review agendas for influential scientific information and highly influential scientific assessment (as defined by the OMB Peer Review Bulletin), and its information quality correction site on a publicly available webpage. These guidelines become effective on an interim basis February 1, 2008.

These guidelines apply to all scientific and scholarly information and assessments produced, used, or sponsored by the NPS. The guidelines identify the ethical standards within which employees and volunteers will conduct NPS sponsored scientific and scholarly activities. The peer review component of these guidelines applies to scientific and scholarly activities. It does not apply to policy or management decisions, although it does apply to the underlying scientific and scholarly information that, along with other factors, informs a decision maker.

## II. AUTHORITY TO ISSUE THIS REFERENCE MANUAL

### II.a. Guidance for Science, Peer Review, and Information Quality

" 305 OM 2 requires that science must be integrated into and used in setting regulatory and management policies in the Department and its bureaus;

DOI Information Quality Guidelines establish policy to ensure and maximize the objectivity, utility, and integrity of information disseminated to the public by the Department. These guidelines implement the Information Quality Act (P.L. 106-554 Section 515) and associated OMB Guidelines (67 FR 8452-8460);

E.O. 12866 establishes a government-wide policy that each agency shall base its regulatory decisions on the best reasonably obtainable scientific, technical, economic and other information; and

OMB Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review (70 FR 2664-2677) establishes government-wide requirements for the peer review of "influential scientific information" and "highly influential scientific assessments." It also establishes requirements for posting peer review plans on a website and annual reporting of associated peer review activities to the OMB.

#### II.b. Guidance for Scientific Code of Conduct

5 U.S.C. 301 allows the head of an executive department to prescribe regulations for the conduct of its employees;

43 CFR 20.501 requires employees of the Department to comply with all Federal statutes; Executive Orders; and Office of Government Ethics, Office of Personnel Management, and Departmental regulations;

43 CFR 20.502 states that employees are required to carry out the announced policies and programs of the Department;

43 CFR 20.502(a) states that an employee is subject to appropriate disciplinary action if he or she fails to comply with any lawful regulations, orders, or policies;

Federal Policy on Research Misconduct, 65 FR 76260-76264, December 6, 2000; and Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch, 5 CFR 2635.

#### II.c. General Authority

16 U.S.C. 1 through 4 (the National Park Service Organic Act).

#### II.d. Other Relevant Policy and Guidance

NPS Management Policies 2006

Chapter 1, The Foundation, Sections 1.8 (Managing Excellence); 1.9.4 (Public Information and Media Relations);

Chapter 2, Park System Planning, Sections 2.1.2 (Scientific, Technical, and Scholarly Analysis), 2.1.3 (Public Participation); 2.3.1.4 (Science and Scholarship);

Chapter 4, Natural Resource Management, Sections 4.1.2 (Natural Resource Information); 4.2 (Studies and Collection); 4.8.2.1 (Paleontological Resources and Their Contexts); 4.8.2.2 (Caves);

Chapter 5, Cultural Resource Management, Sections 5.1.1 (National Park Service Research); 5.2.3 (Confidentiality); 5.3.5.3.2 (Sacred Sites); 5.3.5.5.4 (Acquisition, Management, Disposition, and Use); 5.3.5.5.6 (Archives and Manuscripts);

Chapter 7, Requirements for All Interpretive and Educational Services, Section 7.5.4 (Research and Scholarship); Chapter 8, Use of the Parks, Sections 8.5 (Use by American Indians and Other Traditionally Associated Groups);

8.11 (Social Science Studies);

Chapter 10, Commercial Visitor Services, Section 10.2.4.9 (Natural and Cultural Resource Management Requirements).

DO #11 B Ensuring Quality of Information Disseminated by the National Park Service;

DO #12 Environmental Impact Analysis;

DO #19 Records Management; and

DO #78 Social Science, Section III.I (Peer Review).

### V. THRESHHOLDS FOR PEER REVIEW

#### V.a. When is Peer Review Required?

Although peer review generally benefits all scientific and scholarly activities, existing workloads do not permit conducting the same intensity of peer review in every case. As a result, supervisors apply professional judgment to each activity to determine what level of peer review is required at any step in the implementation process. In general the need for peer review should be decided by a supervisor or program leader at least one level above the person who conducts the work. The following factors are examples of considerations used in making this professional judgment:

the probable degree of controversy likely to be associated with the activity or the management, regulatory, or policy decision that it informs;

the potential for societal and resource impacts associated with management, regulatory, or policy decisions that the information might influence;

(Note: We would point out that Federal Judge Alsup, in reinstating the original 1979 GGNRA Pet Policy on June 2, 2005 concluded as follows:

"In 1983, the NPS revamped its regulations and added a new provision to require notice and -comment procedures before any "highly controversial" closure or opening of NPS land or before any such action that would have a major impact on visitor use patterns...Judge Laporte was correct that the 2002 closures were "highly controversial" and the government's appellate brief herein did not argue otherwise." Clearly precedent and the government's decision to utilize the notice and comment process here confirm this proposed change to the DMP is both highly controversial and will have a major impact upon visitor use patterns in the GGNRA. Peer review is required in this circumstance, and the SEIS acknowledges such.)

The last document we see in the chain of regulations following the initial Bulletin regarding Peer Review is Chapter 3 "Integrity of Scientific and Scholarly Activities" of the official Department of Interior Departmental Manual, effective 1/28/11.

Following are excerpts taken directly from the aforementioned document:

This chapter establishes Departmental policy on the integrity of scientific and scholarly activities the Department conducts and science and scholarship it uses to inform management and public policy decisions. Scientific and scholarly information considered in Departmental decision making must be robust, of the highest quality, and the result of as rigorous scientific and scholarly processes as can be achieved. Most importantly, it must be trustworthy. It is essential that the Department establish and maintain integrity in its scientific and scholarly activities because information from such activities is a critical factor that informs decision making on public policies. [Emphasis added]

This chapter establishes requirements for the professional conduct and management of scientific and scholarly activities, and the use of scientific and scholarly information, by and on behalf of the Department.

The Department is dedicated to preserving the integrity of the scientific and scholarly activities it conducts, and activities that are conducted on its behalf. It will not tolerate loss of integrity in the performance of scientific and scholarly activities or in the application of science and scholarship in decision making.

Code of Scientific and Scholarly Conduct includes provisions requiring:

avoidance of conflict of interest (real or perceived)

adherence to scientific standards including the Scientific Method

" publication of data along with study conclusions

(Note: this comment contains review of "studies" proffered by the GGNRA to substantiate restrictions designed to protect the Western snowy plover. These "studies" fail to adhere to the Code of Scientific and Scholarly conduct with respect to all three provisions listed above. We should point out that upon receiving these allegations in written form by way of our Comment on the DEIS, the NPS did not modify their planned restrictions but did remove the studies from the SEIS. Compliance with the law would have required withdrawal of the entire DMP. The same flaws are found in the 2006 Daphne Hatch "study" utilized by the GGNRA in 2008 to abolish off leash recreation on the southern 2.4 miles of Ocean Beach. We raised, in our written comment opposing the closure, the same objections to the Hatch "study" however our objections were ignored by the GGNRA.)

Allegations of scientific and scholarly misconduct with respect to DOI employees, volunteers, contractors, cooperators, partners, permittees, leasees, and grantees must be submitted in writing. The Department will consider allegations submitted within 60 days of discovery of alleged misconduct.

Allegations may be submitted by individuals or entities, internal or external to the Department.

Three criteria are necessary to establish research misconduct (Federal Policy on Research Misconduct):

(1) There is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community, and

(2) The misconduct is committed intentionally or knowingly or recklessly, and

(3) The allegation is proven by a majority of evidence.

43 CFR 20.501 requires employees of the Department to comply with all Federal statutes, Executive Orders, Office of Government Ethics and Office of Personnel Management regulations, and Departmental

regulations.

43 CFR 20.502 states that employees are required to carry out the announced policies and programs of the Department.

18 U.S.C. 208 and 5 CFR 2635 Subparts D and E state that department scientists and scholars are subject to requirements pertaining to conflict of interest and appearance of a lack of impartiality.

(Note: We would point out that a good case can be made that the Code of Scientific and Scholarly Conduct and Federal Policy on Research Misconduct have been violated repeatedly by GGNRA personnel since the 2005 reinstatement of the 1979 GGNRA Pet Policy. Evidence of the misconduct has been submitted by OBD OG by way of public comment when "studies" were revealed to support closures. It is unconscionable that GGNRA/ NPS/DOI personnel who reviewed comments prior to these closures never made any attempt to rectify the shortcomings, and apparently condoned them. Certainly, comments regarding the 2006 Daphne Hatch "study" out at Ocean Beach confirmed scientific and research misconduct based upon Federal policy guidelines. The GGNRA/ NPS/DOI ignored the scientific policy violations, and actually implemented the closure this discredited "study" was submitted to support! Clearly, there is no scientific accountability within the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI and, in fact, scientific misconduct is authorized and supported by management all the way up to the highest levels of the Department of the Interior.)

We at Ocean Beach Dog Owners Group (OBD OG) have called for the withdrawal of the proposed use changes for recreation with dogs in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) and the reinstatement of the original 1979 GGNRA Pet Policy. This may appear on its face to be a radical position, but in actuality it is the only action the GGNRA can take in order to comply with current law. In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) the GGNRA promulgated several "studies/scientific claims" that clearly were not peer-reviewed and OBD OG discredited these "studies/scientific claims" quite effectively in our document "Comments on the GGNRA Draft Environmental Impact Statement" (dated May 26, 2011). The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) no longer contains the "studies/scientific claims" that we discredited. Further, in the current SEIS the GGNRA acknowledges that they have no peer reviewed, site-specific studies to support their claims that dogs adversely affect water quality, vegetation, soils, or wildlife in the GGNRA. Rather than dropping these claims the SEIS relies upon possible outcomes, potential for degradation, and so on. In fact, there has been no peer review of the faux science the GGNRA has used for any closures since the original 1979 GGNRA Pet Policy was reinstated by Judge Alsup in 2005 (see United States of America v. Barley, Sayad and Kieselhorst; June 2, 2005)

The fact is the National Park Service has had a shift in ideology, and this new ideology is in direct conflict with the promises the NPS made to citizens to persuade them and their governing bodies to turn over the properties that make up the GGNRA. Had the GGNRA monitored this property conscientiously and peer reviewed their findings, the GGNRA would not have initiated this change to the Dog Management Policy in the first place.

This Agency's Management Is The Source Of Controversy And Conflict

It is the GGNRA's refusal to abide by the enabling legislation for this recreation area that has created controversy and user conflict. I am obligated to go through a chronological history of the GGNRA because the history provided in the DEIS/SEIS is inaccurate in many respects.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6687	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	N/A, UN N/A United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					

---

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** History

The historical backdrop presented in this DEIS/SEIS could be politely classified as "revisionist". A more accurate description is as follows:

In March 1963, the President's Recreational Advisory Council released "Policy Circular No. 1." In it, the council laid out a new outdoor recreation policy for all agencies, with the key stipulation that all National Recreation sites be accessible at all times for "all-purpose recreational use." To make the point even clearer, it asserted that agency management of National Recreation Areas should be more responsive to recreational demands than to other such considerations as "preserving unique natural or historical resources." (Administrative History of Point Reyes National Seashore) The NPS was left with little choice but to heed these stipulations.

In response, the NPS advisory board decided to create three separate operating units and management goals for traditional NPS natural or Wilderness areas, Historical Monuments, and for the broad category of Recreation Areas. Secretary of the Interior Udall made official the new categories in his July 10, 1964, memorandum to new NPS director George B. Hartzog, Jr. Udall outlined the prescribed management policies for the recreational area category: "Outdoor recreation shall be recognized as the dominant or primary resource management objective." Resource use would emphasize "active participation in outdoor recreation in a pleasing environment." (Administrative History of Point Reyes National Seashore)

In 1970 Secretary of Interior Walter Hickel moved to create the GGNRA "to bring parks to the people", (U.S. Department of Interior News Release, September 14, 1970.) Congress established the GGNRA on October 27, 1972, stating:

"In order to preserve for public use and enjoyment certain areas of Marin and San Francisco Counties, California, possessing outstanding natural, historic, scenic, and recreational values, and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (hereinafter referred to as the "recreation area") is hereby established. In the management of the recreation area, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall utilize the resources in a manner which will provide for recreation and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management. In carrying out the provisions of this subchapter, the Secretary shall preserve the recreation area, as far as possible, in its natural setting, and protect it from development and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and natural character of the area..." (16 U.S.C. Sec. 460bb.)

In addition to a generic statement of purpose as appears in most national park statutes, it is important to note that Congress included two "specific provisions" unique to the GGNRA.

First, the park was established "to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning."

Second, the GGNRA statute imposes a unique limitation on NPS's discretionary power for "management of the recreation area" by providing that the "Secretary of Interior ...shall utilize the resources in a manner which will provide for recreation and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management."

While composing a list of enumerated recreational activities contemplated for the new urban park would be virtually impossible, legislative history reveals what Congress meant by "needed recreational open

space necessary to urban environment." "It is a well-recognized principle of statutory construction that contemporaneous interpretations of dated legislation are ordinarily given considerable deference when its meaning is later questioned." (National Rifle Association of America v. Potter 628 F. Supp. 903, 911 (D.C. Dist. Col. 1986).) In addition to sun bathing, picnicking, horse riding, swimming, hiking, and fishing, offleash dog walking was specifically addressed during Congressional hearings. For example, a letter by a seven year old child from San Francisco petitioned the Chairman for a dog park where she could play and socialize

her dog: "Dear Congressman Roy Taylor: I want a park so I can play in the park and my sister wants a park too and so my dog can play with another dogs and my Mom wants a park so she could take my dog out to play. I hope you will make a park. Elizabeth Linke." (Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, p. 414.)

Consistent with the trend at the time, Congress explicitly stated the GGNRA was to be a "new national urban recreation area which will concentrate on serving the outdoor recreation needs of the people of the metropolitan region." The GGNRA's mandate was to "expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available in this region." (1-1. R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Cong., 2nd Session (1972).)

At the time, all municipal beaches and adjacent city parks considered for inclusion in the park were dedicated to off-leash recreation. (It has been the law of the State of California since its inception in 1850 that the State holds the tidelands in trust for its citizens. In decisions from both the United States and California Supreme Courts, the uses encompassed by the public trust doctrine have been held to include "general recreational" activities.)

When voting for Charter Section 7-403-l(a) authorizing the transfer of the City parks, the citizens of San Francisco were told that "the transfer of these lands is a technical resolution allowing the City and County of San Francisco to transfer city lands to the Golden Gate National Recreation area ...a national urban park established in 1972 by Congress to preserve 34,000 acres of land and water in San Francisco and Marin for recreational use by all citizens. " The first GGNRA Superintendent William J. Whalen made specific promises to San Francisco voters that the new NRA would retain historical recreational access (including off leash recreation) should they vote to include SF park properties in the GGNRA.

Although the city was interested in having its parks included in the new urban park, it wanted to retain jurisdiction over them; surrendering total control to the federal government was not part of the original deal. San Francisco Mayor Joseph Alioto told the United States House Hearings that the city parks proposed for inclusion in the GGNRA "should remain under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission" (April 6, 1972). The Department of Interior clearly understood that the "taxpayers of San Francisco had the foresight to preserve these recreational areas and the willingness to pay for their support" and "naturally wish to retain some voice in their operations and administration consistent again with an overall master plan. " (February 14, 1972). The San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission adopted Resolution No. 9030 which provides, "[t]hat this Commission, believing that inclusion of these properties is vital to the success of the concept of bringing parks to the people, recommends that they remain under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission of the City and County of San Francisco." (May 30, 1972).

Aware that certain unique restrictions were included in the enabling statute requiring the NPS to maintain "recreational open space necessary for urban environment and planning", San Francisco adopted the "technical resolution" authorizing the transfer of City parks for "recreational use by all citizens."

The Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 364-72, which provides:

1. "the City and County of San Francisco desires to maintain and improve the recreation facilities available to the residents of San Francisco on the aforementioned property owned by the City and County

of San Francisco located within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area;"

2. "The City and County of San Francisco desires to participate in the planning, administration and operation of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area"" and

3. "this Board of Supervisors endorse a policy of cooperation and administration and management of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area including the property owned by the City and County of San Francisco located within the Recreation Area. (June 9, 1972)".

Before the transfer occurred, an Agreement/Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between San Francisco and the Federal Government gave the City Planning Department jurisdiction to review NPS plans within formally owned City lands after their incorporation into the GGNRA. Department of City Planning memos from the 1970s confirm that the MOU requires that all NPS proposals be submitted to the Department for review.

As minutes of the San Francisco City Planning Commission, dated December 5, 1974 confirm, the resolution to transfer the property was approved on that day because the Commission was told: "the deed transferring jurisdiction over the parcel to the Federal Government would specify that the property should be used for Open Space and Recreational purposes only."

Even as the properties were being secured, the National Park Service was moving in the direction of abolishing the National Recreation, Historical Monuments, and Wilderness Management categories. The General Authorities Act of 1970 began the legal unraveling of the three management categories. Officials in Washington assured field operations that these changes were administrative and "not intended to create significant changes in the management of parks." (Administrative History of Point Reyes National Seashore)

But in reality, the move was being made to reverse the priority of recreation. We shall now track the progression of this move to place "preservation/restoration" over recreation.

Considering his representations to SF voters and elected officials, it seems duplicitous at best that in 1977 the same William J. Whalen (recently promoted to Director status in the NPS) officially dismantled the three-category distinctions which provided different management for National Recreation Area category properties (which included the GGNRA). To answer the obvious question as to how the priority of recreation was still to be honored, it was said the promulgation of new regulations were developed to reflect "the actual Management practices which have become established in park areas, either through legislative requirements or policy decision." (Memo from Associate Director, Management and Operations to Directorate and Field Directorate, 12/22/77).

Congress bolstered NPS Director Whalen's decision to further de-emphasize the Recreational preference in the Redwoods Act of 1978, which included an amendment to the 1970 General Authorities Act declaring the "regulation of the various areas of the National Park System, . . . shall be consistent with and founded in the purpose established by the [Organic Act] to the common benefit of all the people of the United States." (Administrative History of Point Reyes National Seashore)

Acting on the promise to the city and the mandate to manage park resources "consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management" for the "maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning", NPS developed the 1979 Pet Policy through the auspices of the Citizens Advisory Commission which designated certain areas for voice control in San Francisco and Marin counties. The development of this policy was initiated "because the ordinary guidelines outlined in the Code of Federal Regulations do not really apply in an urban area. People and their animals have been visiting the park for too long to apply an all-inclusive arbitrary policy."

Documents relating to development of the policy leave no question that NPS and not the Citizens Advisory Commission developed the off-leash policy for GGNRA. In October, 1977, Rolf Diamant, GGNRA "Environmental Coordinator" prepared a memo proposing a "Draft Dog Policy for San Francisco Unit." His memo enumerated the following guidelines:

1. "No regulation, verbal or written, should be attempted that cannot be reasonably and consistently administered."
2. "Dog regulations should be different for different areas of the park reflecting public needs and attitudes as well as urban geography and our capabilities."
3. "When we discourage or restrict dogs in any area, whenever possible, an alternative site where dogs are allowed should be suggested."

Each precept is consistent with "sound principles of land use management". To facilitate public review of the proposed policy, the Citizens Advisory Commission established a Pet Policy Committee to conduct hearings on the proposed policy. A briefing memo for the record prepared by the Staff Assistant to General Superintendent dated April 3, 1978 acknowledged that 36 CFR 2.8 leash law was "applicable to all properties of GGNRA". NPS realized a special regulation would have to be prepared. "A deviation from this regulation will require the writing of a special regulation specific to GGNRA". The leash law was not enforced while the new policy was being developed: "Enforcement of the CFR has been non-existent until a dog policy and possibly a special regulation is established."

The 1979 Pet Policy was established as the official off-leash recreation policy for the GGNRA as required by the enabling statute and the promise made to the city. NPS issued press releases of the official off-leash policy (Lynn Thompson memo to Coalition For San Francisco Neighborhoods, 10/17/78). Again, NPS told San Francisco this policy was developed because the "[e]xisting federal regulations' were not "a viable situation in an urban area".

By summer of 1979, GGNRA had initiated the process to bring federal regulations into compliance with the enabling legislation and the off-leash policy. A draft special regulation 7.97(b) was submitted to the Western Regional Director NPS for approval. Department of Interior Solicitor Ralph Mihan reviewed the draft proposed regulation and found "the proposed regulation to be legally acceptable", but advised the formal request should include a "authorship statement or a statement of significance" which "must be included within the rulemaking package before its transmittal to Washington." (Ralph Mihan, Solicitor to Western Regional Director, Re: Proposed Rulemaking Golden Gate National Recreation Area (Pets), 7/23/79).

The draft proposed regulation in fact contained a statement of significance, the Section Seven Amendment was being proposed "because large portions of land formerly used as pet exercise areas have been included with Golden Gate National Recreation Area." (1/9/80 Regional Director memo to Superintendent GGNRA: Re: Proposed Special Regulation - Pets USPROD00386-8). The proposed regulation also called for public comment "within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the Federal Register."

Although this 1979 Pet Policy was consistent with the statutory mandate for the GGNRA to provide "needed recreational open space necessary for urban environment" and required by the promise made to San Francisco when city property was donated to the park, officials in Washington D.C. did not finalize the Section Seven Special Regulation to bring their regulations into compliance with the enabling statute. Subsequently the 1979 Pet Policy guidelines were incorporated into the 1982 Natural Resources Management Plan as Appendix C. The duplicity lay in the GGNRA's intentional failure to designate the 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation-the type of regulation referred to in the Memo dated 12/22/77 referenced above.

The significance of this will be apparent in 2001.



Finally, Director William J. Whalen's 1980 NPS Management Policies produced a systemwide change in overall policy and management. The clear directive was preservation first, recreation second."  
(Administrative History of Point Reyes National Seashore)

If you look at some of the GGNRA's management activities, you have cause to wonder if the GGNRA really wants us in "their park". For example, in 1989 the GGNRA, under the supervision of Brian O'Neill, signed on to a biosphere habitat program entitled "Man and Biosphere Habitat Programme" ("MAB" or "MAP"). One would be hard pressed to find a philosophy in greater conflict with the recreational priority of the GGNRA than that of Peter Bridgewater, Secretary of the MAB/MAP Programme, who has said, "Earth would be a better place if we had no people." The year of 1989, when the Biosphere program began, saw visitors drop by over 5 million in this Recreation Area that otherwise had shown steady growth in recreation visitors since they started tracking visitors in 1973.

In 1992 Bill Clinton's newly appointed Secretary of the Interior, Bruce Babitt, had a different vision for the National Parks System. A new anti-recreation ideology pervaded Park Service policy. Despite the legislative mandate that sound land use principles be applied "to maintain needed recreational open space necessary for urban environment", NPS summarily closed off in August of 1996:

over 15 miles off-leash recreational space in San Francisco

11 miles of trail in Presidio

2.2 miles at Ocean Beach

Lands End

Fort Miley

The aforementioned Diamont memo confirms that all closures affected areas used for this recreational activity before the park was established: Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Sutro Heights Park, Phelan Beach, Lands End, and Baker Beach. Diamont's comments concerning Ocean Beach explain why that closure has been unsuccessful:

"Ocean Beach: no rules should be enforced here. Ocean Beach is too large and too accessible to control dogs. It would be a logistical nightmare for the Park Service to try. Also lifestyles are such on Ocean Beach, that an inflexible NPS here could hurt our improving relations with visitors."

The DEIS states: "Since the 1990s, the San Francisco Bay Area population and overall use of GGNRA park sites have increased, as have the number of private and commercial dog walkers. At the same time, the number of conflicts between park users with and without dogs began to rise, as did the fear of dogs and dog bites or attacks."

With respect to the claim in the DEIS that use of the Recreation Area had increased, two points can be made. First, increased usage over time was anticipated when this National Recreation Area was created. The House Report No 92-1391 made clear that the GGNRA would be confronted with problems in San Francisco that would require careful planning because of the high volume year-round visitation:

"As a national urban recreation area, this new component of the national park system will be confronted with problems which do not frequently occur at other national park and recreation areas. Great numbers of people can be expected to use the area particularly those portions located in San Francisco County."  
(pg. 11)

There is no surprise here. Therefore, abandonment of the principles outlined in the enabling legislation, in an absence of appropriate monitoring of resources, as proposed in this DEIS/SEIS is not an acceptable management reaction to increased usage of the GGNRA by citizens.

Second, the number of park visitors has NOT increased dramatically over the past 20 years. In fact, in 1987 the GGNRA experienced its greatest number of visitors, coming in at 21,767,176 recreational visitors. According to NPS statistics, in 2010, the total number of recreational visitors was 14,271,503, down about 34% from 1988. The SEIS attempts to attribute the decrease in visitors to a change in statistical methods, eliminating the visitors to the San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park from the GGNRA count. However, the SEIS ultimately concludes annual visitation to the GGNRA is shown to have reached a capacity of 13 to 15 million visitors as the following graph shows. (The graph was a part of our DEIS Comment).

Consider also that in the past 20 years the GGNRA acreage has almost doubled in size, and expanded into San Mateo County. This puts a far larger population in direct proximity to the Recreation Area, yet the visitor numbers are down dramatically. Users of the GGNRA will tell you that this SEIS is just a reflection of the management priorities that Brian O'Neill started with his Biosphere commitment that have systematically denied and discouraged access for the public to this Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Evidence the issue was really a new ideology is the fact that the GGNRA experimented with changing its name to Golden Gate National Parks (GGNP) in an effort to convince citizens of the Bay Area that the paramount mission of the NPS is to bring the wilderness to the City. On August 28, 2001, the GGNRA Advisory Commission meeting was opened by Chair Rich Bartke as a regular meeting of the Advisory Commission to the National Parks in the Golden Gate Area. Mr. Bartke was asked to correct that reference by a concerned citizen, Michael Goldstein. Mr. Goldstein stated publicly in his comments to the Commission that this was not the first time he had addressed the Commission on this topic and that this practice of omitting the word "recreation" from the Park's name had become a matter of public concern. This runs counter to the intentions of the City of San Francisco and its citizens who had been promised that the GGNRA will remain an urban recreation area.

The DEIS further states: During this period (2001), it was clarified by the Department of Justice, U.S. Attorney, and the Department of the Interior Solicitor Offices that the voice-control policy then in effect at Fort Funston and other locations in the park was contrary to NPS regulations. In a public meeting in January 2001, the Commission acknowledged that the voice control policy was contrary to 36 CFR 2.15(a)(2), prohibiting off-leash dogs in national parks, and therefore illegal and unenforceable.

Now we see the significance of the GGNRA/ NPS decision to refrain from making the 1979 Pet Policy a Section Seven Special Regulation. By doing so, they were able to exercise "plausible deniability". In reality, this is just one more example of how the GGNRA has dealt in bad faith with the public whom they, in theory, serve.

The public and elected officials were incensed at the GGNRA change in policy. Indeed, in 2001, a Resolution was approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, detailing the history of the relationship between the City, the public and the GGNRA. The Resolution (and its findings) is so significant that it is quoted in full below:

RESOLUTION for S.F. Board of Supervisors Vote [Urging GGNRA to delay leash enforcement - Passed on December 10, 2001]

Resolution requesting the National Park Service to delay enforcing, in the San Francisco parks situated in the GGNRA, 36 C.F.R. 2.15, requiring pets to be on leash in national parks, until the ANPR process has been completed.

WHEREAS, In 1975, the City and County of San Francisco transferred Fort Funston and other City-owned park lands to the federal government to be included in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), to be administered by the National Park Service (NPS); and,

WHEREAS, The statute creating the GGNRA (16 U.S.C. Section 460bb) specifically states that the GGNRA was established to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to the urban environment and planning and requires that the Secretary of the Interior "utilize the resources in a manner which will provide for recreation and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management;" and,

WHEREAS, Former Charter section 7.403-1(a), as approved by the voters, required that the deed transferring any City-owned park lands to the NPS include the restriction that said lands were to be reserved by the Park Service "in perpetuity for recreation or park purposes with a right of reversion upon breach of said restriction;" and,

WHEREAS, When Fort Funston and other City-owned parks were transferred to the federal government, a federal regulation existed requiring all pets to be on leash in federal parks, yet the NPS chose not to enforce this regulation in the San Francisco City parks; and,

WHEREAS, In April 1978, the GGNRA stated its position that "the ordinary guidelines outlined in the Code of Federal regulations do not really apply in an urban area," and that "people and their animals have been visiting the park for too long to apply an all-inclusive arbitrary policy;" and,

WHEREAS, The Superintendent of the GGNRA in the spirit of this statement developed a draft pet policy and submitted it to the GGNRA Advisory Committee for further review and public hearings; and,

WHEREAS, In September of 1978, after extensive public hearings and public surveys, the Advisory Commission proposed guidelines for a pet policy for the San Francisco Unit of the GGNRA, designating Fort Funston, Lands End, Ocean Beach, Fort Miley, Baker Beach, and Crissy Field for continued off-leash recreation; and,

WHEREAS, On October 6, 1978, GGNRA General Superintendent Lynn Thompson accepted these designations with the following comment: "As you know, the Advisory Commission approved the proposed guidelines for a pet policy in the San Francisco Unit of the GGNRA at their September 27 meeting," and she continued, "We are accepting in total the Commission's recommendations for each of these areas;" and,

WHEREAS, On February 24, 1979, the GGNRA finalized the pet policy for both San Francisco and Marin County, establishing areas where pets could be exercised off-leash; and,

WHEREAS, In 1982, the 1979 Pet Policy was incorporated into the GGNRA Natural Resources Management Plan as Appendix C; and,

WHEREAS, On July 8, 1992, NPS Western Regional Director Stanley Albright assured U.S. Senator John Seymour that "there is no change in the 1979 Pet Policy which provides the visitor of walking one's dog off leash"; and,

WHEREAS, By letter dated July 8, 1992, Western Regional Director Stanley Albright also assured U.S. Senator Cranston that there would be no change in the 1979 Pet Policy; and,

WHEREAS, On February 5, 1999, Pacific Western Regional Director John Reynolds assured U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein that the "GGNRA has adopted a pet policy that is more liberal than the regulations enforced at other national park sites throughout the United States, where pets are required to be leashed at all times and are, for the most part, excluded from all but developed areas," and the letter continued, "[The] GGNRA has, with the assistance of the park's Advisory Commission, established a pet policy that allows some opportunity for visitors to enjoy a few designated areas as voice control areas where pets are allowed off leash;" and,

WHEREAS, On March 19, 1999, GGNRA Superintendent Brian O'Neill stated to U.S. Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, the "GGNRA has adopted a pet policy that is more liberal than pet regulations at other national park sites throughout the country... certain areas of the park have been designated as voice control areas where pets are permitted off-leash;" and,

WHEREAS, In November of 2000, the GGNRA Advisory Committee attempted to revoke the 1979 Pet Policy, but failed due to a point of order; and,

WHEREAS, On January 23, 2001, over 1,500 people attended the GGNRA Advisory Committee meeting to protest revocation of the 1979 Pet Policy, nine San Francisco supervisors spoke, and both Senator Speier and Assemblyman Shelley sent letters to be read by their representatives; and,

WHEREAS, The Advisory Committee recommended that the GGNRA hold meetings with stakeholder groups within the next 120 days to resolve the issue, and to not change leash enforcement for this period; and,

WHEREAS, The Advisory Committee at this meeting did not vote on the Pet Policy; and,

WHEREAS, Rather than hold stakeholder meetings, the GGNRA received permission from Washington for a more formal process called Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR), but this process has not begun; and,

WHEREAS, In November, 2001, the GGNRA began to aggressively enforce the leash requirement at Fort Funston, sending teams of law enforcement rangers for 2 to 3 hour segments, and issuing tickets for walking dogs off-leash without initiating the ANPR process in good faith with the public; and,

WHEREAS, Off-leash recreational users believe that off-leash recreation is legal at Fort Funston, and they agreed to go through the ANPR process and further rulemaking in order to obtain a special rule for the GGNRA that specifically recognizes that off-leash dog-walking is permissible in certain GGNRA parks; and,

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco finds that the recent enforcement of 36 C.F.R. 2.15 is in contravention to the representations made to the public at the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting on January 23, 2001; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby requests the National Park Service not to enforce, in the GGNRA parks which were donated to the federal government by the City and County of San Francisco, 36 C.F.R. 2.15, which requires that all pets be on leash in federal parks, until the ANPR process has been satisfactorily completed; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby requests the NPS to advise the Board as to the status of the ANPR process; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall send copies of this resolution to the offices of United States Senator Dianne Feinstein, United States Senator Barbara Boxer, Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, Congressman Tom Lantos, State Senator John Burton, State Senator Jackie Speier, Assemblywoman Carole Migden, Assemblyman Kevin Shelley, GGNRA Superintendent Brian O'Neill and the National Park Service.

Unfortunately, the GGNRA ignored the Resolution, and in 2002 instituted a ban on off-leash recreation and began ticketing dog guardians for recreating with their dogs off-leash. As mentioned in the Resolution, pressure from the City of San Francisco to take back the management of these properties in the courts, as well as the Federal court confirming other violations of law the GGNRA had been guilty of, caused the GGNRA to invite the public to petition the Federal government for the ability to create a Section Seven Special Regulation for off-leash recreation in the GGNRA (ANPR).

The public submitted thousands upon thousands of requests to the Federal government, and a Federal Panel reviewed the history and legal agreements for the GGNRA. The Federal Panel that reviewed the applicable authorities, policies, planning guidelines, and information on Park setting, natural and cultural resources, and public safety developed the following observation (among others):

"GGNRA parkland is immediately adjacent to San Francisco, one of the most densely populated urban centers in the United States of America, and manages a significant portion of recreational open space in the city. Most residents do not have 'backyards' or access to private open space to exercise their pets off-leash. Residents rely on the close proximity of GGNRA open space for this purpose." (ANPR Decision Documents; Federal Panel Recommendations, *supra*, Section 3, emphasis added.)

"... [the GGNRA should] clearly distinguish between on-leash, off-leash, and no pet areas to avoid management and public confusion. " (Federal Panel Recommendation to the General Superintendent on Proposed Rulemaking for Pet Management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Section 4 ("Federal Panel Recommendations"). p. 11 (Revised November 7, 2002). [See [http://www.nps.gov/goga/pets/anpr/pdf/federal\\_panel\\_recommendation.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/goga/pets/anpr/pdf/federal_panel_recommendation.pdf).]

The Federal Panel concluded in its November 2002 recommendation to the GGNRA it would be appropriate to create a Section Seven Special Regulation to allow off-leash recreation in the GGNRA.

At that time, the GGNRA could have instituted the 1979 Pet Policy as the Section Seven Special Regulation for the GGNRA. Instead, they decided to institute Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) to create a new pet management policy for the GGNRA.

Prior to NR starting, in 2004, a Federal magistrate reviewing tickets issued to dog guardians determined that the 1979 Pet Policy had been illegally rescinded, and re-instated the 1979 Pet Policy as the controlling law for off-leash recreation in the GGNRA

Again, even with the legal protection of a court order, the GGNRA chose not to institute the 1979 Pet Policy as the new Section Seven Special Regulation. Instead, the GGNRA appealed the Federal Court's decision. In 2005 the GGNRA lost their appeal. The 1979 Pet Policy was affirmed as the controlling pet policy in the GGNRA.

Judge Alsup of the Federal Court noted in his decision affirming reinstatement of the 1979 Pet Policy in the GGNRA, his findings regarding the history of pet management in the GGNRA:

"In sum, for more than twenty years, the GGNRA officially designated at least seven sites for off-leash

use. This was not accidental. It was a carefully articulated, often studied, promulgation. The responsible GGNRA officials in 1978 and thereafter presumably believed they were acting lawfully. Even now, the government concedes that the GGNRA had full authority at all times to relax the general leash rule at the GGNRA but argues it could have done so, at least after 1983, only via a "special regulation." In other words, the agency allegedly used the "wrong" procedure back in 1978 (and thereafter) even though a "right" procedure to reach the desired result was available and could have been used. The government has not revealed its internal justification for following the "wrong" process.

Whatever it was, the justification was abandoned in 2002 with the two-word explanation that it had been "in error." With this ipse dixit, the NPS wiped away two decades of policy, practice, promulgations, and promises to the public." (United States v. Barley, Order Of Affirmance, supra, p. 5.)

The GGNRA continued to flout both recommendations that it solicited from the Federal Panel and the Court decision to reinstate the 1979 Pet Policy as the law governing pet management in the GGNRA. In 2007, Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management and Science for the GGNRA was quoted in the San Francisco Chronicle as saying: "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sand box or their backyard."

While Superintendent O'Neill gratuitously stated that the Court "effectively reinstated the 1979 Pet Policy", the GGNRA refused to acknowledge the reinstatement of the 1979 Pet Policy in the manner prescribed by law, 36 C.F.R. Section i.7(b). There was no written designation of the reinstated off-leash properties; indeed, the GGNRA used this murky situation to continue to harass and ticket off-leash dog-walkers in areas that were off-leash pursuant to the 1979 Pet Policy and amendments thereto. In addition, the GGNRA, in violation of 36 C.F.R. Section 1.7(a)(4), persisted in ignoring the Court's ruling and misinforming the public. For example, on the NPS website, under the heading, "Dogwalking Information and Regulations", a statement dated June 8, 2005, proclaims: "Due to the recent court ruling, this information is under review and will be revised shortly." A brochure found online at the NPS website entitled, "Enjoying the Park with your Dog", advises readers that, "Where dogs are permitted, Federal law requires that they be on a leash, not to exceed six feet in length, in all units of the National Park System."

In addition, for over a year, GGNRA management refused to change the signage in the Park to reflect the Court's ruling in derogation of 36 C.F.R. Section i.7(a)(1)(4). For photo documentation of the illegal signage (see <http://oceanbeachdog.home.mindspring.com/id8.html>). This illegal and confusing signage clearly created user conflict and was detrimental to the safety and enjoyment of those visiting the GGNRA.

We would add as an aside at this point, objectives listed in this DEIS/SEIS were the desire to enhance Visitor experience and Safety, enhanced compliance with Dog Rules, and Park Operations. It should be evident from this point in GGNRA history, that the greatest obstacle to fulfilling these objectives was and still is GGNRA Management itself.

Despite the fact that GGNRA management had been given permission to create a Section Seven Special Regulation for off-leash recreation in the GGNRA by the Federal Panel and by the Court when the Court reinstated the 1979 Pet Policy, the Superintendent refused to make the 1979 Pet Policy a Section Seven Special Regulation. He instead instituted a Negotiated Rulemaking (NR) process that was conducted in bad faith, was unlawful and did not reach consensus. The GGNRA refused to acknowledge the 1979 Pet Policy as the logical starting point for NR. In fact, the 1979 Pet Policy was not listed as a document the NR Committee would be able to refer to within the NR process. The GGNRA continued to cling to their view that the 1979 Pet Policy was an illegitimate document which NEVER had the power of law despite the contrary findings of the Court.

NR required consensus among participants. If consensus was not reached for a Section Seven Special Regulation, the GGNRA was allowed to create a Rule arbitrarily, as it did when they rescinded the 1979 Pet Policy. In fact, even if the NR did reach consensus, the GGNRA maintained that they were still free to ignore the findings of the NR process and subsequently create its own rule.

The GGNRA selected the participating groups and their representatives. Six of the nineteen groups that participated had submitted a petition to the Federal government asking that ALL off-leash recreation in the GGNRA be banned. These same groups had both publicly and privately stated they saw NR as a means to eliminate off-leash recreation from the GGNRA entirely. Despite protests, they remained on the NR Committee.

Dr. Valente was initially slated to participate in NR as a representative for Ocean Beach DOG (OBDOG). When she discovered the flawed manner in which this process was to be conducted, she complained. Instead of resolving our legitimate complaints about the process, the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI threw her off the NR Committee. NR predictably came to an end without consensus, and was a colossal waste of taxpayer money to the tune of over five hundred thousand dollars.

Subsequently, the initiation of the DEIS was announced. The explanation for this might be found in a quote from then Western Regional Director (now NPS Director) Jon Jarvis. At the NPS Centennial Initiative Listening Session (Presidio Officer's Club, San Francisco, Calif., March 22, 2007) Director Jarvis said to Dr. Suzanne Valente and Stephen Golub (and we quote), "I would rather give up those [the GGNRA] properties than have dogs running loose on them."

In 2008, the GGNRA supported an attempt by Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi to surreptitiously slip a name change (and therefore a change in the governing mandates) from National Recreation Area to National Park through bill H.R. 6305. This action can be construed as an admission that the NPS/GGNRA is aware their actions do not conform to the enabling legislation. Public outcry upon the discovery of this section in HR 6305 forced Congresswoman Pelosi to withdraw her blatant attempt to circumvent the will of the people and the Federal Court.

In 2011, we were presented with a 2400 page DEIS. In 2013, we are now presented with a 1500 page SEIS.

#### Evaluation Of The Actual DEIS/SEIS

The enabling legislation of the GGNRA requires that the GGNRA "utilize sound principles of land use planning and management". National Park managers are directed by federal law and National Park Service policies and guidance to know the status and trends in the condition of natural resources under their stewardship. NPS describes this process as "monitoring of the vital signs".

There is absolutely no legitimate "monitoring of the vital signs" of the GGNRA to support the premise of this DEIS/SEIS. The failure to complete vital signs monitoring in a competent manner violates the enabling legislation as well as the following list of laws enumerated in the NPS resource "Vital Signs Monitoring" (see <http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/monitor/LawsPolicy.cfm>):

- " National Park Service Organic Act
- " General Authorities Act of 1970
- " Redwood National Park Act
- " National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
- " Clean Water Act

" Clean Air Act  
" Endangered Species Act of 1973  
" Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970  
" Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972  
" Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972  
" National Parks Omnibus Management Act

The failure to complete competent "vital monitoring" results in the following fatal flaws in this DEIS/SEIS:

- 1) The Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS provides no site specific peer-reviewed studies to substantiate the claims of resource degradation or destruction. Instead, the SEIS attempts to substitute a review of the "literature" regarding studies in other locations to establish potential harm to the Recreation Area. It is upon this premise of potential harm that they base their proposed restrictions upon the access of humans and their dogs to the Recreation Area.
- 2) The Draft Plan/ DEIS/SEIS assumes but does not provide the required rigorous analysis that resource conditions result solely from dog use of the sites, discounting the contribution from other visitors and recreational users. The Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS does not address the contribution of other impactful activities, including special events, to the resource conditions and existing impacts at each of the GGNRA sites.
- 3) In many places, the Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS does not provide any data on actual impacts by dogs in areas being proposed for new dog walking restrictions. The words can, may, and could are everywhere in place of hard facts which would have been in evidence had the required "vital monitoring" been done. In places where data are provided, the Draft Plan/ DEIS/SEIS makes undocumented assumptions of unacceptable impacts and that dogs are the culprits.
- 4) The Draft Plan/ DEIS/SEIS assumes species are present in areas where there is no record of their presence. In other places, there is inconsistent information about the presence of species.
- 5) Many of the findings in the Draft Plan/ DEIS/SEIS are founded on a reference included in these documents as Appendix G, "Law Enforcement Data" (NPS 2008c). In the DEIS there was no tangible data. For example, an entry is as follows: "observed a black dog chasing a flock of 14 snowy plovers. I observed the dog chasing the birds from the water to the dunes and up and down the beach for several hundred meters north and south. The dog would charge at the birds and the Plovers would fly away from the dog. Each time the Plovers would attempt to land, the dog would charge directly at them and cause them to take flight again. I watched this happen for continually for eight minutes timed by my watch from 1150 to 1158 hours. Then the dog stopped chasing the Plovers and wandered in the hilly dunes to the north/or several minutes. The dog then returned to chasing the Snowy Plovers for a few minutes more... After the dog ceased chasing the Plovers, they stopped taking flight and started feeding at the water line." Clearly, if this dog was chasing plovers, they would not have returned to feeding at the water line after the chase was over. Plovers feed at the high tide line when the water has already retreated. These were sanderlings, birds that appear almost identical to the plover, are plentiful at Ocean Beach (not threatened or endangered) and can be differentiated by different feeding patterns and different resting patterns. However, in the Appendix G for the SEIS, we have a plethora of graphs outlining the number of violations by area of the GGNRA and year. However, because we have no idea about the level of visitation at each area, there is no context. For 2001-2006, they merely show the number of violations within all of the GGNRA per year. We can see that for 2006, there are 3943 violations, and dog related violations are about 6% of the total. The information we really need, and the GGNRA fails to provide, is that dogs were involved in approximately 227 violations when 13.5 million visitors (many with dogs) came to the GGNRA in 2006. Does this level of infractions justify a decision at that time to radically change the Dog Management policy?
- 6) If you read the Affected Environment section carefully, you will learn that there are no plant species which are endangered or threatened on Federal or State registers that have designated "critical habitat" in



the GGNRA. If we look at the ESA and the enabling legislation for the GGNRA, there is no reason to displace recreation to enhance the growth of any of these listed plants in the GGNRA. However, we see that GGNRA management has displaced recreational access to plant these plants with regularity, the most egregious location being Fort Funston.

7) The Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS assumes, but fails to demonstrate, the "cause and effect" relationship that where dogs are present within GGNRA sites, there is a disturbance of natural resources or demonstrate that the disturbance of resources is attributable to dogs (versus other factors).

8) Because the SEIS does not recognize recreational resources as an environmental resource, the analysis of the environmentally preferable alternative is flawed. Recreation is identified in the GGNRA enabling legislation as one of the four outstanding values to be maintained and protected. In doing so, the enabling legislation recognizes that the achievement of these outstanding values is not mutually exclusive.

9) When new lands become part of GGNRA, the recreational uses existing at the time of acquisition should be allowed to continue unless GGNRA determines, through the public land planning (vital monitoring), peer review of their findings, and NEPA process that unacceptable impairment would occur.

10) The Draft Plan/DEIS/SEIS not only fails to disclose and evaluate the impacts of the alternatives on recreational resources in the context of an urban environment, it dismisses the quality of the urban environment entirely on page 24 where it states, "the quality of urban areas is not a significant factor in determining a dog management plan." As recognized in its enabling legislation, one of the most important aspects of the GGNRA is the sharp contrast between its undeveloped open spaces and the adjacent developed urban environment. The GGNRA's open space and recreational opportunities are intended to provide refuge and relief for nearby urban dwellers. According to NEPA, An EIS is required to analyze the human environment. The federal NEPA rules define the human environment and its scope in an EIS as follows: "Human environment shall be interpreted comprehensively to include the natural and physical environment and the relationship of people with that environment." When an EIS is prepared and human and natural/ physical environmental effects are interrelated, the EIS should discuss all of these effects on the human environment.

The flaws listed above will be highlighted by further analysis of the Western Snowy Plover at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, the Bank Swallow at Fort Funston, Sweeney Ridge, Mori Point, Muir Beach and review of trails in Marin County. We would point out that flawed studies without peer review have been utilized in the interim between the Federal Court's reinstatement of the 1979 Pet Policy and this DEIS/SEIS to implement access restrictions at Ocean Beach, Crissy Field and other sites. All of these closures were unlawful which is why we insist the original 1979 Pet Policy be reinstated and codified as a Section Seven Special Regulation at this time. Additionally, new sites added since 1979 must have appropriate studies and peer review before historical usage is modified.

The failure to peer review scientific information before release to the public or inclusion into this DEIS/SEIS violates the following laws:

" Information Quality Act

Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.

E.O. 12866, 1(b)(7), 2(b)

" OMB Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review (70 FR 2664-2677)

" DOI draft 305 DM 4 Peer Review

" NPS Director's Order 11B: Ensuring Quality of Information Disseminated by the National Park Service

" Secretary of the Interior's December 21, 2007 memorandum "Ensuring Integrity in Scientific Activities"

" E.O. 12866

" 5 U.S.C. 301

" 43 CFR 20.501, 20.502, 20.502(a)

" Federal Policy on Research Misconduct 65 FR 76260-76264

" Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch 5 CFR 2635

" 16 U.S.C. 1-4

" NPS Management Policies 2006, Chapters 1,2,4,5,7,8,10.

" DO # 11B Ensuring Quality of Information Disseminated by the National Park Service

" DO #12 Environmental Impact Analysis

" DO #19 Records Management

" DO #78 Social Science, Section III.I (Peer Review)

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6688	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	N/A, UN N/A United States of America
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** Alleged Protection For The Western Snowy Plover

This DEIS/SEIS proposes to further restrict dogs at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field based upon an alleged necessity to protect the Western Snowy Plover. The language of the Endangered Species Act contemplates and supports the position that any loss of these recreational areas for such purpose be balanced by scientific proof that such sacrifice will indeed help save the plover from extinction.

The requisite monitoring of the plover (as dictated by NPS regulations) in the GGNRA has not been completed in a manner that would provide scientific proof of a need for restrictions. In fact, even the GGNRA admitted in 1996 that the "scientific evidence" showed that restriction of off-leash recreation will not increase the number of plovers at Ocean Beach. It is more likely that the restriction of off-leash recreation in these areas will negatively impact the plover population. Studies in other areas fail to substantiate the GGNRA's plan to limit access in the GGNRA to benefit the plover.

Monitoring in areas like Surf Beach at Vandenburg AFB has confirmed there was an increase in plover breeding pairs and viability before restrictions were instituted. In 2011, it was confirmed there has been no increase in breeding pairs since 1995 when restrictions were instituted, and only 39% of the fledglings survived due to predation. It is generally presumed the presence of dogs and humans discourages the presence of predators such as the fox.

Twenty-five years after Massachusetts started shutting down entire beaches to protect the piping plover, they're still struggling to survive. But crowded places like Revere Beach, with its 2.5 million annual visitors, have been forcing environmentalists to reconsider their assumptions. Even on raucous Sandwich beaches in 2008, when bonfires and fireworks weren't uncommon, 41 plover pairs fledged 87 chicks. Maybe the best way to help the plover is to stop worrying so much.

There was a "study" at Ocean Beach in 1996 by Daphne Hatch, GGNRA Wildlife Biologist, which was more of an inventory assessment, and its conclusions are fatally flawed. I will review that "study" in detail later in this document. The next "study" the GGNRA performed with respect to this "threatened" resource at Ocean Beach was in 2006. Hardly an example of vital signs monitoring that meets the standards described in NPS documents. Restrictions were implemented at both Ocean Beach and Crissy Field based upon this "study", although the "study" was only conducted at Ocean Beach. Further, without mitigation measures implemented over this 10 year time span, and without coordination of intermittent monitoring, it is impossible to draw any conclusions as to the benefit of restricting or eliminating dogs within these respective ecosystems. U.C. Berkeley Environmental Sciences study presented on May 7, 2007 a peer reviewed study that concludes within the GGNRA that the feeding of the Western Snowy Plover does not appear to be negatively affected by human and pet recreation. This study has been ignored by the GGNRA, even though the study was conducted with GGNRA cooperation. The last

"study" of the plover in the DEIS was performed in 2008, and is at Crissy Field only. That "study" was reviewed and discredited in our Comment on the DEIS. Our analysis is contained within this document even though the "study" was omitted in the SEIS.

#### Is The Western Snowy Plover In Danger Of Extinction?

The best scientific data currently available establishes that the Western Snowy Plover is not threatened or endangered (at risk for extinction) at all. Significantly, a study commissioned by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the US Geological Service (USGS) in June of 2000 noted: "Coastal and inland populations of Snow y Plovers in the western United States are currently being managed separately; coastal populations are protected as a Distinct Population Segment under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, while inland populations are not listed. Our stud y provides no evidence of genetic differentiation between coastal and inland populations." [emphasis added] These findings demonstrate that the Western Snowy Plover population is far greater than previously believed, and so large as to no longer qualify the Western Snowy Plover as either threatened or endangered.

#### Why Is The Western Snowy Plover Still Considered Threatened With Extinction?

The latest decision by the USFWS to continue to keep the Western Snowy Plover (WSP) on the Endangered Species List (ESL) is a clear example of the violation of the Endangered Species' Act's requirement that decisions be "based upon the best scientific and commercial data available ". Traditional tenets of science (the scientific method) have been ignored to justify this conclusion.

The scientific method is the process by which scientists, collectively and over time, endeavor to construct an accurate (that is, reliable, consistent and non-arbitrary) representation of the world. In summary, the scientific method attempts to minimize the influence of bias or prejudice in the experimenter when testing a hypothesis or a theory.

The scientific method has four steps

1. Observation and description of a phenomenon or group of phenomena. Based upon monitoring of the movements of the plovers on the west coast (the WSP) and inland plovers, and the perceived decline of the WSP, the USFWS became concerned as they believed the WSP was a species distinct from the large inland population of plovers, and as such required protection from extinction. The Western Snowy Plover was first listed as a threatened species in 1993. Quoting the USFWS (all of their quotes will be italicized):

"The 1993 listing rule stated that the Pacific Coast WSP is "genetically isolated" from the interior breeding populations (58 FR 12864). We based this conclusion on banding and monitoring data, not genetic data. At the time of listing, we assumed the reproductive separation indicated by the banding data, over time, could lead to genetic differentiation. Genetic data for the western snowy plover was not available in 1993."

2. Formulation of a hypothesis to explain the phenomena. The hypothesis, as stated above, was: Because there was little or no breeding observed between the WSP and the inland population of plovers, the WSP was genetically different than the large population of plovers living inland, and being in decline, the WSP required protection.

3. Use of the hypothesis to predict the existence of other phenomena, or to predict quantitatively the results of new observations. Should genetic testing be performed, the USFWS expected to see genetic differences between the coastal WSP population and the large inland population, which would confirm the need for protection of the WSP. The USFWS had no genetic data to confirm their hypothesis. However, apparently the ESA allows the USFWS to move to protect a species first, and investigate to be sure, later. There are timelines specified by law as to how long the USFWS has to test their hypothesis, and it does seem they were abused. In the meantime, measures were taken to protect the WSP, which

included most notably for the public, restriction of beach access.

4. Performance of experimental tests of the predictions by several independent experimenters and properly performed experiments. In fact, a study was done many years later funded and approved by the USFWS and the USGS to test the USFWS hypothesis.

"...a master's thesis (Gorman 2000) that did not find evidence of genetic differentiation between the Pacific Coast WSP and western interior snowy plover populations using mitochondrial DNA (mt DNA). "

The Scientific method concludes: If the experiments bear out the hypothesis it may come to be regarded as a theory or law of nature.... If the experiments do not bear out the hypothesis, it must be rejected or modified.

So, now that the USFWS hypothesis had been disproved, and the WSP could not be distinguished genetically from the very large inland plover population did the USFWS move to delist the WSP? NO. In fact, they continued to proceed to implement management policies to protect the WSP, further restricting the public's access to beaches on the Western coast. Several entities (City of Morro Bay and Surf Ocean Beach Commission) who were suffering due to those management policies decided to sue the USFWS to force them to re-evaluate this situation.

The announcement to retain the WSP's listing as a threatened species on April 21, 2006 is the USFWS response to this lawsuit. It appears that the USFWS, not wishing to delist the plover, refused to reject their hypothesis or modify their hypothesis that the WSP was genetically different, even though it had been reliably disproved. It is not revealed in the announcement how this came about, but it appears that the USFWS authorized another study in an attempt to refute this first study that disproved their hypothesis. USFWS stalled the court proceedings, possibly because they were counting upon the results of this second study using another method of DNA testing to substantiate their original hypothesis that the WSP was genetically different from the large inland population. The second study confirmed the results of the first.

"...a more recent study by Funk et al. (2006) includes analysis of microsatellite DNA markers. Funk et al. (2006) found no statistically significant genetic differentiation between Pacific Coast WSP and western interior snowy plover populations using mtDNA and microsatellite DNA markers. "

Did the USFWS at this point acknowledge their hypothesis was incorrect and move to delist the WSP because it is the same creature as the large population of plovers who live inland and whose numbers require no protection from extinction? NO.

Perhaps most telling is the general opinion of Daniel Funk who provided the second DNA study, and whom the USFWS certainly chose to rely upon: "... it is important to use data from a wide range of criteria-interbreeding, nuclear DNA, behavior, morphology, ecology, etc.-not just mtDNA, when delimiting species boundaries."

This is indeed a disturbing concept, because this indicates Mr. Funk and the USFWS are quite comfortable setting public policy that restricts public access to thousands of miles of beach property based upon their personal definition of a species which may ignore verifiable hard DNA data in deference to intangible and/or incomplete data which is subject to bias. The USFWS chose to rely upon outdated, observational data regarding the lack of interbreeding of the WSP and the larger inland population to conclude that these two populations are separate and distinct and that the WSP should therefore, still be protected.

"In this finding, we rely primarily on the banding and resighting efforts conducted during the period of

1984 through 1993, as this is the period when banding efforts were underway at several areas on the Pacific coast and in the western interior, and nest monitoring studies and breeding season surveys were underway at many locations when banded birds could be detected. Interior populations have not been banded since 1993 (L. Stenzel, in litt. 2005)."

Furthermore, the USFWS ignored yet another fundamental of the Scientific Method in the interpretation of this outdated data. The USFWS recruited four heavily biased researchers in favor of protection of the snowy plover to examine the banding data. All four are associated closely with the Audubon Society or Point Reyes Bird Observatory (PRBO). The Audubon Society formally opposed the delisting of the plover and officials at PRBO are in large part responsible for the initial listing of the plover as threatened. Not surprisingly, their conclusions were as follows:

"...we conclude that the Pacific Coast WSP is markedly separate from other populations of the subspecies due to behavioral differences and that it, therefore, meets the requirements of our DPS policy for discreteness. Banding studies and resighting efforts demonstrate that during breeding, the Pacific Coast WSP segregates geographically from other members of the subspecies, even those that also winter on the Pacific coast. Although not absolute, this segregation is marked and significant. "... This behavioral difference tends to set Pacific Coast WSP individuals apart from the interior birds with which they may mix during the winter."

The USFWS has chosen to deviate from established scientific method, ignore incontrovertible, tangible, and specific data such as the two DNA studies, and rely instead upon clearly biased assumptions regarding the behavior and breeding of the WSP to justify their decision. The decision requires the USFWS to assume that there is little or no interbreeding between the populations. The decision requires the USFWS to assume that should the coastal plover population be lost, the inland population could not recolonize the coast. Neither of these assumptions has the benefit of reliable, incontrovertible data.

Therefore, since 20% of the plovers have decided they prefer to "hang out" on west coast beaches rather than with the rest of the genetically identical plovers inland, the general public will not be allowed that privilege.

For those unfamiliar with the genetic lexicon, consider how it is the Courts and the medical community determine the father of a child when it is in doubt. DNA tests are the standard test utilized, to the exclusion of all others. It would be a gross injustice for the Court to disregard DNA evidence that confirms the child's father is Mr. A, and instead conclude the child's father is Mr. B simply because the child behaved more like Mr. B.

Decisions made based upon intangibles, and without deference to hard, reliable scientific data are subject to abuse of discretion; and are the antithesis of the established "scientific method" which goes to great lengths to minimize the influence of bias or prejudice in the experimenter when testing an hypothesis or a theory. The Endangered Species Act requires decisions to be based upon science's best evidence, not ideology nor politics as it has been in the case of the Western Snowy Plover.

While I and others understand that the GGNRA cannot choose to ignore management of the Western Snowy Plover unless and until the USFWS formally delists the plover, we believe this evidence should temper the decision making when it will result in depriving the public of valuable recreational resources, as expressed in the language of the ESA.

Will Banning Dogs At Ocean Beach Help Protect The Plover From Extinction?

Putting aside the controversy as to whether the Western Snowy Plover is threatened with extinction or not, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS") Draft Recovery Plan for the Western Snowy

Plover can answer this question. The Recovery Plan states that the Western Snowy Plover does not nest or breed at the Ocean Beach location. The Draft Recovery Plan also indicates that despite implementation of best management practices, this location (Ocean Beach) holds NO promise for the plover to nest or breed there in the future. (Table B-1, p. B-11.) Conversations with Gary Page of the Point Reyes Bird Observatory (a central contributor to the USFWS Draft Recovery Plan) reveal that this conclusion was drawn primarily because the level of human activity is too high on some California beaches to ever support a breeding population of the plover. This is consistent with the conclusions of a UK study (specifically identified in the new studies section of this comment) which states, "Sites that are highly disturbed are not used by breeding birds, and therefore any increase in disturbance levels on these sites will not alter population size". Thus, the state of the evidence is that the survival/extinction of the Western Snowy Plover population will not be impacted by the management of Ocean Beach.

And in fact, the GGNRA is well aware that the number of plovers on Ocean Beach is not directly related to the number of people or dogs present on the beach. Indeed, the first Hatch Report regarding the WSP and dogs at Ocean Beach concluded: "Factors other than number of people or dogs, possibly beach slope and width, appear to exert greater influence over Snowy Plover numbers on Ocean Beach." (1996 Hatch Report, p. 10, emphasis added.) Further, Daphne Hatch's 1996 study for the GGNRA documented that since the off-leash policy was officially sanctioned in 1979, there has been an increase of more than 100 percent in the number of snowy plovers frequenting Ocean Beach. Even dog "rush hours" don't seem to faze the plovers- at least, GGNRA observers and analysts couldn't find any negative relationship between the number of dogs on the beach at any given time and the number of plovers on the beach at the same time (pg. 10, 13). Faced with this evidence, GGNRA officials twice acknowledged, at a December 16, 1996 "informational meeting" for San Francisco beachgoers, that banning off-leash recreation or banning dogs entirely at Ocean Beach would have NO effect on the number of plovers on Ocean Beach. Despite this finding, the 2006 Hatch report, the DEIS and SEIS still recommend the restriction of off-leash recreation at Ocean Beach.

#### The USFWS Declines To List Ocean Beach Or Crissy Field As Critical Habitat For The Western Snowy Plover

As stated before, the fate of the purportedly threatened Western Snowy Plover ("WSP") at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field will have no impact upon the overall survival of the species. Consider that the language of the Endangered Species Act ("ESA") itself states:

"The Secretary (of the Interior) may exclude any area from critical habitat if he determines that the benefits of such exclusion outweigh the benefits of specifying that area as critical habitat, unless he determines, based upon the best scientific and commercial data available, that the failure to designate such area as critical habitat will result in extinction of the species concerned."

In concurrence, effective October 31, 2005 and again in 2011, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS") excluded all areas in the City and County of San Francisco as critical habitat for the WSP. In the text of the explanation of their decision in 2005, USFWS made the following findings:

"Our current designation of critical habitat is different from the 1999 rule in two primary ways. In this designation, we utilized a different methodology for determining essential areas, and we relied upon additional scientific information which was not available in 1999. Thus, this rule, while similar in many respects to that in 1999, is a new designation, and does not designate the same areas. "

With respect to Ocean Beach, the following is stated:

"We have decided not to include the suggested additional areas because they do not meet our three criteria from the Methods section: They do not support either sizeable nesting populations or wintering populations, nor do they provide unique habitat or facilitate genetic exchange between otherwise widely separated units. Although we do not consider these areas essential for recovery, we do consider them important, and will continue to review projects in these areas that might affect WSP as required by

sections 7 and 10 of the Act. "

Allowing humans and off-leash dogs to enjoy Ocean Beach is not a new project; it is an activity that has persisted on Ocean Beach for well over 50 years. The language of the ESA contemplates and supports the position that any loss of these recreational areas be balanced by scientific proof that such sacrifice will indeed help save the WSP from extinction. Clearly, the decision not to include Ocean Beach or Crissy Field as critical habitat demonstrates that such scientific evidence cannot be provided.

#### Daphne Hatch's 1996 Study Is Fatally Flawed

Because the data do not support a conclusion that restricting off-leash recreation or banning dogs at Ocean Beach will increase the number of plovers, Daphne Hatch chooses to instead focus on the "disturbance" of the plover at Ocean Beach. However, no published study of a breeding bird quantifies the population consequences of disturbance. This is despite the fact that disturbance has been implied as a factor causing population decline for a wide range of species (Birdlife International 2000). Not surprisingly, it is postulated by Ms. Hatch that the energy expended by the plovers to avoid the disturbing dog is detrimental to their overall health and ability to breed, and as expected, no evidence is cited for such a conclusion. It is merely stated in the study, "little research has been conducted on the energetic effects of disturbance and whether individuals can compensate for this lost energy intake and the increased energy expenditure" (p.13). The NPS/GGNRA must consider the fact that the plover is known to annually migrate over 1,000 kilometers. In proportion to their size, this is the equivalent of a 6-foot human running 290 marathons. Does the energy expended when a plover moves 20 or 30 yards to avoid a roaming dog amount to anything significant? Common sense would indicate that the "disturbance" issue has been substantially overblown, and no scientific study exists to contradict such common sense.

Out of 5,692 dogs observed during the one-and-a-half year study by Ms. Hatch, less than one third of one-percent chased plovers, and none ever caught or harmed one. An even smaller number "inadvertently" disturbed plovers, causing them to walk, run or sometimes fly out of reach. (Id., at 11-13.) See Figure 1 below.

On the other hand, Ms. Hatch did not document the more significant matter of the deaths and disturbances of plovers perpetrated by predators such as the gull, raven, and crow. The gull, raven, and crow are documented predators of the plover, while dogs are not. Ravens are black, cousins of the crow, and larger than crows - generally about two feet long. Federal officials, who attribute the soaring numbers of ravens to sharp increases in road-kill and garbage from fast food restaurants, admit that the population explosion is troubling, given the bird's intelligence.

The Hatch Report is an excellent example as to why scientific studies vary in reliability. Based upon the standards set forth in the scientific community, Ms. Hatch's study qualifies as "junk science", that is, "a publication that has the tone and trappings of science, but is so fundamentally and demonstrably flawed as to lack any serious claim to credibility." Further, this study does not meet the minimum requirements for legitimate "vital monitoring" within the NPS.

The Hatch study is at best an inventory assessment for the Western Snowy Plover. When viewed in the context of universally accepted scientific study guidelines, I find there are several reasons for relegating the Hatch Report to "junk science". First, it is merely an observational study. This means its conclusions are not based upon specific, quantifiable measurements, but instead upon observations. Observations alone allow for the participant's natural biases and subjectivity to influence the results. A credible scientific study to determine the success of, for example, a hair growth product, would dictate that the same person would observe the patients at the beginning and end of the treatment to assess the patients' baseline and subsequent hair growth (or lack thereof). This would eliminate the differences inherent in the observations of different people. The evaluator should have no affiliation with any of the manufacturers

of the different products tested, and would not know which patient used which product. This is necessary to eliminate an evaluator's desire (even if it is subconscious) to favor a particular product. In contrast, the evaluators in the Hatch study consisted of several different volunteers; accordingly, there was no consistency as to the observations. Some evaluators may have characterized plover movement as a disturbance; others might have believed the plover moved on its own. Moreover, the volunteers were all bird enthusiasts, and the specific focus of their study was humans and dogs. As a result, the very premise of the study would lead the volunteers to subjectively and/or subconsciously expect and desire to document disturbance of the plover by dogs and their owners.

The effects of other wildlife and other possible interferences with the plover's daily activities were given but brief mention and not factored into the study in any meaningful way. These issues include the following: beach cleaning, off-road vehicles driven at night, activity of specific predators, non-native vegetation, shoreline erosion control projects (bulldozers), the actual width of the beach available to the plover, weather, helicopters, airplanes, bicycles, vehicles used during the day by Park staff, kites, and an oil spill. An evaluator cannot distinguish the reason or reasons why a plover flies away to another spot given the presence of a dog 40 feet away, a raven 50 feet away, and a plane flying overhead. Yet in the Hatch study, it seems clear the dog would be identified as the factor that disturbed the plover. The Hatch study is one that does not compensate for participant bias, and is not able to effectively associate cause and effect because too many variables are unaccounted for. Hence the study is indeed "junk science". Daphne Hatch's conclusions are without merit, and perhaps worse, led to action which may have harmed the plover at Ocean Beach.

These facts raise the other problem with the operative hypothesis in a study concluding that off leash dogs are detrimental to plovers. Because the Hatch study at Ocean Beach ignores gulls, ravens and crows entirely, there is no data to determine whether the presence of dogs protects the plover from birds of prey. The statistics in Daphne Hatch's own study indicate that during the period prior to this study, the number of plovers at Ocean Beach was increasing, even though there was no requirement for dogs to be on-leash. The maximum Snowy Plover counts for the 1979 to 1985 period ranged from 4 to 16, compared to maximum counts (since 1988) of from 38 to 85 birds (Hatch Report, p. 8). See Figure 2 below.

We believe that it is mischaracterizing the problem to attribute the "disturbance" of the plover exclusively (or even significantly) to off-leash dogs. The data do not support this conclusion. It follows, therefore, that addressing off-leash dogs only will not effectively protect the plover. We maintain, based upon the data, that proper protection of the plover would encompass the effect of humans, predators, and other wildlife as well.

The SEIS discusses the aforementioned "study" by GGNRA employee Daphne Hatch as follows: "During Western Snowy Plover monitoring surveys conducted at Ocean Beach from December 1994 to May 1996, 362 dogs were observed chasing birds; 19 dogs were observed chasing at least 62 western snowy plovers; and roaming dogs inadvertently disturbed at least 100 additional western snowy plovers." (Hatch 1996)

In the SEIS the GGNRA has now chosen to describe their "study" as monitoring (because it was never peer reviewed?), presenting numbers with no context. 19 dogs chasing plovers sounds bad, until you realize it was 19 dogs out of 5,692 which were observed. If the SEIS included the materials and methods of Ms. Hatch's "study" you would see that disturbances due to other factors are not even mentioned. You would know that the people cataloguing the interactions between dogs and plovers were biased in that they held a personal belief that the dogs were dangerous to the plovers. It seems information was deliberately presented in this SEIS so as to mislead the reader into believing the GGNRA's assertion that radical measures to ban the activities of dogs and humans in the Southern portion of Ocean Beach could be justified.



### The GGNRA Refuses To Implement Other Logical Measures To Protect The Plover

Banning dogs and most forms of human recreation as well on a 2.9 mile stretch of Ocean Beach is not a rational, measured response to the plover's seasonal presence on approximately 0.4 miles of Ocean Beach, and it does not address the hazards that both humans and predators present.

Peter Baye (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biologist) noted the presence of the Snowy Plover, which roosts, but does not nest, on Ocean Beach, and made recommendations to the GGNRA for its protection. The plovers are present seasonally and relocate from year to year. Mr. Baye recommended: "Exclosures, in concert with educational signage, have been very effective in areas of concentrated usage where beaches are large (e.g. Cape Cod National Seashore). There are no unique impediments inherent at San Francisco's Ocean Beach which would render these measures infeasible here. They should be implemented at least on an experimental full-scale basis." (Memo to USFWS, 15 March 1995). Rather than establishing these flexible, seasonally rotated exclosures to protect plovers against humans, pets, and wild predators, the NPS chose the fixed and narrow measure of (illegally) banishing off-leash recreation, and now has chosen to ban dogs entirely, and limit human recreation severely as well. Mr. Baye's recommendation of a temporary, seasonal fence to be removed when the plovers leave the area and repositioned when they return could still be adopted. This solution would allow off-leash dogs on Ocean Beach but keep dogs out of the roosting area. Better yet, Mr. Baye's solution would protect the plovers from the predators, campers, runners, children, kite-flyers, etc. Mr. Baye's recommendation clearly shows that off-leash recreation on Ocean Beach is compatible with protection of the Snowy Plover. The GGNRA has refused to consider the option of constructing a fence to protect the Ocean Beach plovers. This might be because there are no dry sand dunes to be fenced off- -see photos which follow in the section entitled "The GGNRA Condone other Disturbances to the Plover".

The GGNRA has made no concerted effort to alleviate the activities that are currently prohibited by law, pose a hazard to the plover, and occur in the vicinity of the plover's roosting. Table A, below, summarizes the current GGNRA record of citations for fireworks, littering, camping, and beach fires on the portion of the beach where the snowy plover may roost. On an average Saturday or Sunday morning in the area the plovers roost you will find (by personal report):

"5 beach fires (3 unattended)

"7 campsites (2 had fires)

Extrapolating, if only weekend offenders were cited, there should have been 520 citations/year for fires, and 720 citations/year for camping. The GGNRA's dismal record of enforcement is reflected below in Table A. Moreover, it should be pointed out that litter is generally left at camp sites and the sites of beach fires. This litter attracts ravens and other predators to the area where the plovers are potentially roosting. The number of citations for littering is grossly inadequate(1).

If the GGNRA is unable to utilize enforcement to protect the plover from the public and their activities, it would make a great deal of sense to provide the exclosures as a refuge for the plover as suggested by Mr. Baye.

In addition, dead wildlife such as seals, sea lions and birds are not being promptly removed from the beach. The rotting carcasses of these dead creatures are left indefinitely on the beach to attract ravens and other plover predators. Recently, a carcass of a cow washed up on Ocean Beach where it sat for almost a week before officials removed it. The dead body was literally covered with ravens, ripping and eating the dead animal's flesh.

### The GGNRA Has No Protocol For The Rescue Of Injured Or Sick Birds Or Mammals In The Park

The response of Federal officials to the oiling of wildlife after the Cosco Busan oil spill was slow and inadequate in the eyes of the citizens who live in the communities affected. However, to those of us who

frequently utilize GGNRA properties for recreation, the poor response came as no surprise. Below are personal notes from our conversation with a GGNRA Wildlife Ecologist regarding our attempted rescue of a bird that morning-sent by email to OBDOG members Thursday September 13, 2007:

Bill Merkle Dispatch # 415-561-5505

Acknowledges it is unfortunate there are no signs for the public to be advised as to whom to call if a bird, marine mammal or other wildlife is injured or requires assistance. GGNRA will not necessarily make every attempt to help an injured bird should you bring it to their attention. It will depend upon three factors: 1) type of bird 2) type of injury 3) location of bird

If it is a shorebird (a common bird), they are much less likely to help. He was noncommittal as to what injuries they would address. As to location, if I bring the bird to their personnel, what is that all about? It was explained to me that if the injury occurred in an undeveloped area, then they would be unlikely to rescue the animal or bird. When asked whether Ocean Beach was developed or undeveloped, he said the parking lot would be developed, but the beach would be undeveloped. He went on to explain that in undeveloped (natural) areas, they allow nature to take its course. Disease is a natural process, and predation is a natural process. As for letting nature take its course, what about dogs chasing birds is not natural? I asked how the GGNRA rationalizes that a dog chasing a common shorebird warrants a ticket (we must protect park resources), yet if the same shorebird is brought to them because it is injured, they are satisfied to let it die? I asked then why is it that since they choose (and I believe erroneously) to define dogs as predators of birds, why are they then not considered part of the natural process at the beach and ignored just like every other predator?

He responded that if they received a report that a dog was attacking an injured bird they would most certainly respond. He advised me the GGNRA considers dogs to be an unnatural part of the park as they are associated with human use of the park (which is also by inference an unnatural intrusion into the park areas). Those of us who thought this park was created for our recreational use had better get used to the idea that the Park Service regards us as unwelcome intruders into their "wildlife protection area".

I went on to point out to him that I did not want to hear him defining dogs as predators or complaining about dogs attacking birds as my dog helped me rescue this bird this morning and has done the same numerous other times. My dog has alerted me to hypothermic birds that are still alive, and he won't leave until I pick them up and take them to safety. My dog will chase off ravens that are attacking an injured bird who is unable to effectively defend itself and actively chase those ravens away while I pick up the injured bird. Earlier this year we rescued a grebe, today it was a common shorebird. I told him I cannot just run by when an injured bird is actively being attacked by ravens and is screaming for help. He didn't have a lot to say in this regard.

The GGNRA claims the purpose of limiting the activities of dogs and their guardians is to "protect the resources" of the park. What resources exactly is the GGNRA protecting? The same resources you are content to let die because you don't care to make the effort to transport injured birds to WildCare in San Rafael? When I asked why they would not transport every injured bird brought to them for care, Mr. Merkle indicated the GGNRA preferred to "manage habitats and work on population levels". I am afraid to contemplate exactly what that means, except that the fallow deer in Marin probably have a pretty good idea. Or perhaps it means they want to work on limiting our human population levels in the Park. Or both.

I am disgusted by the hypocrisy of the GGNRA yet again. Their record of park management policy is abysmal. They neglect to assist injured birds even when they are brought to them, they are slaughtering over a thousand deer in Marin merely because they are non-native.

The proposed rule which sacrifices recreational access to protect the plover cannot be justified when GGNRA management has failed to implement the most basic of plans to ensure their well being.

In this DEIS/SEIS the GGNRA mentions their concern for wildlife including marine mammals, especially when they beach themselves to rest or when they are injured and on the beach. The GGNRA seems to be able to count the number of reports of beached mammals they receive, however what they fail to mention is that they have no protocol for the visitor to the GGNRA to follow should they come across a marine mammal on the beach. We personally have made numerous requests to GGNRA management for signs to be placed at the beach which would instruct visitors not to approach the beached mammal and where to call to request assistance for the animal. Many visitors to the GGNRA are not local, some have never been to a beach before, and they require instruction so that they can assist the animal effectively. Oddly enough, the GGNRA has managed to post signs up and down the beach to advise us of recreational restrictions regarding fires, camping and the plover, but they cannot post educational signs to benefit marine mammals.

#### The GGNRA Condonates Other Disturbances To The Plover

To further compromise the GGNRA's argument that the restriction of off-leash recreation is necessary to protect the plover, the GGNRA has taken the plover's alleged summer hiatus as an opportunity to begin bulldozing of the "Plover Protection Area". In October of 2005, when United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) declined to designate Ocean Beach as critical habitat for the plover they stated the following:

"Although we do not consider these areas [Ocean Beach and Crissy Field] essential for recovery, we do consider them important, and will continue to review projects in these areas that might affect WSP as required by sections 7 and 10 of the Act. " The USFWS is previously on the record as stating, "Activities that may adversely affect plovers include sand deposition or spreading, beach cleaning, construction of breakwaters and jetties, dune stabilization/restoration using native and nonnative vegetation fencing, beach leveling and off-road vehicles driven in nesting areas or at night."

The picture above was taken during the period when dogs are restricted at Ocean Beach due to the presence of the plover. When OBDog principals first observed the bulldozers in the Plover Protection Area below, we made a Freedom of Information Act Request of the GGNRA, to determine the purpose of the bulldozing, as well as determine whether USFWS had approved this drastic action. The GGNRA responded to our request, but failed to answer our questions about the bulldozing. We were later advised verbally that there was no correspondence with USFWS to obtain approval for bulldozing, as the plover was not then present. Internal GGNRA records show the GGNRA bargained with USFWS in 1996, sacrificing our off-leash recreational opportunities in order to get USFWS to agree to allow bulldozing in this same area of Ocean Beach. The ESA is very clear that it is not permissible to modify the habitat of an endangered or threatened species when they are not present, but expected to return. One example would be the prohibition of the removal of trees that hold an eagle's nest, even when the eagle is not present or utilizing the nest.

We understand the GGNRA is modifying the beach in this area to minimize the effects of erosion and the drifting of sand on to the Promenade and Great Highway. The GGNRA has refused to acknowledge in any significant fashion that erosion and the progressive collapse of the shoreline limits the areas where the plover can roost and forage, as well as the quality of foodsource for the plover at Ocean Beach. The narrowing beach puts the plover in closer and closer proximity to all users of the beach, thereby increasing the disturbance to the plovers. These conditions will progress despite the GGNRA's move to ban dogs entirely.

We agree the GGNRA needs to deal with erosion at Ocean Beach. However, it seems unlikely that the GGNRA will admit the obvious: the erosion itself and the GGNRA activities designed to deal with erosion adversely affect the plover to a much greater degree than four dogs who allegedly

"disturbed" plovers in the last six years. The restriction of off-leash recreation or the banning of dogs entirely and the limitation of human activity to purportedly protect the plover is a complete ruse.

The photos above were taken during the time period when the dogs are restricted because the GGNRA claims the plover is present. We see the condition of the plover habitat after the GGNRA has bulldozed to minimize the effects of drifting sand and erosion. The dunes that remain are there because they do have a little beach grass to help hold them together. The tides have run up and behind the dunes that the GGNRA claims the plover inhabits. Note the excessive debris, the graffiti and the remnants of a Christmas tree in this so-called "habitat".

Considering the plover resides on elevated dunes of dry sand, preferably without vegetation, it is quite apparent as to why Ocean Beach is not suitable plover habitat. The SEIS states: "In GGNRA [sic], the western snow y plover uses areas with wide, sandy, dunebacked beaches for roosting and foraging during the nonbreeding season. This species forages above and below the mean high waterline, typically gathering food from the surface of the sand, wrack line, or low foredune vegetation." The pictures above depict a severely narrowed beach with a high tide line that is at the base of a seawall- -it hardly matches the GGNRA's description of plover habitat. The photos also underscore the absurdity of the claim in the DEIS that dogs digging have some responsibility for the undermining of sand dunes at Ocean Beach.

GGNRA personnel routinely drive off-road vehicles through the plover habitat in order to enforce the leash law at Ocean Beach. Certainly the GGNRA's "solution" is far more dangerous to the plover than the perceived "problem" (pictures of this activity on file).

In 2006, the Fourth Annual Ocean Beach Turkey Trot was an event sanctioned by the GGNRA (and SFRPD) for 1000 participants. Certainly the GGNRA recognized there would be additional participants who had not officially registered. Members of Ocean Beach DOG who witnessed the race estimated 1500 participants. The course for the race was charted directly through the Snowy Plover Protection Area. This was also during a time period where the GGNRA declared an "emergency" warranting the restriction of off-leash recreation in this same area in order to minimize "disturbance" to the plover. The GGNRA, by granting permits for the Ocean Beach Turkey Trot, established that their ban of off-leash recreation is arbitrary, capricious and discriminatory-therefore unlawful.

#### The 2006 GGNR A Status Report For The Western Snowy Plover Is Fatally Flawed

This is the second report Daphne Hatch (now Chief of Natural Resource Management and Science for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area) has produced for the GGNRA to justify the closure of most of Ocean Beach to off-leash recreation due to the transient presence of the Western Snowy Plover (WSP). The first was produced in 1996. The second report, dated November 2, 2006, is the subject of this analysis. Reading Ms. Hatch's report brings to mind an article Dr. Valente recently read from the Journal of the American Dental Association October 2006 Special Supplement. The article was entitled, "Challenges in Interpreting Study Results The conflict between appearance and reality" . It seems that the GGNRA and Ms. Hatch have endeavored to manipulate the data so as to reach a predetermined outcome. Their conclusions falsely give the reader the appearance that the threat to the WSP from off-leash dogs is great. The reality is there is no credible threat to the WSP from off-leash dogs within the GGNRA.

Bias: The 2006 Hatch report presents itself as an "observational study". Observational studies have the least reliability of any type of scientific study because their results can be distorted by many factors. The first of those factors is bias. Bias generally stated is a "systematic error in the design, conduct, or analysis of a study that results in a mistaken estimate of an exposure's effect on the risk a subject faces". Bias is the basis of our skepticism of research to determine the efficacy of a medication when the research is conducted by a clinician who stands to gain financially if the medication is shown to be effective.

Ms. Hatch clearly has an ideological bias against people and their dogs recreating in any manner at Ocean

Beach. She was quoted on September 7, 2005 in the S.F. Chronicle as saying, "Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard". This is an incredible admission from a high ranking GGNRA official considering the enabling legislation of the GGNRA.

**Design:** Daphne Hatch's bias is apparent in the design of this study. The objective of this study is to prove her assumption that the present management which allows off-leash dog use of Ocean Beach and Crissy Field is inadequate to protect the WSP from harassment/ disturbance and other detrimental effects of chasing by dogs. We learn nothing about the relative harassment/ disturbance of the plover from any other source in this study. If plovers are harassed/disturbed 50 times in 5.5 hours by ravens, and one time in that same time period by a dog, is the harassment/disturbance by the dog even relevant? A comparative study model would have been more informative with respect to actually determining what management actions, if any, should be taken to protect the plover from harassment/ disturbance in general. Frankly, this comparative study should have been undertaken in 1993 when the WSP was first listed as a threatened species, before the decision was made (and later reversed by the Federal Court) to require the leashing of dogs to protect the plover. However, it could have been undertaken at any time. A comparative study is designed to remove one variable in a situation at a time, and observe the change, if any. An initial period of observation would document the presence of predators (ravens) and their numbers, as well as the frequency of harassment/disturbance from all sources absent any management action. Next, the predators (ravens) being the most serious source of potential disturbance/harassment are removed as much as possible. Rather than killing all the ravens, the GGNRA could have begun a campaign to reduce and remove litter at the beach as a conservative method to reduce the number of ravens. This would entail aggressive ticketing of those who are observed leaving litter at the beach, and resources would be deployed to clear the beach of litter and dead wildlife daily. No one would be adversely affected, and in fact most beachgoers would welcome a cleaner, safer beach. Indirectly, the lack of litter/foodstuff for the ravens would have been expected to reduce their numbers. After the new management practice has been implemented for a reasonable period of time, a second period of observation is conducted. In this second data collection period, we could assess whether the litter reduction has reduced the number of ravens, and has the reduction in ravens reduced the frequency of harassment/ disturbance to the WSP. If the ravens are not reduced, or the frequency of harassment/ disturbance is still unacceptable, the next management measure is implemented. Exclosure fencing could have been placed in the areas where the WSP is observed roosting. This would serve to provide some protection for the WSP from the ravens and any other predators, as well as humans and dogs. Education of the public to give the exclosure fencing a wide berth would be appropriate. After a reasonable period of implementation, a third period of observation would be conducted to determine what effect, if any, this latest management method had upon the frequency of harassment/disturbance of the WSP. There also should be the implementation of an aggressive ticketing policy for all dog owners whose dogs were observed chasing plovers at some point within this process. All of these management measures should have been implemented and assessed for their effectiveness in reducing the frequency of WSP harassment/ disturbances before a leash restriction or banning dogs was even considered. This would have been consistent with the mandate to maintain recreational opportunities in the GGNRA.

**Conduct:** This study exhibits bias in its conduct as well. Clearly, the participants who performed the surveys either had a pre-existing bias to construe the activity of dogs as harassment, or the training provided by Daphne Hatch and her staff created that bias in the participants. Most likely it is a combination of both, as those individuals who volunteered to do these surveys are identified as Golden Gate Audubon Society members. (We should point out that the Golden Gate Audubon Society is on the record as opposing any off-leash recreation in the GGNRA). Ms. Hatch, in her introduction, spells out the definition of harassment per the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Harassment is "an intentional or negligent act or omission which creates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavioral patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding or sheltering". Ms. Hatch seems to use the terms harassment and disturbance

interchangeably in this report, so we will generally refer to it as harassment/disturbance. Harassment/disturbances are not well defined in the portion of the study where they are enumerated for Ocean Beach. However, in the Crissy Field portion, there is more description provided for the harassment/ disturbances observed. In one case, harassment/ disturbance of a plover by a dog was described as "alert posture -stood up and increased vigilance" (in other words, the plover lifted his head up and looked around). Compare this "disturbance" that was classified by a volunteer and the authors of this study as an incident of harassment to the definition of harassment as provided by the ESA. They are clearly inconsistent. In this study, the authors and participants classified activity as harassment/ disturbance that does NOT meet the definition of harassment provided by the ESA. This is a classic example of examiner bias in the conduct of this study. This is more precisely identified as "misclassification" and serves to invalidate the data collected and conclusions drawn in this study.

Analysis: Analysis of this data is compromised because the data itself is in question. Another factor that makes analysis of this data practically impossible is "confounding" in the design of this study. In this case, "confounding" refers to the fact that this study is not designed to isolate the effect of each component of the beach environment that can affect the plover adversely. For example, an off-leash dog is running at the waterline with its owner and they are some 20 feet from a plover. There is additionally a raven 30 feet and closing from the plover. The plover flushes, and it is recorded as a "disturbance". How is it apparent to the observer whether the dog, the owner or the raven was the source of the disturbance? Practically, it could be any combination of all three. Based upon the premise of this study, it is reasonable to assume the disturbance/harassment would be attributed to the off-leash dog. Is that legitimate? There does not appear to be any attempt made to isolate all other activities within the Park that may adversely affect the plover-they are merely given mention. These would include: Beach patrols in vehicles on the beach, equestrian use of the beach, people walking or jogging, kite flying, littering which attracts predators, the predators (usually ravens) themselves, and removal of kelp or driftwood which are sources of food. No mention is even made of bonfires, camping, litter such as cigarette butts, or the shadows surfboards cast.

Perhaps the most egregious omission in this report is that there is no mention made of beach width. The SEIS acknowledges, "In GGNRA, the western snowy plover uses areas with wide, sandy, dunebacked beaches for roosting and foraging during the nonbreeding season. This species forages above and below the mean high waterline, typically gathering food from the surface of the sand, wrack line, or low foredune vegetation. There is no documentation of western snowy plovers nesting in GGNRA." The beach width at Ocean Beach has been decreasing due to erosion. Daphne Hatch's 1996 report concluded on page 10: "Factors other than the number of people or dogs, possibly beach slope and width, appear to exert greater influence over Snowy Plover numbers on Ocean Beach". The GGNRA is quite aware that the number of plovers on Ocean Beach is not directly related to the number of people or dogs present on the beach. However, in this 2006 Daphne Hatch report there is some discussion on page 8 that the plover numbers have leveled off since 2003, and have never matched the level they reached of 85 in 1994. Concurrently, this report discusses repeatedly that since the reinstatement of off-leash recreation, the number of dogs at Ocean Beach has increased dramatically. The report directly asserts the increase in dogs at Ocean Beach is responsible for a greater number of plover disturbances and it is inferred indirectly responsible for the diminished number of plovers. Had Daphne Hatch been intellectually honest, she might have drawn the following conclusion from this data and a study she cites in this report, "Disturbance to wintering western snowy plovers", by K.D. Lafferty. This Lafferty report states "The distance between human activity and the roost peaked at about 30 meters and relatively few people or dogs beyond this distance disturbed plovers" ...presumably because a narrow beach increased the potential overlap between beach users and snowy plovers". Ocean Beach suffers from serious erosion, and hence the beach width has narrowed dramatically, especially during high tides. It could more reasonably be concluded that the narrowed beach width is directly responsible for both the lower plover numbers and the increased frequency of perceived

harassment/disturbance of the plover, not the greater number of dogs or their activities on or off of a leash. The narrowed beach width has both eliminated much of the potential habitat for the WSP at Ocean Beach (this is consistent with USFWS critical habitat designation in 2005), and forced all occupants of the beach into closer proximity to the plover, thereby perhaps causing greater harassment/ disturbance levels (especially if you construe lifting your head and looking around as a disturbance).

How great are the harassment/ disturbance levels really? The way the data is presented in this report is misleading. To put the data in its' simplest form, in 2004 when dogs were required to be on-leash at Ocean Beach, one dog was observed harassing/disturbing a plover in 5.5 hours of observation on weekdays, and one dog was observed harassing/ disturbing a plover every 2.5 hours on the weekends. In 2005, when dogs were legally allowed off-leash on Ocean Beach, (and there were many more dogs present) 1 dog harassed/disturbed a plover in 24 hours of observation on weekdays, and fewer than 2 dogs harassed/ disturbed a plover every hour on weekends. Is this really significant? This report gives us no data regarding the rate of disturbance from any other source, however, the number of ravens far exceeds the number of dogs out at Ocean Beach, and it can easily be postulated the harassment/ disturbances due to dogs are dwarfed by the number of harassment/ disturbances from the plover's natural predator, the raven.

It is difficult to do further analysis of the data, because the GGNRA has illegally withheld the raw data from us. In April of 2006, Dr. Valente requested, by means of a Freedom of Information Act request, all of the data/ reports/Environmental Assessments the GGNRA had to substantiate their claim that there were resources in the Park that required protection. The GGNRA responded in writing that such data did not exist. Based upon the representations made in the November 2, 2006 Memorandum from Daphne Hatch and GGNRA Head Ranger Yvette Ruan, the last of the data for this report was collected in February and March of 2006. The data could and legally should have been provided to Dr. Valente in April of 2006. Dr. Valente subsequently appealed this FOIA request to the DOI, and finally received a note 5 years later from the DOI confirming there was NO data available to support any aspect of the changes proposed in the new Dog Management Plan.

Conclusion: Rational analysis of the situation would suggest that the GGNRA is really not trying to solve a problem. The GGNRA is merely interested in restricting dogs to leashes or banning dogs entirely throughout the GGNRA. Additionally, when taking into account Ms. Batch's above comments to the S.F. Chronicle in 2005, one must question the future of both humans and dogs in the GGNRA. Taking into account the data regarding the numbers of dogs chasing either shorebirds or plovers in context of the frequency of the behavior over time, it seems ticketing of the miniscule number of offenders would be appropriate rather than punishing all for the transgressions of a very few. It is a bit like forcing all cyclists in the GGNRA to ride with training wheels because a very few speed through the park.

If GGNRA management complains that they do not have the resources to adequately police Ocean Beach then it provides an appropriate reason to move for reversion of this property. We remind you again of Rolf Diamont's (GGNRA Environmental Coordinator circa 1975) conclusions when the GGNRA had just accepted possession of Ocean Beach from the City of San Francisco-"Ocean Beach: no rules should be enforced here. Ocean Beach is too large and too accessible to control dogs. It would be a logistical nightmare for the Park Service to try" .

The Hatch report does not meet the criteria for a valid scientific study. It is more appropriately classified as "junk science" - "a publication that has the tone and trappings of science, but is so fundamentally and demonstrably flawed as to lack any serious claim to credibility". Junk science should never be used as the basis for establishing public policy, and in fact it is unlawful to present "junk science" as the basis for a policy decision. Surely had the GGNRA followed the legal requirement for peer review prior to relying upon or releasing this "study" there would have been no restrictions imposed on dogs and their guardians

at Ocean Beach or Crissy Field.

#### The GGNRA Ignores Scientific Studies That Do Not Serve Their Purposes

Our first example would be a site-specific, peer reviewed U.C. Berkeley Environmental Sciences study presented by Megan Warren on May 7, 2007 that concludes within the GGNRA that the feeding of the Western Snowy Plover does not appear to be negatively affected by human and pet recreation. This is highly significant. Because the WSP does not breed at Ocean Beach or Crissy Field, its primary essential activity is foraging and feeding. And, in fact, this study observed that the habitat at Crissy Field is not appropriate as a feeding site and consequently no plovers were ever seen feeding at Crissy Field. If human and pet recreation does not negatively affect these activities, there is no need to restrict recreation in these areas. The abstract is as follows:

#### Recreation Disturbance Does Not Change Feeding Behavior of the Western Snowy Plover

**Abstract** The Western Snowy Plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*) is a small shorebird that has many scattered wintering populations along the Pacific Coast of the United States, including several in the Bay Area. This species has been listed as threatened since 1993 under the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973. For this study I measured disturbance rates, types, plover responses and feeding time in three different sites in the San Francisco Bay Area to explore the link between recreation disturbance and feeding behavior. I predicted that as frequency of disturbance increased, the birds would spend less time actively foraging and more time alert. However, data showed no significant relationship between feeding behavior and direct disturbance by human recreators. Instead, I now predict that recreation has a more indirect effect on the western snowy plover feeding behavior. Future research should focus on indirect effects of recreation, such as habitat disturbance and food source quality.

Our second example is a study, "Predicting the population consequences of human disturbance for Ringed Plovers *Charadrius hiaticula*: a game theory approach" by Durwyn Liley and William J. Sutherland. This study originates from the School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, Norfolk NR4 7TJ, UK. This study clarifies the following three pertinent facts:

" Sites that are highly disturbed are not used by breeding birds, and therefore any increase in disturbance levels on these sites will not alter population size

" No published study of a breeding bird quantifies the population consequences of disturbance. This is despite the fact that disturbance has been implied as a factor causing population decline for a wide range of species.

" We think of individuals [birds] as deciding not to breed rather than being prevented from doing so. Such individuals 'queue' for good quality territories rather than adopting a poor quality territory (such as Ocean Beach).

#### FOOTNOTE:

1 In an article published in The San Francisco Examiner; September 26, 2005; by Marisa Lagos; entitled Residents Irked by Ocean Beach Parties (please refer to the original online version located at:

[http://www.sfexaminer.com/articles/2005/09/27/news/20050927\\_ne01\\_fires.tex](http://www.sfexaminer.com/articles/2005/09/27/news/20050927_ne01_fires.tex)) or an online, printable copy located at:

[http://OceanBeachDOG.home.mindspring.com/GGNRA\\_Ocean\\_Beach\\_NonEnforcement.htm](http://OceanBeachDOG.home.mindspring.com/GGNRA_Ocean_Beach_NonEnforcement.htm)) it is confirmed that the GGNRA's failure to enforce fire and litter policies has led to untold damage in the GGNRA's arbitrarily designated snowy plover habitat at Ocean Beach.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6689	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	N/A, UN N/A				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---



**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:** The third study originates from the School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, Norfolk NR4 1fJ, UK., and was authored by Jennifer A. Gill, published in *Ibis* (2007) 149(Suppl. 1), 9-14. It is entitled, "Approaches to measuring the effects of human disturbance on birds".

This study clarifies a concept that helps to explain the apparent inconsistency of plover behavior at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. On one hand, Ocean Beach is a highly disturbed, poor quality beach area (in large part due to erosion). Crissy Field is another highly disturbed beach environment at which the plover does NOT feed or breed (per the first study listed here). The GGNRA maintains that the plover is highly susceptible to disturbance by humans and off-leash dogs. This is why the proposed Rule has been promulgated. However, one must ask the question: if the plover is highly disturbed by human and canine off-leash recreation, and the plover does not feed at Crissy Field, why are any plovers there at all? Likewise, although the food source may be a bit better at Ocean Beach, why would the plover choose to roost there and endure the disturbance?

This study opines, The principal way in which human presence can impact upon wildlife is by altering the ability of animals to exploit important resources. This can operate either through directly restricting access to resources such as food supplies, nesting sites or roosting sites, or by altering the actual or perceived quality of these sites. Direct restriction of access to resources can occur through animals avoiding areas where humans are present. Changes in the quality of sites as a result of human presence could occur, for example, if predators were attracted to areas with humans, or if the presence of humans reduced the presence of prey species.

For the plovers observed roosting at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field, humans and off-leash dogs are not restricting their access to resources because the plovers are indeed there. The second alternative is that humans and off-leash dogs are altering the actual or perceived quality of these sites. The most logical conclusion is the presence of humans and their off-leash dogs reduces the presence and/or activity of prey species. This theory has been brought up by others such as the SF SPCA (Objections to the Federal Governments Ban on Off-leash Dogs at Ocean Beach- Jan. 9, 1997, page 4), but was summarily dismissed by the GGNRA wildlife biologists. It is disturbing that the subsequent 2006 Hatch study at Ocean Beach intentionally ignores gulls, ravens and crows entirely, so there is no data available that might confirm the presence of offleash dogs may protect the plover from birds of prey.

However, the statistics in Daphne Hatch's own 1996 study support this theory. During the period prior to this study, the number of plovers at Ocean Beach was increasing, even though there was no requirement for dogs to be on-leash. The maximum Snowy Plover counts for the 1979 to 1985 period ranged from 4 to 16, compared to maximum counts (since 1988) of from 38 to 85 birds (Hatch Report, p. 8).

This UK study also evaluates the methodology of studies like the 2006 Hatch study, which attempt to assess the distribution or behaviour of animals in the presence or absence of disturbance. A limitation of these types of approaches is that the numbers of animals that would use these sites in the absence of disturbance is generally not known. For example, if the sites with higher levels of disturbance also have lower levels of resource availability (e.g. food or nest-sites) or higher risk of predation, then removing the source of disturbance may have no effect on the numbers of animals in the area.

In actuality, because it is acknowledged by the GGNRA that removal of off-leash dogs or banning will not increase the number of plovers at Ocean Beach, the question becomes, will the restriction of dogs decrease the number of plovers at Ocean Beach? There is evidence to confirm this is probable, as a

similar scenario which involved the Bank Swallow has already occurred in the GGNRA- - in an area directly adjacent to Ocean Beach, i.e., Fort Funston. This will be discussed in a subsequent section devoted to Fort Funston.

The fourth study was peer-reviewed and accepted on November 12, 1999, and published in *Biological Conservation* 97 (2001) 265-268. The authors are Jennifer A. Gill, Ken Norris and William J. Sutherland. The study is entitled Why behavioural responses may not reflect the population consequences of human disturbance.

The authors contend, The effect of human disturbance on animals is frequently measured in terms of changes in behaviour response to human presence. The magnitude of these changes in behavior is then often used as a measure of the relative susceptibility of species to disturbance; for example, species that show strong avoidance of human presence are often considered to be in greater need of protection from disturbance than those which do not.. By contrast, species which do not avoid disturbed areas are often considered as requiring little or no protection from disturbance.. From a conservation perspective, human disturbance of wildlife is important only if it affects survival or fecundity and hence causes a population to decline.

What becomes clear after reading this study is that in the GGNRA, Daphne Hatch is defining avoidance behavior and what constitutes a disturbance in a very different manner than do other researchers. (This is consistent with my criticism of the 2006 Hatch study). According to this study, avoidance behavior or moving constitutes an activity where the plover actually leaves the site. The 5, 10 or 20 foot flight Daphne Hatch is utilizing as her most severe evidence of disturbance may be relevant in breeding/nesting areas, where movement of that scale can take a plover away from its nest and eggs. In the circumstance where plovers are roosting in an area, this is not classified by other researchers as a disturbance. From the perspective of these authors, the plovers roosting at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field require little or no protection from disturbance because they stay at these sites.

#### The Western Snowy Plover Study In The DEIS Is Fatally Flawed and Omitted In the SEIS

The DEIS relies in large part upon a study by Matthew Zlatunich and Michael Lynes of the Golden Gate Audubon Society (see [http://naprap2.home.mindspring.com/GGNRA\\_100819-GGA-Crissy-Field-WPA-SNPL-Report-2009-2010-final11.pdf](http://naprap2.home.mindspring.com/GGNRA_100819-GGA-Crissy-Field-WPA-SNPL-Report-2009-2010-final11.pdf)). This 2010 study, like the Warren study, was conducted in cooperation with the GGNRA. As noted previously, the 2011 DEIS and the current SEIS again fail to mention a 2007 study by Warren (see [http://oceanbeachdog2.home.mindspring.com/WSP\\_Recreation\\_Warren.pdf](http://oceanbeachdog2.home.mindspring.com/WSP_Recreation_Warren.pdf)) that found plovers' feeding was not negatively impacted by recreational activities of humans and dogs. This is critically important because the plover does not nest or breed at Ocean Beach or Crissy Field; its' primary activity here is feeding and foraging for food. Instead of acknowledging the Warren study, the Zlatunich-Lynes study was conducted in 2009/2010 at Crissy Field in San Francisco. We have included this segment in the SEIS Comment to emphasize the failure of the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI to provide credible scientific data/site-specific studies to support their proposed changes to the DMP. The study by Zlatunich-Lynes exhibits many of the scientific shortcomings noted in previous studies:

- This study was merely an observational study
- The observational collection of data was performed by Audubon volunteers who had a bias-the GGAS has publicly advocated the banning of dogs to protect the plover
- This study made no attempt to ascertain comparative effects on the plover. There is no discussion of the disturbance level perpetrated by other sources, even though they tell us that data was collected
- Raw data is not provided to the reader
- The analysis appears to be biased because it is based upon incomplete data. For example, the level of disturbance is not categorized in the analysis even though we are told they were categorized in their

collection.

-Assumptions are made in this analysis without supporting explanation. For example, they decided to assign the disturbance to an on-leash dog if he was closer to the plover than his guardian. This ignores the possibility the disturbance was due to the number of bodies- -e.g. two people walking would disturb a plover to the same extent as a leashed dog and a person.

To clarify the issue of comparative disturbance, it seems odd that although known predators of the plover are acknowledged to be at Crissy Field, no attempt is made to analyze the disturbance they create for the plover. The Common Raven and American Crow are present, yet ignored in the analysis. Beyond this, the California Gull is noted as being present. This is of interest because a recent study using surveillance cameras at plover nesting sites in San Francisco Bay documented California Gulls as being responsible for 25% of all predation of plover nests . (Robinson-Nilsen, Caitlin<sup>1</sup>, Jill Bluso Demers<sup>1</sup>, Cheryl Strong<sup>2</sup>, and Scott Demers<sup>3</sup>; <sup>1</sup>San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory, [crobison@sfbbo.org](mailto:crobison@sfbbo.org); <sup>2</sup>U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge; <sup>3</sup>HT Harvey and Associates DETERMINING THE EFFECTS OF HABITAT ENHANCEMENTS AND PREDATORS FOR WESTERN SNOWY PLOVER). California Gulls are new to some of these areas-could the decline in the number of plovers at Crissy Field be related to an increase in the presence of California Gulls? This study makes no attempt to ascertain if there is any such correlation.

The Zlatunich-Lynes study notes the number of plovers has been steadily declining since 2005/2006 records. They choose to rely upon previous conclusions that the greatest disturbance impact to wildlife within the Wildlife Protection Area at Crissy Field is caused by dogs, joggers and walkers. The data from this study showed the number of dogs and humans in the plover area spiked in 2008/2009, and declined dramatically in 2009/ 2010. The number of plovers continued to decline, despite the reduction in recreational disturbance in 2009/2010. This could lead one to conclude that there is no correlation between the number of dogs and people and the number of plovers present. There is no discussion of this possibility in the data analysis of this study.

The Zlatunich-Lynes study is without merit because it deliberately misleads the reader about the GGNRA's legal obligations to protect the plover. Ocean Beach and Crissy Field are not designated as critical habitat by the USFWS. Therefore, the GGNRA is obligated only to prevent the harassment or taking of the plover within its boundaries. Appendix B contains the legal definition of a disturbance which would constitute harassment and be a violation of the law: "If the observer witnesses a blatant violation of the law, such as a dog owner knowingly and without regard allowing his dog to harass wildlife, the observer shall make note on the comment sheet and shall, upon completion of the survey, file a wildlife harassment report at the park police station..." There is no indication in this study analysis that any observer EVER witnessed this type of harassment of a plover during their observations.

Alternatively, the Zlatunich-Lynes study records "disturbances" which they define as minor, moderate and major-none of which rise to the level of the legal and accepted definition of harassment that is utilized by USFWS and other studies. For example, the Zlatunich-Lynes study states: "a minor disturbance will cause a resting bird to stand". A clear thinking individual can conclude that a minor "disturbance" as defined by this study is really no disturbance at all.

Worse yet, when analyzing the number of "disturbances" observed, there is no acknowledgement as to how many of these "disturbances" are actually minor, moderate or major based upon these authors' criteria. It is entirely possible (and I believe probable) that each of the disturbances recorded and utilized to justify the restriction of recreation were merely minor "disturbances".

This would be consistent with the conclusions of other studies including the following which states: "...snowy plovers in other areas have become habituated to relatively constant and non threatening human trail use." (Trulio, Lynne! , Caitlin Robinson-Nilsen<sup>2</sup>, Jana Sokale<sup>3</sup> and Kevin Lafferty<sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup>San Jose State University; [Lynne.Trulio@sjsu.edu](mailto:Lynne.Trulio@sjsu.edu) ; <sup>2</sup>San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory; <sup>3</sup> Sokale Environmental Planning; <sup>4</sup> Western Ecological Research Center, US Geological Survey NESTING SNOWY PLOVER

#### RESPONSE TO NEW TRAIL USE.)

In summary, the Zlatunich-Lynes study and its recommendations are flawed, dishonest and biased. This "study" would never have passed peer review, and it was unlawful for the GGNRA to promulgate and rely upon this "study" in the DEIS. The DEIS advocates recreational restrictions based upon this study. Even though this "study" had bias against dogs and their guardians, they still failed to find any violation of the law that constituted harassment of the plover- -the actual criteria that is legally significant with respect to the protection of the plover. The omission of studies that contradict the need for recreational restrictions and the failure to obtain peer review render this aspect of the DEIS invalid. This "study" is omitted in the SEIS, however the GGNRA still maintains in the SEIS that recreational restrictions must be implemented to protect the plover in the GGNRA.

#### The Western Snowy Plover At Crissy Field

This DEIS/SEIS proposes to ban dogs from large areas of Crissy Field to protect the Western Snowy Plover. It is especially disturbing to note the lack of "vital signs monitoring" in this location because there was a full evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of canine recreation when the renovation/restoration of Crissy Field was first proposed. This was a perfect opportunity to obtain a baseline monitoring survey and follow through annually to monitor the effects of the originally permitted levels of recreational activity. Instead, you will see that the citizens were advised the recreational interests would be compatible with the renovation/restoration just until the renovation/restoration was completed. Then off-leash recreation was banned without environmental study. The recent study relied upon within this DEIS has been reviewed in the Ocean Beach section, but it fails entirely to meet standards the NPS sets forth for "vital signs monitoring", and was not peer reviewed. It was unlawful to include the study or its conclusions in the DEIS or SEIS.

"The 1988 Crissy Field Site Improvement Assessment evolved from concepts present in the 1980 General Management Plan. The Crissy Field plan recommends native planting, preservation and enhancement of the site's natural qualities, and preservation of views of the bay while recognizing the needs of existing and future visitors." (Final General Management Plan, Amended Environmental Impact Statement, Presidio of San Francisco, July 1994, p. 5.)

Public concern over the impact of the plan on recreation surfaced in 1994. Wind surfers and dog-walkers were concerned that the new Crissy Field proposals did not address future use of the area for these recreational activities. On November 28, 1994, the Crissy Field project team met with representatives of boardsailors and Rich Avanzino, then President of the SF SPCA, to discuss "the direction [they] were going." (USPROD00684.)

Meanwhile, the GGNPA encountered problems obtaining donations for the project because of these concerns. Toby Rosenblatt was responsible for raising funds on behalf of the GGNPA for the restoration project. He became alarmed in 1994 upon discovering that NPS officials were not honoring the "voice control" 1979 Pet Policy established when the City donated Park lands to the GGNRA. In December 1994, Mr. Rosenblatt wrote a letter to Superintendent O'Neill and Presidio Manager Robert Chandler, protesting reports that Rangers and Park Police were approaching people in the Presidio, Crissy Field, Upper Fort Mason and Ocean Beach "telling them about a leash law and enforcing the law." Mr. Rosenblatt disagreed with the change in enforcement and warned "[i]t will raise a very major reaction, as you know, in the community and will seriously impact relations with lots of people". He also noted that the enforcement was impacting fund raising efforts for Crissy Field: "I know that a change which implements such a law will hurt our fund raising efforts for Crissy and elsewhere - in fact that is beginning to happen already." Copies of the letter were sent to Greg Moore, Executive Director GGNPA, and Amy Meyer of the GGNRA Citizens Advisory Committee. (USPROD00694.)

Nevertheless, the NPS refused to include off-leash recreation in official plans for Crissy Field. In February 1995, Richard Avanzino met with Superintendent O'Neill, Presidio Manager Chandler and GGNPA Director Moore in order to address concerns "about the continued lack of official acknowledgment and recognition for this vital recreational activity." In a letter summarizing these discussions, Mr. Avanzino noted that the NPS was refusing to provide official recognition because federal regulations require dogs to be leashed, and many NPS staff and powerful environmental groups who want a wetlands established at Crissy Field are opposed to off-leash dogs. NPS also threatened to retaliate if dogwalkers pushed for official recognition during the planning process: "[I]f we advocate publicly for official recognition and status, our efforts will be frowned on and may well be greeted with retaliatory action." The SF SPCA responded by demanding official recognition: "We want the National Park Service to officially acknowledge and preserve off leash dog walking as it exists today at Crissy Field. We want this acknowledgment to be reflected in the legal and other documents pertaining to Crissy Field, as well as in the official design plans for the site." Copies of the letter were sent to Senators Feinstein and Boxer and Representatives Pelosi and Lantos. (USPROD00666-7.)

Public pressure continued to build. On March 28, 1995, a public debate over the issue of a wetlands and its potential impact on off-leash dog-walking was held at the Commonwealth Club. A flyer for the lecture, entitled "Wetlands at Crissy Field - Is this a Good Idea?" identified the speaker as James F. Kirkham, Advisory Partner, Pillsbury Madison & Sutro, Native San Franciscan and Outdoorsman." Summarizing the issue up for debate, the flyer noted: "this habitat could include up to half of the entire acreage of Crissy Field, which could drastically reduce the amount of space left for recreational activities, including off-leash dog exercise." (USPROD0068i.) A few days later, on April 1, 1995, a massive Presidio "dog-in" was held to show support for off-leash dog walking at Crissy Field. (USPROD00679-80.)

In April 1995, Mr. Avanzino met with Superintendent O'Neill and Citizens Advisory Commission members Amy Meyer, Jacqueline Young, and Trent Orr to discuss the status of the 1979 Pet Policy and the issue of inclusion of officially designated off-leash areas in the Crissy Field Plans. A letter memorializing the meeting indicates the following issues were resolved:

1. The "NPS will again honor the Pet Policy";
2. "Legal counsel for the NPS has advised" that the Superintendent has "discretionary authority to reinforce through the Compendium mechanism the principles expressed in the Pet Policy";
3. "This is permitted even though there is some conflict with the Code of Federal Regulations";
4. The NPS agreed to include "site-specific plan that clearly delineates off-leash dog walking areas";
5. The NPS agreed "to public review and participation at the level of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area Advisory Commission of any future changes to the agreed upon off-leash dog walking areas." (Richard Avanzino letter to Brian O'Neill, April 27, 1995.)

To bolster fundraising for wetlands restoration at Crissy Field, the NPS announced (in the San Francisco Chronicle) that it "has no intent to forbid off-leash, even if a large wetlands area is restored along the northern waterfront...all plans either maintain or expand off-leash dog walking. Under any future scenario, more generous areas of the Presidio's northern waterfront will be available to dogs." [emphasis added]

On October 2, 1996, the GGNRA Issued a "Finding of No Significant Impact" ("FONSI") for the Crissy Field project. Included in this document were notes about the comments and concerns voiced during the Comment period for the Environmental Assessment ("EA"). The FONSI addressed these concerns as

follows: "The Crissy Field Plan ...includes expanded opportunities for off leash dog walking, and the marsh design, as noted in the EA, incorporates features to avoid conflict between other recreational activities, such as off leash dog walking, and wildlife. Section 2.1.2.10 ("Dog Use Areas") provides: "Dog walking is a popular activity at Crissy Field, and both alternatives provide for the continued enjoyment of that activity. An approximately 70 acre area would be available for dog activities. Walking dogs off leash under voice control would be permitted on the Promenade and beach east of the U.S. Coast Guard station, on the restored airfield, and in the East Beach area." Indeed, the Crissy Field Plan Summary confirmed that the proposed plan includes 70 acres for "off-leash dog walking." (Id., p. 10) With respect to protected species, the issue of vegetation was also addressed in the FONSI as follows: "The decision to avoid the introduction of special status species in the restoration was made recognizing the high level of recreational use at Crissy Field anticipated to continue in the future and the concern expressed by many individuals that special status species could cause a change in management of the site that would restrict recreational uses." NPS did in fact replant the federally endangered California sea-blite (*Suaeda californica*) that drowned out during the prolonged inlet closures/non-tidal lagoon flooding phases, and some transplants are thriving."

Thereafter, the \$35 million in funds were raised, the restoration completed, and subsequently, off-leash recreation was illegally banned at all GGNRA properties, and massive ticketing and harassment of dog walkers commenced. This directly violated the following agreements between the GGNRA and San Francisco: 1975 Memorandum of Understanding; 1979 Pet Policy; 1980 General Plan; 1982 GGNRA Natural Resources Plan; 1995 EIR for the Crissy Field Plan, and the 1996 Compendium Amendment. The only redress for these actions by the GGNRA was for three citizens to spend ten of thousands of dollars of their own funds to defend themselves in a criminal proceeding challenging the tickets they were illegally issued. The GGNRA was found to have acted illegally when it rescinded the 1979 Pet Policy and began ticketing citizens for engaging in legal activity.

In the DEIS/SEIS, the presence of these plantings as well as the Western Snowy Plover are utilized to justify the restriction of recreation in the area. The GGNRA has, yet again, violated the mandate under which this Park was created, violated its promises to the City, reneged on the promises made in the FONSI, and made clear that this DEIS/SEIS had a predetermined outcome to cutback off-leash recreation or ban dogs in areas used for this purpose before the Park ever existed. The failure of this DEIS/SEIS to present any credible evidence which would support the restriction of recreation due to the presence of the plover has been discussed in detail in the Ocean Beach section of this comment.

Fort Funston (aka Doggie Disneyland)

Post WWII History of Fort Funston

After WWII, Fort Funston (FF) was pretty much abandoned. It could be best described as acres of sand dunes partially covered in iceplant that the Army Corp of Engineers had planted to stabilize the sand. In the 50's and early 60's, FF was a fabulous habitat - but not for wildlife or native plants. Rather, FF became a favorite hangout for seedy S.F. and Daly City gangs, drug dealers and users, sexual predators, off road recreation vehicle enthusiasts and a few off-leash dog walkers. Parents in nearby neighborhoods forbade their children from playing at FF due to its reputation for being unsafe. Tired of being harassed/harangued at other city parks, the dog community soon recognized the value in FF. It was clear that FF provided them an opportunity to recreate with their dogs off-leash in a beautiful seascape without any of the hassles presented at the other parks. No longer would they have to be inundated by the claims that they were infringing on the enjoyment of the city parks by adults and children who were afraid of dogs and complaints about dog waste.

Soon the word got out in the dog community and in the mid-late 60's FF realized a huge spike in the

number of dogs and their human companions. It was these people who became the true custodians of FF. They were the ones who turned it into a real park. They took pride in their park. They kept it clean and safe. In fact, because of the significant presence of dogs and their humans, the criminal element soon left FF in search of a new refuge where they had control and would remain unchallenged. Many went to Golden Gate Park. Truth be told, the criminals were afraid of the dogs. And the dogs, being the good judge of people that they are, didn't like the criminals. Yes, it was because of the dogs, and only because of the dogs, that FF was now a VERY desirable park. This did not go unnoticed by the National Park Service.

When SF deeded FF in 1972 to the NPS/GGNRA, they inherited a spectacular park that was safe and well taken care of by its true custodians - the dog community. In return, the GGNRA promised via its enabling legislation to respect the historical usage of FF which consisted almost entirely of off-leash dog walking. This promise was codified in the GGNRA 1979 Pet Policy (see <http://oceanbeachdog2.home.mindspring.com/id11.html>) which officially designated FF as an off-leash dog park. In the early 1990's a new management philosophy permeated the GGNRA where conservation would now trump everything else in this national recreation area. Most notably, it would trump recreation. In 2000, after several illegal closures at FF, Fort Funston Dog Walkers sued the GGNRA and won. In 2001 the GGNRA arbitrarily and capriciously wiped out 30 years of promises and promulgations and voided the 1979 Pet Policy (see <http://www.fortfunstonforum.com> for details). This action was reversed in 2004 in Federal Court and then again in 2005 in Federal Appellate Court. The 1979 Pet Policy was reinstated as the law of the land and remains that way today (also see <http://oceanbeachdog2.home.mindspring.com/id6.html>). Presently, we are embroiled in a process, i.e., the 2013 GGNRA Pet Management Policy SEIS (see <http://oceanbeachdog2.home.mindspring.com/index.html>), which assures us that the GGNRA will once again remove off-leash dog walking from all of its recreation/park spaces. The areas left for off leash recreation in the GGNRA's Preferred Alternative will soon be eliminated by virtue of the poison pill- -the Monitoring Based Management Strategy (discussed in detail on page 64 of this document). In short, this proposed compliance strategy has a measure of compliance that is totally subjective, with the GGNRA making all the decisions. Further, short or long term (permanent) closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which we have no ability to influence by our actions. The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon the language of the Monitoring Based Management Strategy.

#### The Bank Swallow At Fort Funston

Beginning in 1991, the GGNRA/ NPS began destroying the Fort Funston ecosystem with the premise being protection of the California state-threatened Bank Swallow. The GGNRA/ NPS maintained that that recreational activity and "exotic" plants were having a profound negative impact on the Bank Swallow. The GGNRA/ NPS never conducted an environmental impact analysis or vital monitoring as required by Federal law before beginning this ecological destruction.

For decades, the Bank Swallow population had been thriving at Fort Funston, with their population increasing steadily even as off-leash dog walking was legally permitted and visitor use increased. In 1982, there were 229 burrows, 417 in 1987, and 550 in 1989- providing anecdotal evidence that dogs and Bank Swallows co-exist and thrive.

In October 1991, the GGNRA/ NPS closed approximately seven acres at Fort Funston by moving fences designed to protect the Bank Swallow 75 to 100 feet away from the cliffs in order to construct native plant habitats. (Milestone, J. "Just a Swallow Habitat Restoration Project".) By early 1992, almost four acres were converted to coastal dune and chaparral. At that time, NPS staff began chain sawing twenty-

four (24) Monterey Cypress trees lining a trail leading to the beach, and volunteers pulled up erosion-preventing ice plant. Bulldozers were used to level hillocks and bury concrete slabs. In the course of only a few months, volunteers replaced ice plant with 5,000 native plants in the four acre area. The entire seven acre project was designed to take five years to complete with only 75% coverage of plants. The goal of the project was to increase "natural" erosion and create "moving sand" ecology. With the closures at Fort Funston, the GGNRA/ NPS embarked on a unilateral course that was illegal under its own management policies, the MOU Agreement with the City, and the GGNRA enabling statute.

At Fort Funston, the GGNRA/ NPS pursued a strategy of repressing dog-walking each time it expanded its closures. Concomitant with the native plant expansion, Park Rangers began telling dog-walkers, in late 1991 and 1992, to leash their dogs. In May 1992, Mark Scott Hamilton, Chairperson for San Francisco Commission of Animal Control and Welfare, sent a letter to Superintendent O'Neill expressing concern over "NPS Ranger announcements that GGNRA's longstanding 'voice control' policy at Fort Funston was to be changed effective May 1." Mr. Hamilton pointed out that such action would have serious impact on "overall dog-walking policies within San Francisco's geographic boundaries" and questioned how it could be done without public hearings: "It seems inconsistent with GGNRA's past policies (and perhaps violative of applicable regulatory law) that this change would even be contemplated until after public input hearings."

Public outcry over this action was overwhelming. In response, Western District Director Stanley Albright reassured both U.S. Senator Cranston and Senator Seymour that the GGNRA would continue to abide by the 1979 Pet Policy: "At this time, there is no change in the 1979 Pet Policy which [currently] provides the visitor the privilege of walking one's dog off leash."

Addressing public concern over the closures at a meeting that summer, Head Ranger Jim Milestone, in July 1992, assured citizens that the fences would be in place only one year and the native plants would be compatible with recreational use of the area. (Meeting Minutes of Fort Funston Dog Walkers Association, July 9, 1992.) The next year, GGNRA/ NPS expanded the native plant habit an additional three acres beyond the initial seven acre project, again without public review or project approval.

In June 1994, an additional expansion/closure of fifteen acres was proposed without analysis or public hearings. The GGNRA report confirmed that the project was already "expanding into areas beyond our previously agreed to perimeter. Project originally called for removal of all ice plant (a noxious exotic species) from the ten acre Bank Swallow habitat area. This is now complete and new areas outside of Bank Swallow habitat area are now within our grasp ." (Project Review Form, Ice Plant Removal, North Tip of Fort Funston, June 1994, emphasis added.) The project goal was to destroy 15 acres of ice plant, using chainsaws to destroy all "exotic" trees and bushes, and using bulldozers where possible. The map attached to this project limited the expansion to the asphalt coastal trail. In fact, this project also was "expanded beyond agreed perimeters" to encompass areas east of the trail, covering the entire Boy Scout Bowl.

In 1995, Rangers began warning dog-walkers at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and Ocean Beach that they were going to start enforcing the general leash regulation, 36 C.F.R. Section 2.15(a)(2). At the same time, GGNRA/NPS announced plans to close ten acres adjacent to Battery Davis under the pretext of erosion control. Ranger Jim Milestone admitted to the public at a meeting in March 1995 protesting the proposed closures that this area was very popular with children for playing Lawrence of Arabia on the steep slope. Dogs loved to chase balls and frisbees at the bottom of slope.

Following these closures, by letter dated March 14, 1995, Superintendent O'Neill promised Richard Avanzino, then-President of the San Francisco SPCA, that the habitat was nearing completion and would not expand south. The GGNRA/ NPS also promised that the Battery Davis closure was an approximately



5-year closure during which time it would be revegetated. Signs indicating both areas were closed for native plant revegetation were subsequently placed along the affected areas.

After four years of closures of areas adjacent to the Bank Swallow burrows to off-leash recreation and vegetation revision, in 1995 the number of Bank Swallow burrows plummeted from 924 to 713. A simple review of the scientific literature confirms that Bank Swallows are very tolerant of "human disturbance" at nest sites. Indeed, "many colonies are in human-made sites...such as sand and gravel quarries and road cuts." (Garrison, B., "Bank Swallow," *The Birds of North America*, No. 414 (1999), at p. 6.) Mr. Garrison is a California Department of Fish and Game Biologist and an expert on the Bank Swallow. In fact, the only GGNRA/ NPS study to evaluate the dramatic drop in numbers of the Bank Swallow concluded that increased predation, not recreational activity, was negatively affecting the birds. (Chow, N., "1994-95 Bank Swallow Annual Report", US04906-32.)

In 1996, the GGNRA/ NPS failed to document the colony size, and claims to have lost all data for 1997. In 1998, the number of burrows had dropped to 140, and the GGNRA/ NPS closed off the entire slope of coastal bluffs below the hang gliders.

The SEIS misrepresents the activities of the GGNRA during the time frame of 1994-1998 as follows: "The total number of bank swallow burrows observed at the site from 1993 to 2006 through the NPS monitoring program has ranged from a high of 924 burrows in 1994 (Chow 1996, 2) to a low of 140 burrows observed in 1998 (NPS 2007c, 3). The number of burrows was high for the years 1993 through 1996, with total counts above 500 burrows (NPS 2007c, 3). Storm events associated with El Nino conditions during the winter of 1997 into 1998 wiped out all the burrows through heavy erosion at the site (NPS 2007c, 3). The cliffs are subject to rapid erosion from storm events outside the breeding season (NPS 2007c, 1)." We would point out, again, that the native plant restorations were designed to increase "natural" erosion and create "moving sand" ecology. It seems rather self-evident that these native plant "restorations" contributed greatly to the demise of the FF Bank Swallows in the specified time frame.

In 1998, the Bank Swallow colony fled the "Bank Swallow Protection Area," to the "exotic" ecology and recreational activity along the south cliffs of Fort Funston. As a general rule of survival, birds leave areas where they are under stress. Despite the obvious devastation to the Bank Swallow colony, the GGNRA/ NPS failed to analyze the impact of unleashed dogs on controlling predators of the Bank Swallow. (Hatch Report, p. 85, lines 10-16.) NPS Head Ranger J. Milestone indicated the dogs might have protected the Bank Swallows by impacting the weasel population. (US03944.) Additionally, observations indicate that the very habitat the GGNRA/ NPS was destroying was the habitat most suitable for the Fort Funston Bank Swallow. Such observations confirm that ice plant rootlets are used by Bank Swallows to construct nests. (US04062-3.)

In January 2001, the NPS closed twelve additional acres to public use and the Bank Swallow colony again fled further south away from the new closure.

The SEIS characterizes the aforementioned movements of the Bank Swallows as follows: The cliffs are subject to rapid erosion from storm events outside the breeding season (NPS 2007c, 1). This erosion removes burrows from the previous season. The bank swallows respond by digging new burrows in the soft cliffs each year. Years without large storm events often result in burrows remaining from previous years, and these are recounted in the monitoring, though these burrows are not always active with swallows.

Because of a total failure to study causal effects of various activities on the Bank Swallow, the GGNRA/ NPS has no evidence linking recreational activity with the Bank Swallow decline at Fort Funston. Indeed, the best evidence that recreational activity does not impact the Bank Swallow negatively is the swallows'

departure from the fenced off northern cliffs to their present location

- - an area of continuous recreational activity. The overwhelming evidence indicates that the GGNRA/ NPS native plant projects and the erosion they have caused have negatively impacted the Bank Swallow colony.

In fact, NPS documents confirm that Bank Swallow experts do not agree with the NPS/GGNRA contention that the creation of native plant "flyover" habitat is necessary for the Bank Swallows. Notes of a March 16, 2000 phone conversation with Barry Garrison from the California Fish & Game Department, one of the nation's foremost experts on California Bank Swallows, confirm that he "doesn't feel need flyover" (USPR001625)....."doesn't necessarily agree that they need a flyover to persist." (USPROD01624). William Shields, Professor of Biology at SUNY, elected fellow of American Ornithologist's Union, leader of SUNY's Conservation Biology concentration (in letter to GGNRA re: closures at Fort Funston, October 2000), reiterates the Bank Swallows tolerance of human and pet presence and their lack of appreciation for "native plants." "The poor arguments presented in their (GGNRA) plans make little sense to me. The Bank Swallow like other swallows is quite suited to live with humans and their pets" and "... I do not understand or condone what I believe are their misrepresentations about the needs and safety of the Bank Swallows breeding in the cliffs. ... the notion that the swallows would do better by having more species of insects or even more insects on the short flyway between their breeding burrows and their main foraging sites at the nearby lake is a major stretch and smacks of special pleading to me."

The GGNRA's dune conversion destroyed the Bank Swallow colony nesting site that the birds had used since 1905.

GGNRA/ NPS officials have consistently maintained that after some five years, these "habitat" areas would be reopened for public use. Five years have passed for many of these closures, yet to date, no fences have been removed.

This DEIS/ SEIS contains no "monitoring of vital signs" that could possibly justify the actions taken previously or the actions proposed in the Preferred Alternative at Fort Funston to limit recreation of people and their dogs. The science, limited as it is, would indicate the Bank Swallow would benefit from the entirety of Fort Funston again being accessible for off-leash recreation as it was in the 1979 Pet Policy. Instead, this DEIS/SEIS moves to further restrict recreation of people and dogs to presumably "protect" the Bank Swallow.

A legitimate safety mitigation would be planting a bramble-type shrubbery barrier along the cliffs, so as to deter dogs and small children (neither of whom can read warning signage) from the cliff edge and preclude accidental falls off the cliffs for all park users.

**The DEIS/SEIS Promotes The GGNRA Practice Of Perverting The Endangered Species Act To Restrict Recreation**

Historically, one avenue for eliminating access to the public-the recovery of endangered and threatened species-has been extensively utilized by GGNRA management. This explains the GGNRA's repeated treatment of any habitat, no matter how deficient, as critical habitat. An example of this would be the "plover protection areas" at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field. This DEIS/SEIS proposes to ban dogs at these areas which is a management restriction more severe than is often employed in "critical habitat". Although for a time the GGNRA attempted to mislead the public by calling this area "crucial habitat", the fact of the matter is that term that has no legal significance. What is significant is that these areas are NOT critical habitat, therefore management measures are legally limited to preventing "harassment" of the plover at that location. Banning dogs is a restriction that is not commensurate with the observed

activities in these areas with respect to the plovers.

Additionally, in the DEIS/SEIS, the NPS designates areas as "potential habitat". The NPS treats "potential habitat" (build it and they will come) as if it were "critical habitat" and embraces all legal restrictions that would enure from that status. An example of this would be at Mori Point in Pacifica. At Mori Point the GGNRA chose to remove 2/3 of the property from recreational access in order to create potential habitat for the red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake. The GGNRA treats this "potential" habitat as if it were "critical" habitat (which it is not) with respect to recreational restrictions.

The GGNRA has also embarked on a mission to create native plant habitats where no habitat previously existed. GGNRA management alleges this is a part of their obligation to "preserve" the park for future enjoyment, however, this is NOT what they are doing. When you read the overview for Fort Funston, it is abundantly clear that they are creating these native plant habitats, and in doing so they are destroying parts of the park that existed long before the GGNRA took control. This process is not preserving anything. Additionally, this is in violation of their authorizing directive, as they insist establishment of native plant areas requires the exclusion of humans from the site, eliminating all recreational activity in the area.

Specifically, let us consider the San Francisco lessingia. From the SEIS:

"the San Francisco lessingia is listed as federally endangered and state endangered and is a low-growing, slender-stemmed annual herb of the sunflower family (Asteraceae). Populations of this species occur primarily in small, local remnants of dune scrub in the Presidio. Dune scrub is found on the sand terrace slopes above Baker Beach and in the Lobos Creek Dunes, and San Francisco lessingia is found in association with this community at Baker Beach. Both Fort Funston and Baker Beach have been designated as San Francisco lessingia recovery and enhancement sites (USFWS 2003, 128, 141). Although dune scrub habitat occurs at Fort Funston, the San Francisco lessingia does not currently occur there. Reintroduction of the species is precluded by the current unmanaged (or unrestricted) dog use at Fort Funston. "

We have just detailed the closure of some 35 acres at Fort Funston for the purpose of reintroducing native plants, presumably including lessingia. Clearly the GGNRA's native plant "experiment" has encompassed 35 acres and been ongoing since 1991. When will they admit failure? The plants they intend to reintroduce such as lessingia became extirpated in the area and there has been no documentation to show dogs came to Fort Funston and selectively dug up all the lessingia and left only the iceplant the Army Corp of Engineers planted to prosper. Perhaps the soils, weather, or other forces of nature have modified the environment at Fort Funston such that lessingia are unsuited to survival there.

In fact, there would be highly respected ecologists such as Katherine Suding of UC Berkeley and Richard Hobbs of the University of West Australia whose writings would suggest the GGNRA managers are going about their "restorations" in an outdated, ineffective manner. The failure to monitor areas as required by Federal law, is also a failure of good ecologic practices. The taking of parcel after parcel of property such as at Fort Funston without learning from your "experimental design" before moving to the next parcel is inexcusable. What results is an illegitimate taking of recreational space with nothing to show for it, except the demise of the Bank Swallow, a protected species.

Consider the article entitled "Management of Novel Ecosystems: are novel approaches required?" authored by Timothy R Seastedt, Richard J Hobbs and Katharine N Suding, and published in *Front Ecol Environ* 2008; 6, doi:10.1890/070046. The conclusions of the article in short are as follows: "Most ecosystems are now sufficiently altered in structure and function to qualify as novel systems, and

this recognition should be the starting point for ecosystem management efforts...Novel ecosystems composed of new combinations of species under new abiotic conditions are increasingly common, and adaptive ecosystem management approaches must explicitly acknowledge the current status and predict the future conditions of these systems ...Old styles of management, which focused on removing undesirable species or conditions from ecosystems to return them to a prior condition, may no longer be sufficient... In addition to enhanced monitoring, attention to a rigorous "experimental" design, including reference areas wherever possible, is appropriate if not essential to a defensible, informative, and publicly acceptable management program for novel systems. Awareness among stakeholders, policy makers, and managers of the realities of current and future ecosystem changes is essential to generate management strategies that have positive rather than neutral or negative outcomes. "

This SEIS proposes to drastically reduce recreational access to Fort Funston and further expand their unscientific native plant "experiment" rather than fulfill their mandated obligation to expand and enhance recreational opportunities at Fort Funston and elsewhere in the GGNRA.

Further, Closures at Fort Funston were conducted without a NEPA required environmental impact analysis with regards to recreation or the Bank Swallows, without proper project approval, without peer review, and without public hearings in violation of NPS regulations, U. S. Department of Interior management policies, and federal law. The GGNRA has implemented similar closures at Baker Beach, Lobos Creek, and in the Presidio. Concerned citizens were unable to obtain specific vegetative plans for the Presidio. Eventually plans to cut down approximately 4,000 trees in order to plant a native "vinegarweed" (*lessingia*) came to light and were opposed vigorously.

Lastly, the GGNRA has utilized this DEIS/SEIS to ambush recreation in areas where the public agreed to "restoration" to enhance the environment for "sensitive" species with the promise that recreation would be able to co-exist with these species when the project was complete. Several examples come to mind; one would be Crissy Field (described in a previous section of this document) and another would be Muir Beach. The conclusion in the Environmental Review for the Redwood Creek/Muir Beach "restoration" stated:

"The preferred alternative will have short-term minor adverse impacts on visitor and resident access to Muir Beach by contributing to traffic congestion. With the implementation of the mitigation measures, the intensity of these adverse effects will be reduced to a minor level. In addition, the overall effect of the project is beneficial and will improve resident/visitor access and recreation opportunities. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would not impair park visitors or residents. "

The project has been completed, and this DEIS/SEIS now fences dogs out from areas of Muir Beach and requires leashes where they were allowed off-leash before. Residents/visitors do not see the proposed outcome as an "improvement of recreation opportunities as previously promised".

#### GGNRA Usurps Authority Of The State Of California In This DEIS/SE/S

The GGNRA intends to ban the recreational activities of dogs and their guardians upon the tidelands that are adjacent to GGNRA beaches. These tidelands remain subject to State "public trust" uses and may not have their longstanding recreational usage turned into purely conservation areas without violating State law and the terms of the permit under which the GGNRA manages some of these tidelands. The GGNRA's position that the public trust doctrine goes into "dormancy" while it manages these tidelands is without any legal support. The 1987 permit specifically allows for enforcement of federal regulations on these State-owned tidelands only to the extent they are not inconsistent with State law. The "public trust" doctrine has been significant State law since California's admission into the Union in 1850. The general recreational uses of these tidelands are not subject to federal rulemaking of any type.

## Compliance Based Management Strategy morphs into Monitoring Based Management Strategy - A Distinction Without a Difference

The 2,400 plus page GGRNA Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) purports to offer its proposed alternative (almost everywhere on leash or no dogs at all) and then several alternatives. However, buried deep within the document is the GGNRA's Compliance-based management Strategy-a poison pill, which itself demonstrates that the alternatives are illusory  
- nothing more than a default to the GGNRA's desired change:

"In order to ensure protection of resources from dog walking activities, the dog walking regulations defined in action alternatives B, C, D, and E would be regularly enforced by park law enforcement, and compliance monitored by park staff. A compliance-based management strategy would be implemented to address noncompliance and would apply to all action alternatives. Noncompliance would include dog walking within restricted areas, dog walking under voice and sight control in designated on-leash dog walking areas, and dog walking under voice and sight control outside of established ROLAs.

If noncompliance occurs, impacts to resources have the potential to increase and become short term minor to major adverse. To prevent these impacts from increasing or occurring outside of the designated dog walking areas the NPS would regularly monitor all sites. When noncompliance is observed in an area, park staff would focus on enforcing the regulations, educating dog walkers, and establishing buffer zones, time and use restrictions, and SUP restrictions. If compliance falls below 75 percent ( measured as the Executive Summary xiv Golden Gate National Recreation Area percentage of total dogs I dog walkers observed during the previous 12 months not in compliance with the regulations) the area 's management would be changed to the next more restrictive level of dog management. In this case ROLAs would be changed to on-leash dog walking areas and on leash dog walking areas would be changed to no dog walking areas. This change would be permanent. Impacts from noncompliance could reach short-term minor to major adverse, but the compliance-based management strategy is designed to return impacts to a level that assumes compliance as described in the overall impacts analysis, or provide beneficial impacts where dog walking is reduced or eliminated."

The SEIS presents a "new and improved" Management Strategy which they euphemistically call "Monitoring Based Management Strategy". This new scheme purportedly addresses the comments/concerns of the public regarding the DEIS. The DEIS plan is in italics above. The SEIS plan is essentially the same except that it modifies the portion of the Management Strategy in blue above, substituting the following:

"Secondary management response: If compliance rates are deemed unacceptable based on the previous 12 months' monitoring data in one of the zones, in spite of the park's primary management actions, the park will evaluate secondary management responses and institute short term measures, including but not limited to short-term closures and/or establishment of buffer zones, and will evaluate whether to propose long-term closures. Note that primary management responses may continue to apply. A short-term closure is a closure contained in the GGNRA Compendium, typically one year or less in length. A long-term closure is typically longer than one year in length, and would likely require a special regulation. Examples of buffer zones or short term closures being triggered include a change in resource conditions requiring resource protection, such as sensitive species moving into an area, creek channel migration, beach erosion, habitat expansion or habitat restoration ( such as allowing vegetation within a ROLA to recuperate), or re-establishment of a baseline level of compliance."

First, the discussion of compliance rates has changed from 75% to "deemed unacceptable". Respectfully, this is even worse! We now have a measure of compliance that is totally subjective, with the GGNRA

making all the decisions. This is unacceptable.

Under this SEIS, the GGNRA may decide to impose a short-term closure. This would be handled by Compendium. Let us point out, a portion of Ocean Beach was closed to off-leash recreation some years ago by Compendium. We had public comment, and we commented in opposition. We enclosed the same scientific information in our Compendium Comment as we did in our DEIS Comment regarding Ocean Beach. We provided enough information to discredit the "study" the GGNRA relied upon to create their access restrictions. We now know the GGNRA was legally obligated to have the Hatch "study" peer reviewed before they ever released it. The requirement for peer review was ignored, as were our comments, and our analysis of the science. The GGNRA proceeded to unlawfully impose their restrictions in the Snowy Plover Protection Area by way of Compendium. It was a complete ruse. The GGNRA utilized the same "science" about the plover in the DEIS. We once again challenged that "plover science" within our Comment on the DEIS. This time, in the SEIS, someone within the GGNRA/NPS/DOI chose to omit the "plover science" we challenged from the SEIS. Clearly, we were correct about the "science", and we all know it was unlawful for the GGNRA to include or rely upon their "science" without prior peer review (which would have concluded the "science" should have been thrown out). Now the GGNRA intends to use this SEIS to double down and actually ban dogs and some human activities in that same Snowy Plover Protection Area, even as their omission of their "plover science" is tacit admission they have no scientific or legal basis to do so.

Further, these short or long term closures could be triggered by any number of conditions totally under the purview of the GGNRA, all of which we have no ability to influence by our actions.

The GGNRA could decide they want to make Fort Funston in its entirety a native plant restoration/habitat; and they can do so, based upon this language. More erosion at Ocean Beach or the beach below Fort Funston, and surprise- -dogs are now banned.

Worse, the language indicates a long term closure would likely require a special regulation. We have waited since 1979 for a special regulation codifying the 1979 Pet Policy. Despite prevailing in court, elected officials applying pressure, and public outcry over all these years the GGNRA has refused to make the 1979 Pet Policy a Section Seven Special Regulation as they should have had they been honest (check the history section of this comment). Why did they refuse?

Because they recognized how difficult it would be for them to achieve their goal of removing off leash recreation from the GGNRA if it was instituted as a Section Seven Special Regulation. But now, at their whim, under this Management Strategy they can initiate a long term closure and codify it as a special regulation- -never to be reversed by the public.

The entire concept of "compliance based management strategy" is one that has never before been utilized in any other National Park or National Recreation Area by the NPS. The Draft Plan/DEIS states (page 1725) that "the compliance-based management strategy is an important and effective tool to manage uncertainty when proposing new action" and "has been created" to assure successful implementation and long-term sustainability. We argued this policy attempts to allow the implementation of future restrictions without public notice and comment. This is unlawful and should never have been included in the DEIS. We were correct - - so they changed the Management Strategy to include public notice and comment, but their intent has not changed. Because history has shown the GGNRA has their own agenda and cares little about the science or public comment, this SEIS version of a Management Strategy is every bit as much of a poison pill as the original version in the DEIS.

It is clear that regardless of whatever alternative is finally selected by the GGNRA, the end game for the GGNRA is the complete removal of off-leash recreation throughout the GGNRA as well as the banning of dogs entirely from most, if not all, of the GGNRA. At this point we are once again reminded of the revealing statement made by now NPS Director Jon Jarvis: "I would rather give up those [the GGNRA]

properties than have dogs running loose on them."

In summary, in recent interviews GGNRA representatives have stated that they are forced to ban dogs entirely in many of the former GGNRA off-leash areas provided by the 1979 Pet Policy because, "We do not have the resources to enforce voice control or on-leash compliance...". However, it seems to be no problem for them whatsoever to fund staffing resources, expensive surveillance cameras, and muster up a Compendium or special regulation when it comes to dispensing their "poison pill".

#### This DEIS/SEIS (and GGNRA Policy in General) Punishes The Disabled

The disabled are given no special consideration by the GGNRA/NPS. As stated by San Francisco City Attorney Louise Renne (in a letter dated December 19, 2000):

"In addition to receiving numerous complaints regarding the closures at Fort Funston, members of the Board of Supervisors have been contacted by members of the public protesting the removal of pavement from the Sunset Trail, which was closed in November 1999 and reopened in March, 2000. Organizations such as the Golden Gate Senior Services have complained that a major portion of the trail is no longer paved and is therefore inaccessible to persons with limited mobility. We are writing to request a written response from the GGNRA explaining how this diminution of recreational opportunities is consistent with the GGNRA's responsibilities under the Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (9 U.S.C. 794). Please include in your response a description of the GGNRA's plan to make its programs accessible to persons with disabilities, including those with mobility impairments".

The Sunset Trail is still closed to the public (including those with disabilities), and the Preferred Alternative would restrict more of the trails the disabled might possibly access at Fort Funston to recreate with their dogs.

At Sweeney Ridge in Pacifica stands the Portola Monument, considered to be the most historic site in the GGNRA. When the GGNRA took control of this property, it closed the access road off to cars, thereby preventing the disabled or mobility impaired from accessing this site. The hike from the current parking spot is 2.5 miles to the Monument, with an elevation rise of some 1,000 feet. The GGNRA has made no legitimate effort to remedy this situation, despite complaints from the City Council in Pacifica, and groups representing senior citizens. This DEIS/SEIS further restricts access to this portion of the GGNRA.

Perhaps the best indicator as to how badly the GGNRA treats the disabled in this National Recreation Area is the lawsuit brought by Disability Rights Advocates against the GGNRA in 2008. The lawsuit seeks to resolve GGNRA's discriminatory practices and conditions which prevent people with mobility and vision disabilities from fully accessing its parks system. The suit alleges people with disabilities are systematically excluded from restrooms, visitor centers, historic sites, trails and pathways. One of the plaintiff's attorneys explained that at the Marin Headlands, the visitor center has a ramp, "but to a third-party evaluator, it was so steep as to be inaccessible and dangerous. Alcatraz offers a tram, but it only holds two wheelchairs - they just don't have the capacity. At Muir Woods, one of our plaintiffs has had problems with paved trails. GGNRA hasn't kept the paved trails in a condition that allowed her to use them."

Federal laws since 1973 have obligated Golden Gate National Recreation Area to provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Having to hike 2.5 miles to see Portola's Monument may be inconvenient for the average citizen, but it is impossible for an individual with a physical disability. The Sweeney Ridge/Portola Monument situation is a representative example of how when making decisions regarding access the GGNRA always chooses less access. The judge in this litigation sent both parties out

to mediation, yet after a time the parties were sent back to the court as there was a complete failure to come to any workable conclusion. Therefore, it cannot be asserted the GGNRA did not recognize the problem-the reality is that the GGNRA has no intention of remedying the problem, unless forced to by the Court. This DEIS/SEIS is consistent with this pattern of practice.

Instead of addressing their obvious discriminatory policies with respect to the disabled community, this SEIS attempts to divert attention by claiming their desire to limit off-leash access in the Recreation Area is in part to protect the guide dogs and their handlers from injury or duress from said off-leash dogs. This is patently disingenuous, considering guide dog teams have 99% of the GGNRA's 80,000 plus acres where they can travel without interference by off leash dogs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6690    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** N/A, UN N/A  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,14,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Duplicate Comment. See correspondence 6685.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6691    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** NA, UN 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-Dogs need some freedom to run be dogs. They are our family.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

-Racoons cyotes do more damage than dogs!

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

-GGNRA was formed in an urban area. We're lucky to have it but it should be compatable with urban living!

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

---



Crissy Field, Other: Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6692    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** NA, UN 94132  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-Dogs are our family - they need freedom to be dogs!!

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

-The GGNRA is a unique park. Do not transplant here the policies use limitations for non-urban parks.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Crissy Field, Other: Ocean Beach - San Francisco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6693    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** NA, UN 94117  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,11,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Crissy Field, Other: Ocean Beach

This is super important for human mental health.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6694	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	NA, UN 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Other: Ocean beach

Often people with dogs are the only people using the beaches/trails!!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6695	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	NA, UN 94114 United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,07,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

-Been walking my dog for years on GGNRA beaches. I always am a responsible user of our public spaces. Don't punish the majority of users for a few bad seeds.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6696	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

<b>Address:</b>	94116
-----------------	-------

United States of America
--------------------------

<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual
------------------------------	-------------------------

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-The GGNRA should not be allowed to TAKE OVER CITY PARKS!

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6697	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94070				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

-Not fair to people who are complying

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6698	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94114				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,13,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				

I love my dog, and birds, and kids and this town, and its surroundings and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash

areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

Please! do not enact these restrictions

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6699	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94115				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-I am for fenced non fenced.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

-Ex-member of ur park asc. in protest

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6700	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94960				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,18,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

-I comply!

-How about some enforcement then?

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6701	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94010				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,20,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Please don't take this special place away from our furry friends!

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6702	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94123				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				

---

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

-I run relax and anjoy the open area that surrounds these parts. No fences.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

I don't want fences at my parks

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit

Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6703 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416

**Address:** 94925  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,20,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

-Will result in significant adverse impact under NEPA to community environment cohesion

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

---

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6704    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94116  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

-Accommodate disabled and senior access by allowing use in some areas of retractable leashes greater than six feet in length.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

-Presumed wildlife protecting interests can be achieved by less burdensome restrictions of precluding dogs off leash within 50 feet

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

-GGNRA should attempt less harmful restriction of a test provision to certify some dogs as permissible under voice control tested for proper training.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Other: Ocean Beach

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6705    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** 94114  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.



I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

PLEASE LIMIT PRO. DOG WALKERS TO 4 DOGS AT ONE TIME ENFORCE IT!

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

THE "PROFESSIONAL" DOG WALKERS ARE THE REAL PROBLEM.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6706	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94132				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

-I do not have a dog, but I enjoy their presence in our parks

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6707	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:**

United States of America

**Outside Organization:**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

-No collective punishment

-Please come ticket the offenders

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands, Other: All

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6708 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** 94114

United States of America

**Outside Organization:**

Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:****Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter**Correspondence:** I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I love my dog and I vote.

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

-CONTROL THE # OF DOGS THAT DOG WALKERS CAN HAVE

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6709	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	94960				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,19,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan				

I love my dog and I vote.

Keep the trails open to off leash DOGS!

I oppose the GGNRA Draft Dog Management Plan

I oppose the Preferred Alternative because it is too restrictive. There is no justification in the dog management plan for major changes. I support formalization of the 1979 Pet Policy PLUS off-leash access in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

I oppose fences to surround or delineate any off-leash area in the GGNRA. Fences will make off-leash areas feel like pens and visitors using them will feel unwelcome.

The GGNRA should not be allowed to change the leash status in particular GGNRA areas just because it deems that not enough people are complying with the leash restrictions.

Parts of the Golden Gate National Recreational Area I visit with my dog:

Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Marin Headlands

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6710	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
<b>Address:</b>	N/A, UN N/A				
	United States of America				
<b>Outside Organization:</b>	Unaffiliated Individual				
<b>Affiliation:</b>					
<b>Received:</b>	Feb,14,2014 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Environmental Justice				

The issue of Environmental Justice, as it is postulated in the DEIS/SEIS is offensive at best. To claim that ethnic minorities are dissuaded from visiting the park because dogs are present is a perversion of the data. None of the 20 or more recommendations in the study about what the GGNRA could do to increase accessibility by minorities includes banning or restricting dogs.

The study was flawed in that it was a small sample of non-randomly selected people who were largely unfamiliar with the GGNRA (only 1/3 had visited at least one GGNRA site in the past year). This creates

a situation where opinions about the GGNRA are obtained from people who have not experienced the GGNRA to any significant degree. It is more likely that the measurements only reflect their perception of the GGNRA, not what actually occurs there. The responses obtained from this study might be well suited to establishing a public relations campaign for the GGNRA, but not establishing park policy. If the GGNRA had complied with their legal requirement to have this "study" peer reviewed, maybe it would have been modified so as to actually produce results that could have been informative.

The study itself says the goal of the study is to "realize the park goals of understanding how to improve 'connecting people to the parks' and how best to engage under-represented communities in plans and programs"-it was a public relations survey. What the study overlooks is that dog walking connects all different kinds of people to the parks. Had the subjects in this survey been to Fort Funston or Crissy Field recently they would have seen a wide diversity of people - - seniors, kids, disabled people, Asian-Americans, African-Americans, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, all there with dogs. Compare that mix to any other GGNRA park activity (with nowhere near the diversity) and the "we have to restrict dogs to protect ethnic minorities" argument appears misguided and somewhat condescending.

Respondents who did visit the GGNRA express no apparent problem with dogs recreating with people. A quote from P-42 of the SF State study: "I go to the beach ... When I look at the ocean I could totally relax and let my imagination run wild. I feel that life in America is truly wonderful when I watch people fishing, jogging, playing and walking their dogs."

An interesting observation: the GGNRA talks about protecting access for ethnic minorities who don't come to the GGNRA, but hypothetically might come to the park if there were changes. Who will protect access for the ethnic minorities who DO come to the park to enjoy off-leash recreation?

Suffice it to say that Environmental Justice would appear to be a specious argument at best for restricting the access of people with their dogs in the GGNRA.

#### Protection Of The Cultural Resources

The idea that cultural resources such as buried missile silos at Fort Funston require protection from dogs trampling, digging or urinating is far-fetched at best. I would point out that the larger size and weight of humans would be a greater threat to trample notable sites than would dogs.

With respect to missile silos at Fort Funston I would not assume all urine deposited would be that of the canine visitors. The GGNRA still has not installed any permanent bathrooms for the many human visitors at Fort Funston. In fact, it seems the GGNRA has little regard for the enjoyment of these resources.

I would also point out the GGNRA has failed miserably in their restoration efforts for facilities such as the Cliff House which are within the Recreation Area's boundaries. The new facility is quite unaesthetic, and popular restaurants within have been altered and have lost their popularity. I have talked to many visitors who are familiar with the previous incarnations of the Cliff House. They always express their disappointment and/or outrage as to its boxy appearance with the service entrances in the most visible area. There used to be a line down the hill for the Sunday brunch at the Cliff House, now it is empty. Our cultural resources are in far greater danger from GGNRA management and their "restoration" plans than they are from dogs.

#### Safety In The GGNRA

The actual Law Enforcement incident reports/citations were withheld when Dr. Valente made her initial FOIA request in 2006 for all data utilized by the GGNRA to conclude there was a need for a change in the DMP. When the DEIS was released, it included this conclusion: "Most of the issues related to the

health and safety of park visitors are related to their encounters with unruly/ aggressive dogs". No data was included in the DEIS to substantiate that claim.

Subsequent to the release of the DEIS, after several requests, Law Enforcement data was obtained by FOIA from the GGNRA/ NPS/DOI. The data was catalogued by interested dog guardians and the chart below is the result of their careful analysis.

The chart below specifically relies upon the incident/offense data for 2001-2006. As you can see, the incidents involving unruly or aggressive dogs comprise only 2 percent of the total incidents Law Enforcement reported in the GGNRA. Remarkably, these bite/attack incidents only occurred once in every 1.36 million park visits. 93 percent of the time, Law Enforcement was dealing with human-specific incidents. Clearly, the data regarding this issue of park safety for visitors and staff being compromised because dogs are present had been omitted from the DEIS because it does not justify the radical recreation restrictions the GGNRA was promoting in the DEIS and now in the SEIS.

In the SEIS, although the GGNRA maintains specific data is still not available for the years 2001-2006, they do create graphs of dog-related incidents as well as other incidents for those years. The SEIS graphs in Appendix G provide no visibility with respect to the number of overall park visits, which is misleading in and of itself. Despite this, the SEIS graphs for 2001-2006 do not substantiate the decision in 2006 to change the DMP. In 2001 and 2002, the dog related incidents are about 9% of the total number of incidents. In 2003-2004 the dog related incidents rise to 14% of the total. However, in 2005-2006, dog related incidents drop to 6% of the total. It would appear things are moving in the right direction, not getting worse so as to justify a DMP change. And, in fact, if we utilize their data as to the total number of incidents each graph represents, the number of dog incidents would be as follows: [see table in attachments]

This omission of pertinent law enforcement data in the DEIS was no accident. The data does not support the GGNRA's aforementioned assertion: Most of the issues related to the health and safety of park visitors are related to their encounters with unruly/aggressive dogs.

In the SEIS, the GGNRA attempts to emphasize data collected in 2007-2011 - data not available to the GGNRA when they decided to initiate the change in the DMP. This data's inclusion is disingenuous at best. At worst, this is evidence of a GGNRA/NPS/DOI attempt to justify their decision to change the DMP by skewing the data for the following years. The graphs in the SEIS for 2007-2011 are of very limited value, as they specify the proportion of incidents and total incidents at selected areas of the GGNRA for each year, with no indication of the number of public visits at each site. Further, had they been engaged in vital resource monitoring as they are required by law to do, we would have data that outlined the problems experienced by location and nature.

There has been no effort by the GGNRA to monitor vital resources or mitigate problems that monitoring could expose. 'Vital Resource Monitoring is a method by which effective land managers identify specific problems in specific areas and try to solve those problems. Take for example, picking up dog feces. It's the law, and the vast majority of dog guardians in the GGNRA follow it. For those who do not, we self-enforce. Additionally, most of us pick up one extra pile of poo in addition to that of our own dogs every time we are out recreating in the GGNRA. At Fort Funston, there are monthly clean-ups to ensure feces are not a problem. What is the GGNRA's response? In this SEIS they complain people do not pick up their dogs feces. In another section of the SEIS, GGNRA management complains about the weight and mass of dog feces in trash receptacles at Fort Funston. What are dog guardians supposed to do with that complaint? Why is that even a complaint?

Just to be clear, the GGNRA's Management has never met cooperatively with dog guardians to try to keep the 1979 Pet Policy working successfully as it did for many years. Had the GGNRA spent a fraction of

the time or money spent trying to justify and implement a predetermined outcome (e.g., expensive litigation, Negotiated Rulemaking, producing massive 2400 page documents under the guise of codifying policy) truly making an honest effort to work with the dog community, the GGNRA would be a shining example of how urban National Recreation Areas can work- -beautifully. However, if you read the history section of this Comment you understand that the GGNRA/NPS/DOI does not want dogs recreating with their guardians anywhere in the National Park system- -regardless of the designation as a Recreation Area or the enabling legislation. The GGNRA/NPS/DOI certainly does not want us setting a precedent for other NPS units such as the one in New York or Washington DC. The GGNRA/NPS/DOI does not want to identify or solve problems pertaining to dogs - -they simply want dogs and their guardians excluded from the GGNRA. Jon Jarvis said it himself- - I would rather give up those fthe GGNRAJ properties than have dogs running loose on them. (Presidio Officers Club, San Francisco, Calif., March 22, 2007) Clearly, we cannot do anything to please the GGNRA except stay out of this Recreation Area.

Maybe San Francisco should take Jon Jarvis up on his offer to give up the off-leash GGNRA properties like Ocean Beach and Fort Funston. We would like to remind the GGNRA/NPS/ DOT that the 1975 agreement for the lands transfer from the City of San Francisco to the NPS states that The National Park Service, acting through the General Superintendent, agrees to utilize the resources of GGNRA in a manner that will provide for recreational and educational opportunities consistent with sound principals of land use, planning and management, to preserve the GGNRA in its natural setting and protect it from development and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and natural character of the area, and to maintain the transferred premises in a good and sightly condition. Judge for yourself whether the following photos of Ocean Beach (taken in June, 2012) appear to fulfill that promise [SEE PHOTOS IN ATTACHMENTS]:

These conditions are present for months on end. The sand overflows from the beach on to and across the promenade path. Imagine a disabled person trying to make their way through mounds of sand on the walkway. And the planters on the left were stripped of their ice plant and native plants were planted, surrounded by red pea gravel. The plants died, the pea gravel became dislodged and flows on to the walkway to provide yet another hazard for the walker. The one photo where there appears to be a ridge running through the sand is actually the seawall. On the beach side the sand is up to the top of the seawall, and on the promenade side the sand has piled up so high the walkway has been obliterated. Yet in this SEIS the GGNRA complains about spending 1.5 hours a day picking up trash at Ocean Beach which is over 3 miles long. From these photos it does not appear 1.5 hours a day is enough, and it also appears that people are bringing their trash up off the beach and often placing it next to overflowing trash receptacles. You cannot put the responsibility for this mess on dogs. The GGNRA's poor performance in maintenance of Ocean Beach should preclude them from holding the property- - it certainly does not meet the requirements as stated above in the documents of transfer.

In reality, the safety issue with respect to dogs is a disingenuous argument at best. GGNRA management has sacrificed safety of the public repeatedly when safety comes into conflict with their restoration agenda. For example, the GGNRA was happy to spend over a million dollars at Mon Point to construct a bridge so that frogs could migrate from their current habitat on property outside the GGNRA to the potential habitat the GGNRA had spent another million dollars to create at Mon Point. Previous to the construction of the bridge, the frogs would have been required to cross the emergency access road for Sharp Park and Mon Point. In building this bridge, the GGNRA destroyed the original access road. Consequently, there is no direct way for emergency vehicles to get out to these popular public properties should there be an emergency. Further, the GGNRA's potential habitat included ponds which are mosquito breeding grounds, only a few hundred feet from a residential neighborhood. Insecticides are sprayed routinely on and around these ponds, and the neighbors were never advised of the risk of mosquitoes carrying West Nile virus and/or the risks of the insecticides sprayed to kill them in the environmental review the GGNRA promulgated before building the ponds.

With respect to management in the GGNRA, their high cost discretionary projects (e.g., the \$12 million spent by the GGNRA to create the new Giacomini Wetlands in Mann, the aforementioned bridge to nowhere at Mon Point always take precedence over everything else - - most notably public safety. Budget cuts enforced by the GGNRA in spring 2008 cost nearby Presidio Fire Station No. 2 the use of their ambulance, and could have made the difference between life and death for a woman found hypothermic at Rodeo Beach by a maintenance worker. The woman died before the ambulance dispatched from much further away was able to get her to a hospital.

### Water Quality In The GGNRA

It was interesting to review the water quality findings in the DEIS. Although it is asserted dog feces are a significant component in water bacterial contamination, once again the DEIS is short on facts and misleading as well. The DEIS refers to a substudy of the San Francisco Sewage Master Plan which determined that bacterial contamination of waters off Ocean Beach was significant due to dog fecal matter deposited along the shoreline (NPS 1999, 21). The difficulty with this reference is that it cannot be located. It does not exist.

What we find much more relevant is the Annual Report by Heal the Bay. The 2011 report gives Ocean Beach an A ranking at Balboa Avenue year-round excepting a B ranking during wet weather. At Lincoln Avenue there is an A or A ranking year-round excepting a B ranking during wet weather. At Sloat, the ranking is an A or A all year-round in wet or dry weather. Clearly dog feces are not creating a problem at Ocean Beach. Further, the 2010 Heal the Bay report acknowledged that in the summer nearly all beaches had a clean bill of health. But in the winter, when heavy rains cause untreated sewage to flow into the bay and ocean, bacteria hit perilous levels in some areas. Deb Self Director of San Francisco Baykeeper said, We have a massive, rampant problem with human waste. Among the worst offenders is Baker Beach, where raw sewage leaking from old pipes and overflowing storm drains flows into Lobos Creek and forms a pool at the south end of the beach.

Clearly, most dog guardians are picking up their dogs feces, and the relatively few instances where people fail to pick up after their dog, while not excused, do not constitute a threat to our water quality.

The assertions that dogs negatively affect water quality in the GGNRA have been omitted in the SEIS with the following explanation: 'Although water quality monitoring currently occurs at GGNRA, no site-specific, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted at the GGNRA sites to document impacts to water quality specifically from dogs. It is also difficult to discern what is causing an impact to water quality, especially in a large metropolitan area where water quality may already be degraded. The literature review found very few investigations or peer reviewed, scientific studies that document the isolated effects dogs have on water quality in recreational settings. Water quality has therefore been dismissed as a resource topic in this document due to lack of literature. We suspect that the data provided above by Heal the Bay and Baykeeper (as a part of our Comment on the DEIS) had something to do with the GGNRA's decision to omit water quality from consideration.

What was included in the SEIS was again anecdotal evidence gleaned from Comments on the DEIS, placed into the record to draw inferences but contradicted by data/science we provided in our comment on the DEIS. As taken from the SEIS: Wherever dogs swim and run, their feces introduce pathogens into the water, soils, and sand, and also onto vegetation and paved surfaces, possibly elevating the risk of human disease... During the public comment period for the draft plan/EIS, some comments noted the amount of dog waste at GGNRA sites, especially within the beach areas. One commenter stated, Just yesterday while coming out of the water from surfing I witnessed a woman watch her dog defecate in the shallow water and then just walk away. It happens all the time, virtually every day. I personally have seen dogs

run up and pee on innocent bystanders - children even - who just happen to be sitting on the beach (NPS 2011a, Correspondence 1169).

### Effect Upon Surrounding Parks

The DEIS failed to meet NEPA requirements by omitting an analysis of the effects of the proposed change on park properties in the cities and counties where the GGNRA now owns large swaths of recreational resources. However, when reading the DEIS, it seems pretty clear what the effect would be. From the DEIS itself: High numbers of incidents occur because of the large number of people that use the site at one time, and the high number of dogs off-leash at the site.. Certainly the GGNRA would acknowledge that this is precisely what will happen to parks outside the GGNRA should they close down 90% of the GGNRA's off-leash acreage as the Preferred Alternative would do. This is an unacceptable outcome. A phone or written survey and the addition of some analysis in the new SEIS does not change the numbers of users or the size of the properties they will be forced to utilize. The outcome is still unacceptable.

The City and County of San Francisco's Board of Supervisors passed Resolution No. 386-13 on October 29, 2013 opposing the GGNRA's DMP. The Mayor signed it on November 8, 2013. The text of the Resolution is as follows:

### FILE NO. 131002 RESOLUTION NO. 386-13

Opposing Golden Gate National Recreation Areas Draft Dog Walking Access Policy Resolution opposing the Golden Gate National Recreation Areas (GGNRA) currently proposed preferred alternative for dog management; and urging the GGNRA to adopt a different approach.

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

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

WHEREAS, The GGNRA was established, among other things, to create an area that concentrates on serving the outdoor recreation needs of the people of the metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, In 1975, the City and County of San Francisco transferred Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, and other city-owned lands to the federal government to be included in the GGNRA and administered by the National Park Service after being given assurances that recreational access and usage would be continued and protected; and

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

WHEREAS, In 1979, after an extensive period of public comment including public hearings, the GGNRA determined that voice-controlled dog walking would have no negative impact on the natural environment or on other park visitors when conducted on one percent of the GGNRA land, and the GGNRA therefore determined that dogs could be walked under voice control on that one percent of its land; and

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

WHEREAS, On January 15, 2011, the GGNRA released a Dog Management Plan that would severely restrict off-leash, voice-controlled dog walking and create large areas



where dogs would not be allowed at all in areas that currently allow off-leash, voice-controlled dog walking at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, Ocean Beach, Lands End, and Baker Beach; and WHEREAS, On April 26, 2011, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 183-11, putting the City and County of San Francisco on record as opposing the GGNRA's proposed preferred alternative for a Dog Management Plan, calling for a thorough study of the GGNRA proposals' impact on San Francisco and particularly on neighborhood parks if severe restrictions on off-leash dog access in GGNRA result in an increase of off-leash dog activity in City parks, and opposing the plans' compliance-based management strategy; and

WHEREAS, Public comment on the 2011 GGNRA Dog Management Plan was overwhelmingly opposed to the GGNRA plan, and, in response, the GGNRA announced that it would release a revised version of the Dog Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, On September 6, 2013, the GGNRA released a Supplemental Dog Management Plan that included only minor changes to the original plan, and that still would severely restrict off-leash, voice-controlled dog walking and create large areas where dogs would not be allowed at all, including restrictions in areas where off-leash, voice-controlled dog walking is currently allowed; and

WHEREAS, The Supplemental Dog Management Plan would still significantly reduce in the GGNRA a main group of recreational park users - people who recreate in the GGNRA with their dogs; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco reiterates its belief that the GGNRA is an urban recreation area and not a remote national park and that the GGNRA should be managed with the needs of recreational users very much in mind; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That given the complexity and length of the Plan, additional time for comment and analysis (until early 2014) should be allowed before the GGNRA takes action on the Plan; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the GGNRA should create a regular recreation roundtable through a private public partnership, where different user groups can address and resolve visitor concerns; and, be it

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

It should be noted that the City and County of San Francisco has an ordinance (San Francisco City and County Health Code; Article I; Section 41.12; Paragraph (c); Subparagraph 5) that, among other things, requires dog guardians to provide their dogs with adequate exercise to maintain muscle mass and appropriate weight. Therefore, the issue of whether or not to exercise dogs when access has become severely restricted is not optional. Dog guardians will be forced to do what they have to in order to comply with San Francisco health code law.

#### This Agency Action Will Not Resolve Litigation

In recent history, litigation has been the only recourse the taxpayers have had to combat this abuse of power by the GGNRA/NPS/DOI. And, in fact, the GGNRA/NPS/DOI was forced to reinstate off-leash recreation in the GGNRA following a Federal Court order in 2005. Should the GGNRA/NPS/DOI proceed with any of the alternatives proffered in this DEIS/SEIS, litigation to have this DEIS/SEIS declared unlawful or litigation by San Francisco to take back some of these properties will become a necessity.

#### Duty To Preserve - This Agency Is Responsible For Resource Degradation

The greatest threat to the long term health of the GGNRA properties is the failure of GGNRA

management to implement and use effectively a Vital Signs Monitoring program. Ecosystem changes GGNRA management has made until now to preserve the resources of the Park would not have been approved had a Vital Signs Monitoring program been utilized. The GGNRA has destroyed large areas of the Park in an attempt to remake the Park environment in the vision of a nativist ideology. These actions are in direct violation of the enabling legislation for this National Recreation Area. The SEIS Preferred Alternative proposes additional changes purported to protect wildlife from harassment. The data indicates the unintended consequences of ecological changes GGNRA management has implemented without the benefit of Vital Signs Monitoring have proven to be a far greater danger to wildlife than dogs. The scientific data presented in this DEIS/SEIS has not been peer reviewed and does not adequately support the dog management changes GGNRA management has made subsequent to the 1979 Pet Policy, or the changes they seek to make in any alternative proposed.

## Conclusion

On one hand, we have Congress, a Federal Panel and the voters and government officials of San Francisco City and County, all participating in the establishment of precious open space in this large, densely populated urban area as a key recreational area, necessary for both the health and well-being of its populace. On the other hand, we have a high ranking official from the government agency charged with managing that area quoted as saying: Ocean Beach without the people is an incredible habitat. But people think of it as a sandbox or their backyard. (Daphne Hatch, Chief of Natural Resources Management, GGNRA, SF Chronicle, 2007) Clearly, we have a problem.

No single action better exemplifies the GGNRA's commitment to distance themselves from their enabling legislation and any connection whatsoever to the concept of recreation than the GGNRA's failed attempt to rename and repurpose this National Recreation Area. In 2008, the GGNRA joined forces with Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi to surreptitiously slip a name change (and a stated change in the governing mandates) from National Recreation Area to National Park through bill H.R. 6305, a bill devoted to some management issues for the Presidio. Had this bill successfully passed, all references to the term recreation would have been removed from the laws, rules, regulations, documentation, signage, web sites, etc. surrounding this newly christened National Park. Even as this action, on its own merits, can be construed as an admission that the NPS/GGNRA is aware their actions do not conform to the enabling legislation; the GGNRA in the SEIS FAQ #21 tells the public National Parks and National Recreation Areas are legally bound to be managed to the same preservation standard.

Upon examining all of the available evidence, a reasonable person must conclude that this DEIS/SEIS, along with its preferred alternatives and the deliberately deceptive Monitoring- Based Management Strategy, are not based upon science or data but rather are the product of a predetermined outcome. This DEIS/SEIS is exactly what we have come to expect from an agency whose top authority, Director Jon Jarvis, is on the record as stating, 'I would rather give up those [the GGNRA] properties than have dogs running loose on them.

Upon review by knowledgeable legal resources, it is their professional conclusion that this DEIS/SEIS is arbitrary, capricious and an abuse of discretion. In simple terms, it is unlawful and must be thrown out. The GGNRA still has the authority, the ability and the moral responsibility to codify the original 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation. Post 1979 Pet Policy acquired lands should maintain their historical use upon inclusion into the GGNRA and vital signs monitoring should be implemented to determine whether subsequent changes must be made to protect resources. Since the GGNRA to date has refused to follow the law, we would ask Congress to intervene and establish the 1979 Pet Policy as a Section Seven Special Regulation with an Addendum to include in the Section Seven Special Regulation newly added GGNRA lands with historic recreational use by dogs and their guardians.

Should the GGNRA fail to heed these recommendations, San Francisco City and County could remedy their issues by formally taking back their affected properties through enforcement of their contractual reversionary clause. Unfortunately, this would be of little assistance to Mann and San Mateo counties. Therefore, it would be likely that those counties would pursue Congress to implement a Section Seven Special Regulation to ensure recreational access as was originally intended when this National Recreation Area was created. Should properties remain under the management of NPS/GGNRA, there must be strict oversight by Congress in order to ensure the GGNRA lives up to its Congressional mandates, including, but not limited to adherence to the sound principles of land use planning and management on a permanent basis.

There is a third option which might very well be appropriate in this situation. Considering the GGNRA's long, jaded history of ignoring their enabling legislation, violating numerous laws, rules and regulations and unilaterally implementing their own self-styled, self-serving management policies, perhaps its time to turn the GGNRA over to someone better suited to manage this recreational area. We would like Congress to consider the transfer of GGNRA properties to another Federal agency, e.g., the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management, where recreation is not a bad/foreign word and the sound principles of land use and planning are a major component of their routine management policies.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6711	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,25,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I have lived and worked in the city of San Francisco for the last 20 years and have enjoyed everything this city has to offer: cultural events, variety of ethnic restaurants, short commutes to work by bicycle, wonderful parks and plentiful outdoor areas for my dog, Lola, to run. Off-leash. Health and social benefits of owning a dog are many and are well-documented in numerous scientific studies. My dog and I run along Crissy Field, in Fort Funston or hike in Mann Headlands on a regular basis. Being able to run with my dog off-leash, keeps us both healthy and safe. My dog is extremely well trained and socialized. She is under my voice control at all times and will return to me without a moment's hesitation. We're enrolled in K9 Good Citizen program and will volunteer and local hospitals as part of Therapy Dogs Program and libraries (Tail Wagging Tutors). Dogs that are well-exercised and well-socialized among other dogs and people make better neighbors, too. After Lola's daily off-leash hike with a dog walker who is a certified dog trainer, the only noise that comes out of her is a snore. Ask my neighbors and they'll tell you how much they appreciate a dog that has no energy to bark. Studies have shown that there is no public risk in having dogs off-leash in "neutral territories" such as public parks or beaches. Triggers for dog attacks don't exist in wide open areas but are rather more frequent in homes or fenced off areas where one dominant or protective dog is not properly supervised. Leashes, too, may limit the dog's natural movement and cause them to become territorial. Hence, I oppose any fences surrounding off-leash areas. It will not only limit my dog but make me feel caged in. I pay high property taxes to live in San Francisco for the space and freedom the city affords me. There are other alternatives that must first be tried. Whether it's requiring an "off-leash" license which is granted to dog owners after passing a series of courses available at the SPCA or cite irresponsible owners, off-leash dog areas must stay untouched and unfenced. I request a written response or acknowledgment of receipt of this letter within 3 (three) weeks.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	6712	<b>Project:</b>	11759	<b>Document:</b>	55416
---------------------------	------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------

---

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,21,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern,

I am a San Francisco resident and a responsible dog owner who strongly opposes the GGNRA restrictions for off leash in the recreational areas of San Francisco. I am a taxpayer and a voter. I walk Crissy field every morning and evening with my dog and have seen no incidents of what is being brought up as concerns. It is the human beings that seem to be wreaking havoc on the grounds. Without these areas for my 701b poodle to run I will not be able to give her the exercise she deserves.

Dogs need to be socialized and can not do that well on leash. Being on leash in recreational area or confined only raises issues between the animals as they feel threatened and restricted when another dog approaches them. I very much support the alternative proposed by the Crissy Field dog group. We need to come to an agreement that will support both sides. Fort Funston has had no issues with habitat destruction. These are responsible dog owners making this stance. With the proposed plan we will have over crowding in the assigned gated areas for the dogs,

Please as a citizen of San Francisco who uses these parks, as a voter, taxpayer, and volunteer for park cleanups and SPCA. I urge you to reconsider this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6713    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

**Affiliation:**

**Received:** Feb,26,2014 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** As someone who walks several times per day with my dog in the GGNRA, I'm writing to

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

The new plan was not modified in any significant way to reflect the many substantive concerns and objections of the thousands of people who submitted comments in response to the first plan. In addition, there hasn't been a single peer-reviewed, sitespecific study (as required by law) that supports such a drastic restriction of dog-friendly areas.

The GGNRA has lost sight of its purpose: it was set up to be a RECREATION AREA for a densely populated, urban area. These trails and beaches have been set aside for dog walking since the original pet policy in 1979. That policy needs to be formalized and supported with off-leash areas in San Mateo County and on new lands that the GGNRA acquires in the future.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6714    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114  
United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual

---

**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,23,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I know you have many more important national issues to address, and our fight with GGNRA is way down on your list of priorities. To us it is a quality of life issue. GGNRA is ruining a major component, which is off-leash recreation on less than 1% of the land GGNRA supervises, for thousands of people in the Bay Area. I am a life-long Democrat, and believe in a strong federal government. But this federal agency, GGNRA, is out of control. It feels like some outsiders have come in to change what has been a traditionally off-leash pastime for generations for those of us in San Francisco. It would be different if they could produce one shred of evidence that off-leash walking and hiking is causing any damage at all. Their reasoning is, they are the professionals and its their opinion things must change. Well, I disagree. I know you are aware of this issue. I am begging you to rein GGNRA in, to have them follow the rules established in the 1979 Pet Policy, or give us the land back. This affects dog walking businesses, pet supply businesses, veterinary businesses, the health and well-being of dog owners in San Francisco and the BayArea, and the quality of every city park if GGNRA restricts so severely dog walking on the land they oversee. Thank you for looking into this. You would restore my faith in government if you would step in.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6715 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94123

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:****Received:** Jan,17,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** I would like to submit a comment about the GGNRA Dog Management Plan. My comment

is, it is pointless to make a comment since you clearly are ignoring all past comments of 2011, which I diligently and painstakingly researched. In a letter to me, Nancy Pelosi asked me to trust the process. Unfortunately, after reading your non-response to the comments previously made, I cannot. You don't really care what we citizens of the Bay Area think or need, do you? So why should we waste our breath and precious ink commenting, when you are going to do what you planned to all along. Bottom line, I reject the entire Dog Management Plan, the concept of a Dog Management Plan, and suggest the only answer is for you to give all the land back to the cities and counties they are in. Give back Alcatraz too, while you're at it. What we really need is a GGNRA Management Plan if the thousands of taxpayer dollars you spent on this fiasco is any indication. You should focus your attention on Yellowstone and Yosemite, true wildernesses where a tazered errant bear might be more appropriate than a tazered hiking citizen exercising his beloved canine companions. Trust? I think not,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6716 **Project:** 11759 **Document:** 55416**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94131

United States of America

**Outside Organization:** San Francisco Dog Owners Group Unaffiliated Individual**Affiliation:** OfficialRep**Received:** Feb,18,2014 00:00:00**Correspondence Type:** Letter

**Correspondence:** THE SEIS DOES NOT CORRECTLY ADDRESS THE VALUE OF RECREATION IN THE GGNRA

The SEIS contains a distinct bias against recreation in the GGNRA. The first two sentences in the legislation that created the GGNRA are:

In order to preserve for public use and enjoyment certain areas of Marin and San Francisco Counties, California, possessing outstanding natural historic, scenic, and recreational values, and in order to provide for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to urban environment and planning, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (hereinafter referred to as the "recreation area") is hereby established. In the management of the recreation area, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall utilize the resources in a manner which will provide for recreation and educational opportunities consistent with sound principles of land use planning and management. (PL-92-589) (emphasis added)

The legislative history of the creation of the GGNRA (H.R. Rep. No. 1391, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972) provided the following additional guidelines for the GGNRA (emphasis added):

"This legislation will ... [establish] a new national urban recreation area which will concentrate on serving the outdoor recreation needs of the people of the metropolitan area."

"Action is required if ... the relatively natural areas within the city are to be available to satisfy the growing need for outdoor recreational opportunities."

"The objective of H.R. 16444 is to assure the preservation of open spaces presently prevailing within the proposed recreation area, to provide public access along the waterfront, and to expand to the maximum extent possible the outdoor recreation opportunities available to the region."

The enabling legislation lists recreation as one of the four values to be protected and maintained in the GGNRA, along with natural, historic, and scenic values. Yet, "recreation" does not appear at all in the SEIS/Draft Plan's Objectives on p. 2. The SEIS' frequent references to "park resources and values" do not include recreation as one of them, even though the GGNRA's enabling legislation indicates it should be.

NEPA Attorney Ken Weiner, in his comment on the SEIS says: "Conservation of recreation is an essential GGNRA value that should not be impaired. Certainly conservation of GGNRA's ecological integrity is a paramount mandate under the NPS organic act, but omitting urban recreation as an object and as a park value that should be maintained improperly biases the planning and alternatives evaluation process."

Weiner also notes that the SEIS does not mention the central role of recreation in the GGNRA until 43 pages into the document, where it is presented as a historical footnote rather than a founding principle.

Even if recreation was not so critical to the GGNRA's founding, NEPA rules require that agencies consider impacts of alternatives on recreation. This is especially crucial in the GGNRA because its location in the middle of an urban setting means that GGNRA lands serve as residents' backyards. Most of us who live in San Francisco do not have yards, and we rely on park open space for our recreational needs. The GGNRA is where people in San Francisco, and indeed in the entire Bay Area, come to play. For example, the only

beaches available to the people in San Francisco are controlled by the GGNRA. Removing recreation from the GGNRA will have a significant negative impact on the quality of life of the people of the Bay Area, and that impact should have been included in the SEIS.

Because the SEIS shows so much bias against in its description and analysis of recreation, it and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE SEIS MISREPRESENTS THE HISTORY OF DOG WALKING IN THE GGNRA

On p. iii of the Executive Summary, the SEIS says: "Underscoring the increasing conflict over off-leash dog use, dog walking groups filed a lawsuit against the NPS in March 2000." The lawsuit was filed because the GGNRA did not take public comment before closing a section of Fort Funston to all users, not just dog walkers. The lawsuit had nothing to do with increasing conflicts over off-leash dog use.

GGNRA staffer Chris Powell gave a brief history of dog walking in the GGNRA at the first meeting of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in 2006. She said that after dog walkers sued the GGNRA, they realized they had to do something about the "dog problem." That is the point at which the GGNRA decided to begin the process of rescinding the 1979 Pet Policy that had worked so well for decades. In essence all this time, energy, and money that has been spent over the past 15 years in an attempt to change the 1979 Pet Policy and create a new Dog Management Plan amount to little more than spite and revenge by the GGNRA against a group that dared to sue them and win.

On p. 5, the SEIS says: "... for more than 20 years the park erroneously implemented the 1979 Pet Policy in contravention of Service-wide regulation." As I said in my DEIS comments, Judge William Alsup, in his June 2, 2005 ruling in an appeal of a challenge to tickets received by three dog walkers for having dogs off-leash at Crissy Field, said:

In sum, for more than twenty years, the GGNRA officially designated at least seven sites for off-leash use. This was not accidental. It was a carefully articulated, often studied, promulgation. The responsible GGNRA officials in 1978 and thereafter presumably believed they were acting lawfully. Even now, the government concedes that the GGNRA had full authority at all times to relax the general leash rule at the GGNRA but argues it could have done so, at least after 1983, only via a "special regulation." In other words, the agency allegedly used the "wrong" procedure back in 1978 (and thereafter) even though a "right" procedure to reach the desired result was available and could have been used. The government has not revealed its internal justification for following the "wrong" process. Whatever it was, the justification was abandoned in 2002 with the two word explanation that it had been "in error." With this ipse dixit, the NPS wiped away two decades of policy, practice, promulgations, and promises to the public. (Case Number: CR04-00408 WHA, p. 5)

True enough, the procedural requirements for a special regulation were not followed in 1978. Trouble is, when the off-leash areas were designated in 1978, a different and earlier set of NPS regulations applied, not the later revamped rules. See 26 C.F.R. Parts 1-7 (1978) Although the earlier regime still prohibited off-leash dogs as a general matter, there was nothing then that restricted the local authority of each superintendent to make activity designations on a park-by-park basis contradicting the national regulations. That restriction came later in 1983- when Section 1.5 (Closures and Public Use Limits) itself



was introduced, among other changes. The 1983 change cautioned that, going forward, the use-designation provision of the new Section 1.5 should not be invoked to circumvent a general regulation. 48 Fed. Reg. at 30262 (col 1). In the period leading up to the 1983 amendment, therefore, we must presume that the GGNRA designations were lawful. (The government has not shown otherwise.) Nothing in the 1983 regulations set aside then-extant use designations. (Case Number: CR04-00408 WHA, p.7) (emphasis added)

Based on Judge Alsup's decision, the statement that the GGNRA erroneously implemented the 1979 Pet Policy is wrong and should be changed.

Similarly, the SEIS says on p. 6, that: "In a public meeting on January 2001, the GGNRA Citizens' Advisory Commission acknowledged that the voice control policy was contrary to 36 CFR 2.15(a)(2), prohibiting off-leash dogs in national parks, and therefore illegal and unenforceable." As I said in my DEIS comment, the official transcript of the GGNRA Citizens' Advisory Commission January 23, 2001 meeting makes it clear that while CAC Chairman Richard Bartke did say this, the Commission itself took no position on the matter, and indeed took no action on the issue. The description of the meeting in the SEIS on page 6 should be changed to reflect the truth.

Because of these misrepresentations of the history of dog walking in the GGNRA, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE SEIS CONTINUES TO MISREPRESENT A SF STATE STUDY ABOUT ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

In my DEIS comment, I criticized the way a SF State report (Roberts 2007) of results from focus groups of non-randomly-selected ethnic minority groups was presented in the DEIS. The description has been changed in the DEIS, but it is still misleading. On p. 330, the SEIS says about the Roberts 2007 study: "While not all participants were familiar with the GGNR, a common theme was identified, as related to dog management in the park: dogs were a problem mentioned by Hispanic/Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander groups. Hispanic/Latino people expressed the most concern with dog owners' lack of concern or control over their dogs. For example, participants in the survey noted that dog owners assume that other people will like the owners' dogs as much as they do; dog owners let their dogs approach other people without first asking their permission; and owners do not react to their dogs begging for other people's food. One participant stated, "Every time we go to picnic the dogs come and eat our food, they wander around, and the owners don't do anything. The same with their bowel movements! The owners don't clean after them." Research found that Hispanic/Latino people and Asian/Pacific Islanders mentioned dogs, especially dog waste, as a barrier to park visitation and a constraint to enjoyment of the park."

My criticism of the Roberts study still applies. The Roberts study was a series of focus groups of a small group of non-randomly selected members of various minority groups intended to "realize the park goals of understanding how to improve 'connecting people to the parks' and how best to engage under-represented communities in plans and programs." The focus groups totaled less than 100 people, who were largely unfamiliar with the GGNRA (only 1/3 had visited at least one GGNRA site in the past year). There is nothing in the report to indicate how common a comment was - did only one person say it, or was it mentioned repeatedly. Thus the focus groups' opinions reflect only the opinions of the people who participated and cannot be extended to indicate opinions

shared by all members of the minority groups represented. Yet that is what the DEIS does with the Roberts study.

While dogs were mentioned, it is a misrepresentation of the study to claim dogs were a major factor keeping minorities out of the GGNRA. A major concern expressed was that there are not enough minorities represented in NPS staff. Common barriers to coming to the GGNRA included the lack of mass transit to get to the GGNRA, and fear of unknown plants and wildlife behavior. When asked to describe why they think San Francisco parks have become less safe, African Americans in the focus groups expressed concerns about finding used drug paraphernalia on the beaches, the danger of pedophiles/sexual predators at the park, and aggressive panhandling. Asians and Hispanics expressed concerns about cleanliness, defined as unclean bathrooms and dog feces. While Hispanics in the focus group did mention dogs as a constraint to park enjoyment, they also mentioned concern for personal safety, lack of mass transit, and fear of crime (fear of being raped, witnessing drug use, the presence of homeless people, and observing fights - "it is only safe if enough people are around"). Asians similarly mentioned dirty bathrooms and dog feces in the same context as a barrier for access to parks. Two focus groups of Asians reported dislike for "dog owners [who] do not clean up after their pets," but also for trails not being well kept.

Out of the more than 30 recommendations at the end of the study, there is no mention of dogs. While dogs were mentioned in the focus groups, it is by no means the indictment of dogs - if only there were no dogs, Asians and Latinos would visit the GGNRA - that is implied in the SEIS. It is at best anecdotal accounts of a few people's opinions of parks in general, not necessarily the GGNRA, since most had never been to the GGNRA. Because the SEIS contains this misrepresentation of the study on environmental justice, it and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

## OTHER BIAS IN THE SEIS

On p. 262, the SEIS says: "Stranded marine mammals and marine mammals that have hauled-out on GGNRA lands often attract the attention of dogs and people. The Marine Mammal Center data indicate that marine mammals are often harassed by dogs." This statement implies the Marine Mammal Center supports restrictions on off-leash dog walking on beaches in the GGNRA and is clearly intended to put dog walking in a poor light. However, during Negotiated Rulemaking, the representative from the Marine Mammal Center on the NR Committee read a statement opposing restrictions on off-leash dog walking on beaches because people walking dogs in the early morning were frequently the first ones to find the mammals and call the Center to come help the animals. They worried that restricting off-leash would cut down on the calls and mean it would take longer for the animals to get the help they might need. The statement in the SEIS should be either removed or qualified with the Negotiated Rulemaking letter.

On p. 1233, while discussing conflicts between visitors/dog owners and law enforcement personnel, the SEIS says "Conflicts typically involve verbal abuse, though physical assaults on the staff have occurred." Note that "assaults" is plural. However, on p. 337, the SEIS says: "There has been one reported physical assault of a federal law enforcement officer by a dog owner (no injuries reported)." One, singular, "assault", not plural "assaults". This inconsistency should be corrected as the notion that there have been multiple assaults on law enforcement personnel by dog walkers can only serve to bias the SEIS against dog walkers.

On p. 16, the SEIS says: "Soils and vegetation can be affected by dogs through defecation and urination, but although mentioned in reviewed studies, this has not been specifically documented in peer-reviewed studies." The rest of the paragraph goes on to list ways that dog urine and feces "could" affect soils and vegetation, despite the previous statement of no proof. Once again, claims of impacts without solid evidence that they are occurring should not be used in an EIS.

On p. 1345, the SEIS says: "Portions of Fort Funston have been heavily impacted by intense dog use, particularly where there is accelerated erosion from natural forces of the geologic resources, At this site, the impacts of dog walking are exacerbating the ongoing erosion that is caused by the weather and natural coastal processes." However, the SEIS includes no site-specific evidence to back up this claim.

On p. 352, the SEIS says: "While GGNRA cannot provide an exact number of incidents that go unreported, even if law enforcement data undercounts incidents, the data substantiates a need to regulate dog walking to protect resources, diverse visitor experiences, and health and safety." No, actually, the incident reports data show few dog-related incidents that involve wildlife disturbances, resource degradation, visitor safety, or anything other than the fact the dog is off-leash.

#### Errors of Fact:

On p. 361, discussing dogs at the McLauren Park DPA, the SEIS says: "... (although dogs are not allowed in the waterbody)..." referring to the reservoir in the DPA. Actually dogs are allowed in the reservoir. The parenthetical phrase should be removed.

On p. 390, the SEIS says: "The SNRAMP, authored by the SF Planning Department, will guide natural resource protection and habitat restoration..." Actually, SNRAMP was written by SF Recreation and Park Department staff, not people from Planning. This should be corrected.

Throughout the SEIS, extensive quotes from people who view dogs as a problem or who do not want dogs in GGNRA are included. Comparatively fewer quotes from dog walkers are included, giving the impression of serious problems with dogs in the GGNRA. Comments where people report a single disturbance or problem with dogs are considered illustrative of those larger problems, while comments from dog walkers that they have not seen those same problems in decades-long experiences in the GGNRA are dismissed and not included. There continues to be an underlying assumption throughout the SEIS that dogs are bad that they have negative impacts on nearly everything - plants, wildlife, safety, other visitors, etc. - even though the SEIS has no site-specific studies showing any of those negative impacts are actually occurring in the GGNRA.

Because of these cases of bias, along with other instances recounted throughout this comment, the SEIS and Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE GGNRA IS NOT FOLLOWING INTERIOR SECRETARY SALLY JEWELL'S LEAD ON WORKING WITH NEIGHBORING COMMUNITIES

As San Francisco Supervisor Scott Weiner noted at a Town Hall Forum on the GGNRA's Dog Management Plan sponsored by U.S. Representative Jackie Speier on January 30, 2014, "The entire political leadership of San Francisco is expressing concerns" with the GGNRA Preferred Alternative for a Dog Management Plan. Since the SEIS was released, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee, US Representatives Jackie Speier and Nancy Pelosi, the Marin County Board of Supervisors, and then-President of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Don Horsley have all passed resolutions or written letters to the GGNRA expressing concerns about the proposed Dog Management Plan.

At a November 7, 2013 appearance before the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, Interior Secretary Sally Jewell said that the National Park Service should work closely with neighboring cities like San Francisco. Unfortunately, as evidenced by the previous paragraph, the GGNRA is not working with the surrounding communities on a Dog management plan, and, instead is pushing ahead with a highly unpopular plan no matter what the neighbors say.

Secretary Jewell also talked about the need for the National Park Service to "welcome young people on our public lands." Ironically, many young people who currently walk their dogs in the GGNRA will no longer be welcome to enjoy this recreation on GGNRA land if the Preferred Alternative is adopted. Because it goes against what the Secretary of the Interior has said should be goals of the National Park Service, the SEIS and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE SEIS INCLUDES FENCES AS A MANAGEMENT STRATEGY WITHOUT ADEQUATELY CONSIDERING THEIR IMPACTS

The SEIS suggests fences be erected around off-leash areas to clearly delineate where dogs can be let off leash so that people who don't want to interact with a dog can know where not to go. During Negotiated Rulemaking, GGNRA staff, including then-Superintendent Brian O'Neill, consistently and adamantly refused to consider fences, despite pressure to do so by those who do not want dog walking in the GGNRA. At the time, GGNRA staff argued that fences were ugly and no one wants to see fences in the park. Fences were not included in the DEIS, and there is no adequate explanation for why they were added to the SEIS. Fences are ugly, and serve to make those penned inside feel unwanted. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs inside will hinder movement of wildlife. Fences secure enough to keep small dogs inside will hinder movement of wildlife. Fences are a bad idea. There is no analysis of impacts of fences on the visitor experience in the SEIS, especially the visitor experience of people who walk with dogs. This analysis should have been included in the SEIS. Because of this inadequate analysis of fences, the SEIS and the Dog management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE MONITORING-BASED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IS STILL COMPLIANCE BASED

The Monitoring-Based Management Strategy (MBMS) in the SEIS is marginally better than the Compliance-Based Management Strategy in the DEIS. It will no longer include an automatic change in status from off-leash to on-leash or no-dog if the GGNRA claims there is not enough compliance with new restrictions on access, and that is an improvement. However, the plan remains primarily based on compliance alone, rather than on impacts that result from non-compliance, and, as such, is not acceptable as an adaptive management strategy. There is no requirement that non-compliance cause measureable impacts on resources before changes in status happen. In addition, because the MBMS only goes one way - toward more restrictions - with no provision for increasing off-leash areas if no impacts are found, it is not acceptable. Because the SEIS includes the MBMS, it and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

#### THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE IS JUST TOO EXPENSIVE

The SEIS quotes the cost of the No Action Alternative as \$470,317 (p.1209). It quotes the cost of the Preferred Alternative as \$2,587,194 (p.1219). On p. 1053, the SEIS says: "If funding is available, the park would explore options that would allow improved access for disabled and elderly visitors to ROLAs, such as beach mats or improved trail surfaces." The GGNRA has budgeted \$2.5 million to deny people dogs access to 90% of the places where they can go now with their dog, but it cannot promise that there will be any money to allow elderly and disabled dog walkers to access what little off-leash space is left.

A January 2014 report by Environment California, titled "Death by a Thousand Cuts," describes how

budget cuts in the GGNRA has led to significant downgrades in services, including closures of visitor centers, delays in repairs to buildings, roads, and trails. The GGNRA has cut back on garbage collection in recent months. Yet they plan to budget an additional \$2.5 million to hire little more than glorified dogcatchers. The GGNRA's priorities are skewed. Because the SEIS endorses this costly and misguided spending plan, it and the Dog Management Plan it supports cannot be accepted.

## CONCLUSION

Taken individually, each of these problems with the SEIS is damning. But when taken together, it is clear that the SEIS is so deeply flawed that it cannot be fixed. The analysis essentially needs to be thrown out and done over in an unbiased, science-based way. I made the same statement about the DEIS, yet no significant changes were made in the SEIS. Given the lack of evidence of impacts from dogs in the GGNRA in the SEIS, along with the apparent inability of the GGNRA to produce an unbiased, science-based EIS, it is clear that the SEIS and the Dog management Plan it supports should be thrown out.

The GGNRA should choose the 1979 Pet Policy (including returning off-leash access in the plover protection areas at Ocean Beach and Crissy Field since the SEIS does not represent any solid evidence that the presence of dogs in these areas has any impact on snowy plover populations or survival rates, and indications the presence of dogs may actually protect the plovers from their "real" predators, especially ravens and crows) as its Preferred Alternative. Both on- and off-leash recreation should be allowed at sites in San Mateo County that have been added to the GGNRA since the 1979 Pet Policy was adopted and in any future land added to the GGNRA, especially those sites where off-leash dog walking has traditionally occurred. You can think of this as the A+ Alternative.

To quote from Ken Weiner, a NEPA attorney, in his comment on the SEIS:  
GGNRA is unique. There is no other urban national parkland like it. No unit of the National Park System - from Santa Monica to New York harbor - has the identical mandate. The Superintendent has the administrative discretion to adopt rules that will further conservation of all of the values for which this national recreation area was established.

GGNRA is San Francisco's and the Bay Area's backyard. GGNRA serves an extraordinary population with a similarly unique culture. Its residents love nature and the outdoors, love their dogs, and love their communities, urban neighborhoods and shorelines perhaps as no other region in the US. These are complementary - not conflicting - values to the vast majority of GGNRA users. San Francisco and the Bay Area residents have a distinct culture that places high value on both community and individual choice, on both freedom and responsibility. Out-of-town visitors, like many of us, expect and appreciate this culture as well. The Dog Management Plan can and should support, not diminish these values.

The A+ Alternative, along with a renewed commitment of GGNRA staff to work with dog groups, rather than against them, can create and nurture this unique park experience.

Sincerely,

Sally Stephens  
Chair, San Francisco Dog Owners Group

Cc: Secretary Sally Jewell, Department of the Interior  
Jon Jarvis, Director, National Park Service  
Christine Lehnertz, Pacific West Regional Director, National Park Service  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer

Congresswoman Jackie Speier  
Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi  
Mayor Ed Lee  
Supervisor Scott Weiner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 6717    **Project:** 11759    **Document:** 55416  
**Address:** Seattle, WA 98104  
United States of America  
**Outside Organization:** K&L Gates LLP Unaffiliated Individual  
**Affiliation:**  
**Received:** Feb,19,2014 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** Letter  
**Correspondence:** Mr. Frank Dean General Superintendent  
Golden Gate National Recreation Area Building 201, Fort Mason  
San Francisco, CA 94123 Attn: SEIS

Re: Comments on behalf of the Crissy Field Dog Group on the GGNRA 2013 Draft Dog Management Plan I Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Superintendent Dean:

We represent the Crissy Field Dog Group (CFDG) and we write to comment on its behalf on the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Draft Dog Management Plan I Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS), released in Fall, 2013. CFDG is also submitting an additional comment letter, and this letter is intended to supplement those comments.

#### Introduction

Regrettably, CFDG believes that the DSEIS remains inadequate as a legal matter and fails to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and NEPA implementing regulations from the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), and fails to comport with relevant NEPA guidance. These concerns are detailed further below .

But legal insufficiency is only one level of concern here. Perhaps more important is that the NEPA process should result in better plans , better alternatives, and better projects, not just better environmental impact statements. Unfortunately, CFDG believes that the DSEIS also fails this crucial test by once again proposing a management plan that is unduly restrictive of dog walking recreation and fails to protect this important urban recreation activity from impairment in a manner consistent with the legislative purposes of the

GGNRA, and the National Park Service's mandates. The DSEIS continues to treat recreational uses as being opposed to natural resources - - and fails to preserve recreational dog walking resources as part of the inherent value of the GGNRA.

#### Need for Enhanced Dialogue and Collaboration

CEQ guidance strongly encourages meaningful dialogue and collaboration consistent with NEPA's goal of facilitating a meaningful opportunity for dialogue between interested citizens and federal agencies (1). To realize that goal, the Council on Environmental Quality has identified that federal agencies should collaborate with interested parties throughout the NEPA process beyond the basic requirement to call for public comment. Collaborating with all groups, especially those with conflicting interests, allows federal agencies to "improve the quality of decision-making and increase public trust and confidence in agency decisions (2)." Indeed, the CEQ pointed to the GGNRA negotiated rulemaking process as a notable example of collaboration that worked (3).

Unfortunately, constructive dialogue has not occurred in recent years. As stated in its May 24, 2011 comment letter, now almost two years ago, CFDG feels strongly that a meaningful dialogue among all relevant stakeholders must occur in order to improve the Dog Management Plan. A supplemental DSEIS is a potential first step toward real dialogue, but if recent years have proven anything, it is that written environmental analysis, written comments, and further written response to comments - - all spaced over the course of several years - - have failed to achieve any meaningful movement in shaping a workable dog management plan that has stakeholder buy-in among GGNRA visitors. Without a workable plan based upon sound policy, legitimate science, and practical enforcement policies that can be understood and agreed upon by the dog walking community and the community at large, there is, unfortunately, a significant risk that there could be continuing political controversy, an exacerbation of lack of a trust in GGNRA management, and the potential for widespread noncompliance, resulting in increased costs of GGNRA enforcement without impact reduction benefits. CFDG makes this observation as a good faith participant in this process who wishes to achieve meaningful results that bring value to members of the community. CFDG feels strongly that such results must be founded on realistic dog management policies.

Even if compliance is achieved, other problems may likely emerge, the scope of which have not been analyzed in the DSEIS. The current proposed plan would concentrate off-leash dogwalking in only 5 GGNRA units - - four of them subject to greater restrictions than existing conditions - - which presents a drastic reduction from the 18 historic off leash use areas within the GGNRA (4). The impacts of funneling this off-leash use into these few remaining areas have not been analyzed in any meaningful way (nor has the impact on nearby city and county parks), but there is plainly a real potential for increased user conflict in these areas or other impacts if only these areas remain for off-leash access. In this way the current plan has the real potential to make things worse, but how much worse, the community does not know, because the NEPA analysis - - despite thousands of pages - - has not looked at this question.

To date, GGNRA and NPS have failed to achieve stakeholder buy-in. The City of San Francisco, Marin County have each adopted resolutions opposing the NPS's preferred alternative and pointing out significant deficiencies in the DSEIS, and San Mateo County Board of Supervisors President Don Horsley has expressed concern on behalf of his constituents in a letter to the GGNRA about the restrictions on dog recreation (5). We understand that Representative Jackie Speier has expressed significant concerns regarding the

preferred alternative in San Mateo County, including the lack of off-leash dog walking throughout the GGNRA's San Mateo lands. Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi has urged that "comments from the community should not only be reviewed, but carefully considered and incorporated into the final dog management rules (6)." In addition, the San Francisco SPCA and the Marin Humane Society have clearly stated their concerns about the DSEIS. Regrettably, it appears at this time that the process is currently not headed in the right direction, largely due to the failure of the DSEIS to adequately incorporate to community comment, and the continued adherence to an unduly restrictive preferred alternative. However, it is not too late - - all parties have a strong interest in a plan that actually works on the ground, and CFDG therefore urges the NPS to reconsider its current unduly restrictive approach to enable true give-and-take that will let a workable plan emerge.

Despite the difficulties of the past several years, CFDG remains committed to constructively working toward meaningful solutions in this process. CFDG proposes here a set of working guidelines and management alternatives which we believe would allay concerns identified in the DSEIS, improve the NEPA analysis, while increasing clarity, compliance, and achieving real-world impact reduction on the ground.

#### Polarizing Assumptions Reflected in the Purpose and Need Statement

The DSEIS continues to treat recreation as inimical to natural resource preservation, and still fails to recognize that recreation is a core element of the GGNRA's mission, deserving of protection as a resource unto itself. Unfortunately, the DSEIS still fails to internalize the fact that the GGNRA is an urban recreation area - - not a "national park" in the commonly understood sense. Congress recognized dog walking as an appropriate recreational activity when it created the GGNRA and identified recreation, natural, scenic and cultural resources as deserving of protection in the GGNRA (7).

In this regard, the purpose and need statement of the DSEIS retains its fundamental bias when it omits dog walking recreation as deserving of protection - - indeed the statement of purpose and need appears to be verbatim unchanged from the 2011 draft. Instead, dog walking recreation is treated as something needing "management" - - i.e., restriction - - while other GGNRA values are singled out for "protection (8)." This approach fails to implement the GGNRA enabling legislation and results in a fundamental bias in the document. Moreover, it represents a basic failure on the GGNRA's part to meaningfully change its approach in light of CFDG's prior comments. The purpose and need statement should be revised to acknowledge that dog recreation is a core value of the GGNRA deserving of protection in its own right.

The purpose and need statement also continues to reflect the NPS's unsupported determination that the mere presence of dogs has negative water quality impacts. Due to a lack of reliable information, the NPS eliminated its analysis of water quality impacts (9). These considerations therefore should not form the basis of NPS's decision with respect to dog management in the GGNRA. Nevertheless, the "Objectives" continue to describe the purpose of the Plan as "[m]inimiz[ing] degradation of vegetation, soil and water resources by dog use." DSEIS at 2. The NPS should revise the purpose and need statement and all relevant alternatives accordingly.

#### Failure to Respond to Prior CFDG Comments

CFDG reiterates and incorporates by reference in full the concerns expressed in its May 27, 2011 and



May 30, 2011 comments on the 2011 draft Dog Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement and comments submitted by K&L Gates for CFDG on May

23, 2011. (For convenience, see also the text of these comment letters as attachments E and F, hereto.)

(10) While CFDG appreciates the steps taken to incorporate additional data and re-evaluate the scientific underpinnings of the impacts analyses, we continue to see gaps in the impacts analysis.

CFDG submitted lengthy appendices with specific comments on enforcement data, biological resources, water quality, soil, vegetation, and recreational resources. The NPS's Response to Comments does not provide a substantive response to any of these specific points or clearly indicate that the NPS has incorporated the substance of CFDG's technical comments into the DSEIS or otherwise responded in a substantive manner to these comments consistent with 40 CFR 1503.4. We attach these comments again here as Attachment G for an adequate response.

CFDG also identified increases in special events and other recreational activities (e.g., bicycling) in its comments on the 2011 DEIS. Many of these special events are recurring, such as Fleet Week, and many events occur regularly, such as corporate receptions or fundraisers. The DSEIS, however, still fails to analyze the impact of an increasing number of special events, some of which may result in greater impacts on natural resources than a year's worth of off-leash dog walking. For instance, CFDG and other dog walkers from Baker Beach picked up massive amounts of trash and fireworks casing debris after celebration of

the Golden Gate Bridge's 75th anniversary. Ultimately, while the DSEIS acknowledges that dogs are only a "contributing factor" with respect to wildlife, (11) soil and vegetation impacts, the DSEIS does not address the relative share of dog-related impacts compared to impacts related to human impacts such as special events and other recreational activities (e.g., bicycling) (12).

This is pertinent to the NEPA and administrative decision-making process because the current analysis may be confusing to the public and legislators. NPS claims there will be "beneficial impacts" to resources from reducing off-leash dog recreation within the GGNRA, but no environmental benefits will materialize if the anticipated benefits do not accrue due to incorrect compliance assumptions in the DSEIS or benefits are offset by increases in other recreation activities.

Finally, the NPS also continues to dismiss urban quality from consideration in the EIS. The GGNRA is an urban recreation area and its purpose is not to provide a remote wilderness experience but to serve as open space for the citizens of the San Francisco metropolitan area. *Trinity Episcopal School Corp. v. Romney*, 523 F.2d 88, 93-94 (2d Cir. 1975) (13). Analysis of urban quality and the design of the built environment must be undertaken to comply with NEPA here.

As discussed further below, many of the gaps that have survived in the 2013 DSEIS also reflect serious deficiencies in the DSEIS's impacts analysis.

#### Illogical Conclusions in Impacts Analysis with Respect to Wildlife Without Evidentiary Basis

When defining the scope of an action's environmental impacts, NEPA requires a "reasonably close causal relationship." *Metropolitan Edison Co. v. People Against Nuclear Energy*, 460 U.S. 766 (1983). Like the 2011 DEIS, the 2013 DSEIS continues to brush past the causation issue of how the presence of dogs actually harms special status species occurring within the GGNRA, as pointed out in CFDG's prior comments with respect to Western Snowy Plovers. Instead, where there is uncertainty as to the mechanism for impacts, the DSEIS construes this uncertainty against dogs and concludes that because impacts "could" occur, that continuing with the status quo "would" result in adverse impacts.

â€ The DSEIS notes that "there is no published documentation that dogs have either directly or indirectly affected [California Red-Legged Frogs]" at Muir Beach, but, based on the ways in which the presence of dogs "could" affect these frogs, the DSEIS nevertheless anticipates that the status quo would result in "negligible to

long-term minor adverse impacts (14)."

â€ The DSEIS documents the occasional presence of humans and dogs on the cliffs at Fort Funston, but acknowledges that bank swallows are "somewhat resilient to disturbance" and that "effects from human/dog presence on the nesting success of the bank swallow at Fort Funston have not been adequately studied." The DSEIS nevertheless concludes that impacts on the bank swallow under the no action alternative will be "long-term minor adverse impacts (15)."

â€ For Muir Beach, the DSEIS acknowledges there is "no documentation that dogs have directly or indirectly affected" coho and steelhead (16). Yet the conclusion of this section is that dogs may have "minor and adverse" impacts on coho and steelhead.

The NPS lacks information relevant to a reasoned choice, but nevertheless appears to consistently conclude that despite the lack of evidence, dogs are likely to impact wildlife solely by their presence. These analyses should be revised to acknowledge that causation has not been demonstrated.

#### Unfairly Skewed Impacts Analysis with Respect to Visitor Use Experience

The purpose of NEPA is to enable informed decision-making and public participation. *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens*, 490 U.S. 332 (1980). The effects analysis extends to social and economic impacts where such impacts are interrelated with natural and physical effects. 40 C.F.R. Â§ 1508.14; see also *Trinity Episcopal*, 523 F.2d 8at 93-94 (noting that NEPA "must be construed to include protection of the quality of life of city residents").

Unfortunately, the DSEIS fails to inform members of the public to the Preferred Alternative's negative impacts on the GGNRA's recreation resources. The DSEIS applies inconsistent methodologies and assumptions in evaluating impacts of various alternatives to park user experience when compared to existing conditions, revealing an implicit bias against dog walking. For example - - under the "no action" alternative for Crissy Field, the DSEIS concludes that there would be no recreational benefit to dog walkers - - stating instead that there would be "no impact (17)." This conclusion disregards the enormous benefits that accrue (and would continue to accrue under the No Action Alternative) to recreational visitors who have regularly used Crissy Field for responsible off-leash use for generations. By contrast, the DSEIS states there would be "long-term, moderate adverse impacts" to visitors who prefer no dogs if the NPS selected the no action alternative (18). Thus the DSEIS acknowledges impacts to non-dog walkers, but not benefits to dog walkers.

These conclusions are internally inconsistent - - if there is no change to existing conditions, the analysis must consider both benefits and burdens accruing to all relevant user groups. Benefits would accrue to dog walkers, and these should be accounted for in the analysis, but are not. By disregarding benefits to dog users, the analysis is therefore weighted against dog users from the outset because the benefit to dog users has been discounted or ignored - - i.e., the analysis is based on the use of an incorrect baseline assessment of impacts.

Visitors who do not prefer dogs appear to receive the benefit of the doubt in the analysis. For example, under the preferred alternative, and Alternative E (the most dog-friendly of the alternatives), non-dog walkers supposedly experience "beneficial" impacts -Â presumably

measured over existing conditions (19). But the same treatment is not afforded to dog walkers as described above. The baseline for dog walkers is analyzed improperly because benefits of off leash dog walking are disregarded, and therefore, the severity of impacts to dog walkers from restrictions is underestimated. As a result, the analysis is flawed and apparently biased against dog users.

In addition, the NPS has apparently chosen a more restrictive alternative for Crissy Field than even its own analysis indicates is necessary. For instance, Alternative E - - which would allow on-leash use at East Beach and West Beach - - would have "beneficial" impacts even for visitors who prefer no dogs and only "minor" impacts on park visitors who prefer dogs (20). However, the preferred alternative would impose moderate impacts on dog users by the DSEIS's description (21).

Elimination of off-leash dog use at these locations would have more severe impacts than acknowledged in the EIS, because of the incorrect baseline described above and the elimination of substantial benefits of dog walking, which are ignored in the analysis.

Therefore, rather than "minor to moderate" impacts to dog users, the preferred alternative may be more likely to have "moderate to major" adverse impacts to these recreational users. When weighing these moderate to major adverse impacts against a benefit to non-dog users which would accrue under Alternative E or the preferred alternative, there is no compelling reason to reject Alternative E, or even more dog-friendly alternatives based on visitor experience, as the NPS has done.

Without evenhanded assumptions, baseline measurements, and analysis of impacts of each alternative as to all visitor groups and impacted resources, the DSEIS cannot assist in quality decision making and policy setting. These issues should be subject to public comment and corrected in the final EIS.

#### Unreasonable and Inconsistent Assumption of Compliance

The DSEIS is also internally inconsistent regarding enforcement and compliance assumptions. The NPS characterizes user conflict under the No Action Alternative based on incidents that are not currently acceptable or lawful behavior - - harassment or assault by a dog is already prohibited under the current rules. The DSEIS enforcement data, which is the basis for user conflict analysis, has not been updated since the 2011 DEIS. The Final EIS should either update its analysis or explain why the information is unavailable. 40 C.F.R. 1502.22.

But for the NPS preferred alternative (and all other action alternatives), the DSEIS assumes compliance. Given the NPS's position that compliance is impossible under the status quo (22) and its recognition that nearby dogwalking areas experience "major" noncompliance, (23) compliance is not a reasonable assumption for the action alternatives. This is especially true for an agency with such patently inadequate enforcement resources. No agency, especially not one with only nine enforcement personnel to cover 80,000 acres, (24) can guarantee perfect compliance. This assumption is unrealistic and inconsistent with baseline conditions, and ultimately skews the analysis by overestimating the benefits of requiring leashes or banning dogs. A realistic assessment should consider impacts from alternatives where noncompliance is comparable to current or reasonably anticipated rates of noncompliance.

While the NPS's objective is to improve compliance, more strict restrictions may increase noncompliance if visitors are not aware of new regulations or committed to achieving compliance. The DSEIS should undertake a realistic assessment of community buy-in to its proposed plans, including more deference to commonly accepted policies resulting from the negotiated rulemaking process, which had achieved a greater degree of stakeholder support than any other management plan proposed to date.

## Incomplete Analysis of Impacts to "Nearby Dog Walking Areas"

NEPA requires agencies to consider indirect effects, which are "caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable." 40

C.F.R. Â§ 1508.8(a), (b). EPA submitted a comment letter on the GGNRA's 2011 draft Dog Management Plan requesting that the GGNRA examine how its dog recreation restrictions would change patterns of dog use at other recreational areas in and around the GGNRA -Â also known as indirect impacts from dispersion or induced visitation. Simply put, by eliminating many off-leash areas, this activity may be concentrated in the remaining areas within and without the GGNRA, but the EIS had not done this analysis.

CFDG is deeply concerned that the Preferred Alternative may likely concentrate off-Â leash dog use in a much smaller area than under the status quo. The GGNRA encompasses 80,000 acres that includes nearly the entire Pacific coast in Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo counties (25). The DSEIS estimates that the Preferred Alternative will decrease access to off-leash dog walking by 30.9 miles of trail and 107 acres of other areas (26). NPS's Preferred Alternative would increase dog restrictions (e.g., from "voice control" to "on-leash only") in 13 of the 18 units covered by this Plan. Of the most popular GGNRA units for off-leash dog walking, the Preferred Alternative eliminates off-leash dog walking at three and substantially reduces the total area available in the remaining four GGNRA units.

Of greatest concern is the DSEIS's failure to analyze the concentration of dog-related impacts - - which it claims require strict management - - within the five GGNRA units that will still allow off-leash dog walking under the Preferred Alternative. Indeed, the EPA specifically requested that NPS study dispersion-related impacts to the tidewater goby - - an endangered fish species found in Rodeo Lagoon - - but the DSEIS fails to address the possibility that shutting down most of the GGNRA to off-leash dog walking will cause dog walkers to congregate in the few GGNRA locations left to them, let alone the indirect impacts of the increased dog traffic.

The DSEIS also provides an incomplete picture with respect to nearby (non-GGNRA) dog walking areas. As a starting point, the DSEIS analyzes impacts to only a small subset of potential nearby dog walking areas and does not explain its narrow selection. The 2011

DEIS identified 142 nearby dog walking areas, but the 2013 DSEIS omits 88% of these areas from the impacts analysis (27). NPS selected the 18 sites that were discussed in DSEIS (only 12% of the sites originally identified) based on a GGNRA survey with a response rate (13%) that even the NPS characterizes as "extremely low (28)." This is an unreliable methodology, and an insufficient analysis. Because NPS did not otherwise articulate any rationale for eliminating these 124 areas from further analysis in the DSEIS, the FEIS should undertake a complete analysis, and to the extent information is unavailable, fulfill the requirements of 40 C.F.R. 1502.22 with respect to unavailable or insufficient information.

NPS's approach results in strange anomalies, and suggests that the agency failed to identify areas that are likely to receive significant dispersion. NPS fails to mention Point Isabel Regional Shoreline - - one of the most heavily used dog parks in the nation (29) - - despite its proximity to many Marin County cities. Similarly, although NPS identified the 17-acre Pulgas Ridge Reserve off-leash area in the 2011 DEIS, it inexplicably omitted what appears to be the only significant off-leash area in San Mateo County from its analysis.

Further, the DSEIS also fails to provide sufficient information to calculate the acreage and miles of trail within nearby dog walking areas, let alone the portions that are available for on-leash or off-leash dog walking. Available data suggests that only a very small portion of these nearby dog walking areas is open to dogs at all, let alone off-leash dogs. For instance, dogs are only

allowed in picnic areas and campgrounds at the 6,300-acre Mt.

Tamalpais State Park - but even these areas are on-leash only so do not provide comparable recreational experiences to existing condition in the GGNRA (30). Even from NPS's analysis, it is clear that the nearby dog walking areas identified in the EIS do not provide a reasonable substitute for the GGNRA lands closed under the Preferred Alternative and that impacts will be concentrated within a small area. NPS must analyze these questions based on actual data.

The gaps in the DSEIS analysis are not limited to geographical scope, but also extend to the substantive impacts analysis. As a result of these gaps, the EPA rated the 2011 Draft EIS as containing "insufficient information" on areas of analysis required by NEPA. The EPA mentioned the following types of impacts that NPS should "thoroughly" investigate: water quality, vegetation, wildlife, visitor experience, human health and safety, park maintenance needs, changes in vehicle miles traveled to access recreational sites, dog waste management, and increased or concentrated erosion.

The DSEIS fails to examine most areas, and most impacts, that were the topic of EPA's comment. For 76% of the topics at each relevant location, the DSEIS fails to even mention the type of impacts identified by EPA. For certain locations, sources of dispersion were not identified. The GGNRA has not articulated a basis for not conducting this analysis. The attached chart (Attachment H) summarizes the GGNRA's lack of response to approximately 3/4 of the areas and topics identified.

GGNRA has proposed severe restrictions on off-leash dog walking which have a very real potential to concentrate this use in the few remaining areas that allow off-leash. The solution is to ease the restrictions on off-leash dog walking, which would ease the burden on the remaining areas. The NPS should ease these restrictions, in order to both preserve the valuable recreational resources of the GGNRA and avert a potential violation of NEPA and potential environmental impacts that have yet to be studied.

#### Use of an Improper Baseline for Rancho Corral de Tierra and Other New Lands in San Mateo County

The NPS also failed to respond to CFDG's comment (in both the Response to Comments and the DSEIS) that its definition of the No Action Alternative for Rancho Corral de Tierra and other "new lands" in San Mateo County did not accurately reflect pre-existing off leash use conditions.

NEPA expressly requires the inclusion of a No Action alternative in order to compare the impacts of the action alternatives to the status quo ante so that "agencies [can] compare the potential impacts of the proposed major federal action to the known impacts of maintaining the status quo." *Custer County Action Ass'n v. Garvey*, 256 F.3d 1024, 1040 (10th Cir. 2001). In defining the No Action alternative, the focus is on whether the No Action alternative realistically captures preexisting conditions as a baseline for comparison.

*Id.* (explaining that for purposes of the No Action alternative, the preexisting "level of activity is used as a benchmark" and rejecting the argument that "a 'true' no action alternative may only reflect the impacts of lawful activity"); 46 Fed. Reg. 18026, 18027 (1981) (requiring agencies to "analyze a no action alternative 'even if the agency is under a court order or legislative command to act,' i.e., where the No Action alternative would be legally impermissible).

The practical importance of this NEPA deficiency is that the resulting analysis underestimates the miles of trail and acreage lost to off-leash dog walking and thereby understates minimizes the impacts to recreation. CFDG believes that the NPS's inaccurate baseline for Rancho Corral de Tierra and other "new lands" in San Mateo county (Such as Mori Point, Pedro Point, Sweeny Ridge, Cattle Hill and Milagra Ridge) all have no accurate baselines that will leave the final EIS vulnerable to a legal challenge that

would undermine the cooperative efforts of many parties, including CFDG, to develop a workable dog management plan.

### Monitoring Based Management Plan Continues to Be Vague and Unreasonable

CFDG appreciates the NPS's efforts to provide further explanation of its monitoring based management plan. The DSEIS's revised adaptive management plan, however, continues to function as a "one way street" - i.e., it only allows for further restrictions on dog walking and does not contemplate lessening restrictions in any area should adverse impacts be deemed less intense than anticipated. This approach is internally inconsistent and fails to treat dog walking and other recreational uses in an evenhanded manner. The

GGNRA has acknowledged that its assessment of future impacts is to some degree uncertain - if impacts are more severe than expected, it will implement additional restrictions. However, the same assumptions do not apply to the benefit of dog recreational use; if it turns out that dog use causes fewer impacts than expected, there is no mechanism allowed for to permit greater dog walking in the future. This "one way street" is fundamentally unfair and has no reasonable basis.

Further, the DSEIS's revised triggers for additional compliance measures are now unclear. The DSEIS refers to "measurable" or "unacceptable" impacts that may cause GGNRA to implement additional compliance measures, including educational programs and closure of areas to dog use. While CFDG appreciates the NPS's efforts to recognize that the relevant inquiry should include impacts to resources, apparently it is now entirely within the GGNRA's discretion to determine when impacts are unacceptable (e.g., exceed an unspecified threshold), without having to show any violation of a regulation, plan, policy or other law or that off-leash dog walking caused the observed impacts. This system could inject a great deal of uncertainty in day-to-day use of recreational resources, and would give potentially unfettered discretion to the GGNRA, without justification based on significant impacts or regulatory violation.

In developing its monitoring-based management plan, GGNRA should define and allow for public input on criteria for triggering additional restrictions. CFDG also requests that if the Plan relies on inspectors to evaluate impacts, that the NPS ensure proper training and the existence of quality control measures including third-party monitoring to ensure objectivity. Further, the monitoring-based management plan should provide mechanisms for distinguishing impacts caused by dog walking and impacts traceable to other non-dog-related recreation. Since recreation (including dog walking) is a core use and purpose of the GGNRA, the adaptive management should include a mechanism to scale back other uses that conflict with or impinge on dog walking recreation, not just dog walking.

Even with the deficiencies in the NEPA analysis, the conclusion of the DSEIS is consistently that Alternative A (the status quo) results in only "negligible" or "minor" impacts to nearly all types of resources in nearly all GGNRA units analyzed in the DSEIS (31).

In fact, with closer analysis, the NPS has determined that there is insufficient scientific data to establish that off-leash dog recreation impacts water quality and many of the special status species. Indeed, as described above, the DSEIS's own discussion of compliance suggest that the benefits predicted from implementation of the Preferred Alternative are unlikely to materialize.

Indeed, the only resource that is consistently impacted in a "major" way in the DSEIS is the park operations budget,(32) and even then only for the action alternatives (B-F) because of increased enforcement costs. The DSEIS estimates that it will cost an additional \$2 million more per year to implement Alternative F than the status quo (33). While NEPA does not explicitly require a cost-benefit analysis, the value of imposing additional dog management regulations at

the GGNRA should certainly be a concern for the public and legislators who must fund this venture and suffer the associated burdens. GGNRA should allocate its resources to conserving existing off-leash dog walking recreational resources, and improving upon existing management and compliance measures.

The NPS Should Consider Other Solutions for the GGNRA.

CFDG supports maintaining the existing status quo of dog recreational areas. In recognition that enforcement and/or compliance may always be improved, CFDG proposes additional solutions here which should be considered and incorporated into a modified preferred alternative that is based on Alternative A.

The NPS should consider a certification/tag program comparable to one implemented in Boulder, CO. Based on how much NPS is willing to spend on its preferred alternative, there appears to be funding available for a certification/tag program. A certification/tag program can also be developed through alternative funding mechanisms, including community-based models, use of the parks conservancy resources, and hybrid approaches (e.g., where some resources from the current proposed monitoring based management plan are reallocated to other strategies such as certification/tag program). Advantages of a green tag program are many, as it allows enforcement to target problem users (the real cause of issues), not problem areas. A tag program is more fair and effective because responsible dog users are not punished and deprived of recreational resources as a result of a few problem users. Moreover, a tag program can provide a cross-cutting solution to address all impacts of concern including species of concern and other areas needing enforcement. Data from the Boulder program should be considered by NPS, given that that program obtained rates of tag carry compliance over 90% and in the initial year of implementation user conflict dropped by roughly 40%. Compliance rates for leash carry regulations were at almost 100% according to a Boulder representative, and there have been almost no incidents of wildlife harassment. Voice and sight control compliance is in the high 80% to low 90% range. This information did not receive analysis in the DSEIS. Relevant reports on the Boulder experience, including additional modifications to the program being considered, are cited here and CFDG specifically requests that NPS review and consider this information (34).

The NPS should also modify alternatives to incorporate additional design and construction solutions. Crissy Field should serve as a positive model in this regard. Unfortunately, such innovative structural solutions were dismissed from the DSEIS entirely for Fort Funston (e.g., vegetative barrier, post and cable fencing).

The NPS should assemble a "Recreational Roundtable" - a stakeholder group of recreational users. This body would not need to be an official federally regulated advisory committee; the NPS should consider other forms of organization that are legally feasible such as a public-private partnership. This roundtable should represent a broad variety of stakeholders to provide feedback and suggestions to the NPS and solicit continued public input and stakeholder buy-in, which will ultimately lead to increased compliance with the final Plan. Increased public education should be implemented through expansion of the existing work of the San Francisco SPCA and Marin Humane Society to create and expand an Off Leash Open Space Training Program.

Listening to the relevant stakeholders may lead the NPS back to alternatives that are more consistent with the negotiated rulemaking findings released in 2007, including the status quo. Dog management in the GGNRA has been controversial for many years. Of all the management alternatives on the table, more stakeholders (24 of 26) have supported the negotiated rulemaking than any other proposal. With both the 201 1 and the 201 3 versions of the Dog Management Plan, the NPS missed out on the opportunity to develop a workable solution for dog management in the GGNRA.

CFDG appreciates the opportunity to comment on the DSEIS. CFDG hopes that NPS will carefully consider CFDG's concerns regarding the substance of the DSEIS analysis , the choice of preferred alternative, and the opportunity for greater collaboration with community partners. CFDG looks forward to constructive dialogue to craft a practical plan for dog management that will be enforceable, and achieve meaningful preservation of the GGNRA's important recreational dog walking resources.

Thank you.

Very truly yours ,

Ashley S. Miller

cc: House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-CA Senator Diane Feinstein, D-CA  
Senator Barbara Boxer, D-CA Rep. Jackie Speier, D-San Mateo Rep. Jared Huffman, D-Marin  
Sally Jewell, Secretary of the Interior Gina McCarthy, US EPA  
Horst Greczmiel, Council on Environmental Quality Jon Jarvis, National Park Service Director  
Christine Lehnertz, NPS Western Regional Director Frank Dean, Superintendent, GGNRA  
Jared Blumenfeld, US EPA Region 9 San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee  
Supervisor Scott Wiener, City of San Francisco  
Dr. Jennifer Scarlett, Co-President , SF SPCA  
Rebecca Katz, Executive Director, Animal Care and Control Nancy McKenny, Executive Director, Marin  
Humane Society

References:

- (1) Council on Environmental Quality, "Collaboration in NEPA: A Handbook for NEPA Practitioners," 19, 35 (October 2007), available at [http://www.ecr.gov/pdf/Collaboration\\_in\\_NEPA\\_Oct\\_2007.pdf](http://www.ecr.gov/pdf/Collaboration_in_NEPA_Oct_2007.pdf).
- (2) Id. at 2.
- (3) Id. at 14.
- (4) Please see attachment A, hereto summarizing reductions and elimination of off-leash areas.
- (5) Please see attachments B, C, and D.
- (6) Letter from Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi to Frank Dean at 2 (Dec. 2, 2013).
- (7) An Act to Establish the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Pub. L. No. 92-589, Sec. 1, 39 Stat. 535 (1972) (the NPS "shall utilize the [GGNRA's] resources in a manner which will provide for recreation"). Legislative history reflects an intent to continue recreation (specifically including dog walking) within the GGNRA. H.R. Rep. 92-1391, 1972 U.S.C.C.A.N. 4850 (Sept. 12, 1972).
- (8) DSEIS at 2.
- (9) DSEIS at 27-28.
- (10) Attachment J provides an excerpt from the DSEIS' comment response report, containing the one response to K&L Gates' 201 1 comment letter . This is plainly insufficient as a response to comments as a matter of law.
- (11) DSEIS at 376.
- (12) DSEIS at 388-91.
- (13) Additional detailed comments on the significance of an urban quality analysis are attached hereto



from Kenneth Weiner, who is an individual closely involved in this process over the years who has worked with CFDG in the past on its comments. CFDG adopts and incorporates Mr. Weiner's comments herein. (Attachment I.)

(14) DSEIS at 858-59.

(15) DSEIS at 933.

(16) DSEIS at 841.

(17) DSEIS at 185.

(18) E.g., DSEIS at 1074.

(19) Id.

(20) The worst impacts allegedly caused by Alternative E would supposedly be "minor" adverse impacts for dogs lunging, chasing or barking while on-leash near a wildlife protection area for the western snowy plover. DSEIS at 184. However, the analysis fails to credit that these "minor" adverse impacts would be an improvement over existing off-leash conditions. Again, the document fails to measure beneficial impacts when measured over existing conditions in an evenhanded manner.

(21) Id.

(22) DSEIS at 99-100.

(23) DSEIS at 29-31. The DSEIS even asserts that noncompliance with leash laws on non-Â GGNRA property will mitigate impacts to GGNRA dog walkers to the level of "no impact." (e.g., p. 1062, predicting that "visitors would continue to walk dogs across Stinson Beach to reach the nearby county beach, ignoring the official 'no dogs' sign posted on Stinson Beach").

(24) DSEIS at 333.

(25) DSEIS at 251; Map 1.

(26) DSEIS at 373. As discussed below, it is likely that the DSEIS underestimates the trail miles and acreage lost to off-leash dog activities because the NPS relies on an improper baseline for Rancho Corral de Tierra and other recently acquired GGNRA units.

(27) 2011 DEIS Fig. 26, 2013 SDEIS at 339-351.

(28) DSEIS at 329.

(29) [http://www.ebparks.org/parks/pt\\_isabel](http://www.ebparks.org/parks/pt_isabel).

(30) [http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/471/files/MtTamalpaisSP04131 O.pdf](http://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/471/files/MtTamalpaisSP04131_O.pdf).

(31) See generally DSEIS, Table 4.

(32) Id.

(33) DSEIS at 57, 123.

(34) City of Boulder Open Space and Mountain Parks, Voice and Sight Tag Program Evaluation (Jan. 2013 ), available at <https://www-static.bouldercolorado.gov/docs/voice-and-sight-tag-program-evaluation-1-201306071558.pdf>; City of Boulder Voice and Sight Tag Program Monitoring Report (2011) available at <https://www-static.bouldercolorado.gov/docs/voice-sight-tag-program-monitoring-report-1-201304101211.pdf>